OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

58-59 VICTORIA, 1895

VOL. XXXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE TENTH DAY OF JUNE INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1895

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

HON. SIR MACKENZIE BOWELL, K.C.M.G.

(Cabinet formed 21st December, 1894.)

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1895

President of the Council (Premier)	Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL, K.C.M.G.
Postmaster General	Hon. Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio	Hon. Sir FRANK SMITH, KT.
Minister of Finance	Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. JOHN HAGGART.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. A. OUIMET.
Without Portfolio	Hon. J. C. PATTERSON.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. T. MAYNE DALY.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. A. R. ANGERS.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. W. B. IVES.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. A. R. DICKEY.
Secretary of State	Hon. W. H. MONTAGUE.
Without Portfolio	Hon. DONALD FERGUSON.

[*The above form the Cabinet.*]

Solicitor General	Hon JOHN JOSEPH CURRAN, Q.C.
Controller of Customs	Hon. N. CLARKE WALLACE.
Controller of Inland Revenue	Hon. JOHN F. WOOD.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... JOHN J. McGEE, Esq.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Hon. PETER WHITE	*Speaker.*
JOSEPH G. H. BERGERON, M.P	*Deputy Speaker.*
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq	Clerk of the House.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, Esq	Clerk Assistant.
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS:

GEORGE B. BRADLEY	Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN A. ABBOTT	Reporters.
E. JOSEPH DUGGAN	
ALBERT HORTON	
J. O. MARCEAU	
THOS. P. OWENS	
ALPHONSE DESJARDINS	
A. C. CAMPBELL	
J. CHARLES BOYCE	Assistant to Chief Reporter.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIFTH SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1895

ADDINGTON—George W. W. Dawson.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—George Hugh Macdonell.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—William Walter McDonald.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—William Le Boutillier Fauvel.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—Hon. John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Eugene A. Dyer.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.

CAPE BRETON { Hector F. McDougall. / David McKeen.
CARDWELL—Robert Smeaton White.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Newton Ramsay Colter.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Onésime Carignan.
CHARLEVOIX—Henry Simard.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Louis de Gonzague Belley.
COLCHESTER—William A. Patterson.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Arthur R. Dickey.

DIGBY—Edward Charles Bowers.
DORCHESTER—Cyrille Emile Vaillancourt.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Hugo H. Ross.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Henry W. Allan.

FRONTENAC—Hiram A. Calvin.

GASPÉ—Louis Zéphirin Joncas.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Théotime Blanchard.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND—Hon. Walter H. Montague
HALIFAX { Thomas E. Kenny. / John Fitz-William Stairs.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON { Alexander McKay. / Samuel S. Ryckman.
HANTS—Alfred Putnam.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—A. W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—Sévérin Lachapelle.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.

HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Hon. James Colebrooke Patterson.

IBERVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

JACQUES-CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
JOLIETTE—Urbain Lippé.

KAMOURASKA—Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—George V. McInerney.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.
KING'S (N.B.)—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
KING'S (N.S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—Augustine Colin Macdonald. John McLean.
KINGSTON—James Henry Metcalfe.

LAMBTON, E. Riding—George Moncrieff.
LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
LANARK, N. Riding—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE—Louis Conrad Pelletier.
L'ASSOMPTION—Hormisdas Jeannotte.
LAVAL—Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick Ferguson.
LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—William Gibson.
LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.
L'ISLET—J. Israël Tarte.
LONDON—Hon. Sir John Carling, K.C.M.G.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MARQUETTE—Nathaniel Boyd.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph Hormisdas Legris.
MEGANTIC—Louis J. Côté *alias* Fréchette.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Joseph Henry Marshall.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—William H. Hutchins.
MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—Robert Boston.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Frederick Roome.
MISSISQUOI—George Barnard Baker.
MONCK—Arthur Boyle.
MONTCALM—Louis E. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Philippe A. Choquette.
MONTMORENCY—Arthur J. Turcotte.
MONTREAL, Centre—Hon. John Joseph Curran.
MONTREAL, East—Alphonse Télésphore Lépine.
MONTREAL, West—Sir Donald Smith, K.C.M.G.
MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.

NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Gordon E. Corbould.
NICOLET—Joseph Hector Leduc.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—David Tisdale.

NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Michael Adams.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Frank Madill.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—William Smith.
ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.
OTTAWA (City)—Sir James A. Grant, K.C.M.G. Honoré Robillard.
OTTAWA (County)—Charles Ramsay Devlin.
OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G.

PEEL—Joseph Featherston.
PERTH, N. Riding—James Nicol Grieve.
PERTH, S. Riding—William Pridham.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Burnham.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Stevenson.
PICTOU—Hon. Sir Charles H. Tupper, K.C.M.G. John McDougald.
PONTIAC—John Bryson.
PORTNEUF—Arthur Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE (P.E.I.)—Stanislas F. Perry. John Yeo.
PRINCE EDWARD—Archibald Campbell Miller.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
QUEBEC, West—Thomas McGreevy.
QUEBEC (County)—Jules J. T. Frémont.
QUEEN'S (N.B.)—George Frederick Baird.
QUEEN'S (N.S.)—Francis Gordon Forbes.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)—Louis Henry Davies. William Welsh.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Hon. Peter White.
RENFREW, S. Riding—John Ferguson.
RESTIGOUCHE—John McAlister.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph A. Gillies.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Clarence C. Cleveland.
RIMOUSKI—Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, K.C.M.G.
ROUVILLE—Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—Ezekiel McLeod.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City & County—J. Douglas Hazen. John A. Chesley.
ST. JOHNS (Q.)—François Bourassa.
ST. MAURICE—François Sévère L. Desaulniers.
SASKATCHEWAN—Day Hart Macdowell.

SELKIRK—Hon. Thomas Mayne Daly.
SHEFFORD—John Robbins Sanborn.
SHELBURNE—Nathaniel W. White.
SHERBROOKE—Hon. William Bullock Ives.
SIMCOE, E. Riding—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.
SOULANGES—James William Bain.
STANSTEAD—Timothy Byron Rider.
SUNBURY—Robert Duncan Wilmot.

TÉMISCOUATA—Paul Etienne Grandbois.
TERREBONNE—Pierre Leclair.
THREE RIVERS—Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, Centre—George Ralph R. Cockburn.
TORONTO, East—Emerson Coatsworth, jun.
TORONTO, West—Frederick Chas. Denison, C.M.G.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Girouard.

VANCOUVER ISLAND—Andrew Haslam.
VAUDREUIL—Henry Stanislaus Harwood.
VERCHÈRES—C. A. Geoffrion.
VICTORIA (B.C.) { Edward Gawler Prior. / Thomas Earle.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—John Archibald McDonald.
VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—Charles Fairbairn.

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Isaac Erb Bowman.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.
WELLAND—James A. Lowell.
WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.
WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
WELLINGTON, S. Riding—James Innes.
WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.
WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Franklin M. Carpenter.
WESTMORELAND—Josiah Wood.
WINNIPEG—Joseph Martin.

YALE—John Andrew Mara.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse Samuel Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Thomas Temple.
YORK (O.) E. Riding—William Finlay Maclean.
YORK (O.) N. Riding—William Mulock.
YORK (O.) W. Riding—Hon. N. Clarke Wallace.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO SUPERVISE THE PUBLICATION OF THE OFFICIAL REPORTS OF THE DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

BEAUSOLEIL, Mr. Cléophas *(Berthier)*.
BÉCHARD, Mr. François *(Iberville)*.
CAMERON, Mr. Hugh *(Inverness)*.
CHARLTON, Mr. John *(North Norfolk)*.
DAVIN, Mr. Nicholas Flood *(West Assiniboia)*.
HAZEN, Mr. J. Douglas *(St. John City and County)*.
INNES, Mr. James *(South Wellington)*.
LARIVIÈRE, Mr. Alphonse A. C. *(Provencher)*.
LÉPINE, Mr. Alphonse Télesphore *(East Montreal)*.
PRIOR, Mr. Edward Gawler *(Victoria, B.C.)*.
SCRIVER, Mr. Julius *(Huntingdon)*.
SOMERVILLE, Mr. James *(North Brant)*.
TAYLOR, Mr. George *(South Leeds)*.
WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman *(Albert)*.
WHITE, Mr. Robert Smeaton *(Cardwell)*.

Chairman:—Mr. ALPHONSE A. C. LARIVIÈRE *(Provencher)*.

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S proposed resolution (*re* Expenditure on Public Works, &c.) in amendment to Mr. FOSTER'S motion for Committee of Ways and Means, 4th June :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. WELDON,	Mr. BORDEN,
Mr. MACDOWALL,	Mr. FAUVEL,
Mr. STEVENSON,	Mr. SCRIVER,
Mr. HAZEN,	Mr. GILLMOR,
Mr. PATTERSON (Huron),	Mr. BOWERS,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. DELISLE,
Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.).	Mr. PERRY.

On Mr. DAVIES'S (P.E.I.) proposed resolution (*re* The Lachine Canal Bridge Contract) in amendment to Mr. FOSTER'S motion for Committee of Supply, 19th June :—

Mr. MONCRIEFF,	Mr. LISTER,
Mr. BERGIN,	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. SPROULE,	Mr. CAMPBELL,
Mr. LECLAIR,	Mr. LANGELIER,
Mr. HUGHES,	Mr. FORBES,
Mr. BAKER,	Mr. CHOQUETTE,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. CHARLTON,
Mr. SMITH (Ontario),	Mr. LOWELL,
Mr. TYRWHITT,	Mr. EDWARDS,
Mr. PATTERSON (Huron),	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Mr. POPE,	Mr. BOURASSA,
Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.),	Mr. WELSH,
Mr. CORBY,	Mr. DELISLE,
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. LAVERGNE.

On Mr. MILLS'S (Bothwell) proposed resolution (*re* The Public Expenditure) in amendment to Mr. FOSTER'S motion that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, 25th June :—

Mr. HAGGART,	Mr. EDGAR,
Mr. PATTERSON (Huron),	Mr. ROWAND,
Mr. PRIDHAM,	Mr. GRIEVE,
Mr. MONCRIEFF,	Mr. LISTER,
Mr. STAIRS,	Mr. FORBES,
Mr. CORBY,	Mr. FRÉMONT,
Mr. IVES,	Mr. PATERSON (Brant),
Mr. JONCAS,	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. BÉCHARD,

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. SMITH (Ontario),	Mr. LIVINGSTON,
Mr. BRYSON,	Mr. FRASER,
Mr. SIMARD,	Mr. GODBOUT,
Mr. AYMOT,	Mr. BOURASSA,
Mr. BAKER,	Mr. CHOQUETTE,
Mr. TYRWHITT,	Mr. PERRY,
Mr. MACDOWALL,	Mr. FAUVEL,
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier),	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. COCHRANE,	Mr. MARTIN,
Mr. LACHAPELLE,	Mr. BRUNEAU,
Mr. WELDON,	Mr. BORBEN,
Mr. McNEILL.	Mr. McCARTHY.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S proposed resolution (Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Letter to A. McNeill, M.P., *re* Vacancies in the Senate—Vote of Censure) in amendment to Mr. FOSTER'S motion that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, 4th July :—

Mr. DAVIN,	Mr. GILLMOR,
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell),	Mr. CHARLTON,
Mr. BRYSON,	Mr. McMILLEN,
Mr. MONCRIEFF,	Mr. BROWN,
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis),	Mr. WELSH,
Mr. SPROULE,	Mr. CASEY,
Mr. EARLE,	Mr. EDWARDS,
Mr. PATTERSON (Huron),	Mr. PATERSON (Brant),
Mr. DAVIS (Alberta),	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier),	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL,
Mr. CORBY,	Mr. LIVINGSTON,
Mr. DUPONT,	Mr. BOURASSA,
Mr. DUGAS,	Mr. MACDONALD (Huron),
Mr. COSTIGAN,	Mr. DEVLIN,
Mr. DICKEY,	Mr. DAWSON,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. GRIEVE,
Mr. BARNARD,	Mr. LEDUC,
Mr. McALISTER,	Mr. COLTON,
Mr. IVES,	Mr. FAUVEL,
Mr. LÉPINE,	Mr. BEITH,
Mr. HODGINS,	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. INGRAM,	Mr. MARTIN,
Mr. FERGUSON (Renfrew).	Mr. BOSTON.

On Mr. LAURIER'S proposed motion to adjourn the House (Rumoured Resignation of Ministers) 9th July:—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. GUILLET,	Mr. BOURASSA,
Mr. IVES,	Mr. FAUVEL,
Mr. POPE,	Mr. EDWARDS,
Mr. RYCKMAN,	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Mr. FERGUSON (Renfrew),	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. McNEILL,	Mr. PATERSON (Brant),
Mr. COCHRANE,	Mr. WELSH,
Mr. TEMPLE.	Mr. DELISLE.

On Mr. LAURIER'S proposed motion to adjourn the House (Ministerial Explanations *re* Rumoured Resignations) 11th July:—

Mr. BERGIN,	Mr. CHARLTON,
Mr. ADAMS,	Mr. BOWMAN,
Mr. CORBY,	Mr. PATERSON (Brant),
Mr. METCALFE,	Mr. WELSH.

On Mr. MILLS'S (Bothwell) proposed resolution (Lieutenant-Governor's Tenure of Office) in amendment to Mr. FOSTER'S motion that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, 12th July:—

Mr. WALLACE,	Mr. PATERSON (Brant),
Mr. METCALFE,	Mr. EDWARDS,
Mr. FRÉCHETTE,	Mr. LAVERGNE,
Mr. MACDOWALL,	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Mr. BARNARD,	Mr. BOWMAN,
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier),	Mr. DEVLIN,
Mr. CORBY,	Mr. SANBORN,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. DELISLE,
Mr. BRYSON,	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. HAZEN,	Mr. MARTIN,
Mr. LECLAIR,	Mr. HARWOOD,
Mr. CRAIG.	Mr. TARTE.

On Mr. LAURIER'S proposed resolution (The Manitoba School Question) in amendment to Mr. FOSTER'S motion that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, 15th July:—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell),	Mr. CHARLTON,
Mr. ROSAMOND,	Mr. McGREGOR,
Mr. BARNARD,	Mr. WELSH,
Mr. PRIOR,	Mr. EDWARDS,
Sir DONALD SMITH,	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE,
Mr. IVES,	Mr. GEOFFRION,
Mr. CORBY,	Mr. PATERSON (Brant),
Mr. CARSCALLEN,	Mr. GIBSON,
Mr. CARIGNAN,	Mr. BOURASSA,
Mr. KENNY,	Mr. FREMONT,
Mr. POPE,	Mr. LEGRIS,
Mr. MADILL,	Mr. BOWMAN,
Mr. CALVIN.	Mr. SANBORN.

House of Commons Debates

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 18th April, 1895.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 18th day of April, 1895, for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at fifteen minutes before Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

A Message was delivered by Réné Edouard Kimber, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

MR. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that during the recess I have received communications from several members notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz. :—

Of Hon. Mr. Dickey, Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Hon. Félix Geoffrion, Member for the Electoral District of Verchères, by decease.

Of Hon. Walter Humphries Montague, Member for the Electoral District of Haldimand, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of the Rt. Hon. Sir John S. D. Thompson, K.C.M.G., Member for the Electoral District of Antigonish, by decease.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said Electoral Districts respectively.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that during the recess, the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return

Of Hon. Arthur R. Dickey, for the Electoral District of Cumberland.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. Foster.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament. To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy, which is as follows :—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is with much satisfaction that I again have recourse to your advice and assistance in the administration of the affairs of the Dominion.

By the sudden and lamented death of the late Right Honourable Sir John Thompson, Canada has sustained a grievous loss. The deep and heartfelt sympathy expressed by Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and the manifestations of sorrow with which the distressing intelligence was received throughout the Empire, as well as tokens of esteem and respect everywhere paid to the memory of the deceased statesman, have been gratefully appreciated by the people of Canada.

Satisfactory assurances having been received from Her Majesty's Government respecting the interpretation of certain clauses in the Treaty of Commerce with France, ratifications will be exchanged as soon as the necessary legislation has been passed.

The recent action of the Imperial Parliament enabling the various Australasian Governments

to enter into preferential trade relations with the other self-governing Colonies of the Empire, affords gratifying proof that the suggestions of the Colonial Conference are being favourably entertained by Her Majesty's Government.

In conformity with a recent judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to the effect that the dissentient minority of the people of Manitoba have a constitutional right of appeal to the Governor General in Council against certain Acts passed by the Legislature of the province of Manitoba in relation to the subject of education, I have heard in Council the appeal, and my decision thereon has been communicated to the Legislature of the said province. The papers on the subject will be laid before you.

The depression in trade which has prevailed throughout the world for the past few years has made itself felt in Canada, but fortunately to a less degree than in most other countries. Although this has not resulted in any considerable decrease in the volume of our foreign trade, yet, owing to low prices and recent reductions in and removal of taxation, it has been followed by a serious decrease in revenue derived from Customs and Excise. In order to produce equilibrium between revenue and expenditure for the coming year, it will be necessary to observe the greatest possible economy in the appropriations for the various branches of the public service.

During the period that has elapsed since the last Session of Parliament, I have had an opportunity of visiting many portions of the Dominion, including the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. Throughout these tours I have been impressed and gratified by manifestations of an abounding loyalty and public spirit; and notwithstanding the phase of trade depression already referred to, I observed everywhere unmistakable signs of that confident hopefulness in the future, based on a thorough belief in the greatness of the resources of Canada, which is one of the characteristics of her people, and which furnishes a good augury and pledge of further development and progress.

The Government of Newfoundland having intimated its desire to renew negotiations looking to the admission of that colony into the Dominion of Canada, a sub-committee of my advisers have recently met in conference a delegation from the Island Government and discussed with them the terms of union. It will be a subject of general congratulation if the negotiations now pending result in the incorporation of Her Majesty's oldest colonial possession into the Canadian Confederation.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Measures relating to bankruptcy and insolvency, and to joint stock companies will be laid before you. You will also be asked to consider certain amendments to the Insurance Act, to the Act respecting Dominion Notes, to the Dominion Lands Act, to the Indian Act, to the North-west Territories Representation Act, as also a Bill respecting the land subsidy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have directed that the accounts of the past year shall be laid before you. The Estimates for the ensuing year will also be presented. They have been framed with every regard to economy compatible with the efficiency of the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I now leave you to the discharge of the important duties devolving upon you with an earnest prayer that, being guided by the spirit of wisdom and patriotism your deliberations may, under the divine blessing, conduce to the unity and well-being of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the Address with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the session be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That Select Standing Committees of this House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes:—1. On Privileges and Elections.—2. On Expiring Laws.—3. On Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.—4. On Miscellaneous Private Bills.—5. On Standing Orders.—6. On Printing.—7. On Public Accounts.—8. On Banking and Commerce.—9. On Agriculture and Colonization;—which said Committee shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Joint Report of the Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. Speaker.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 19th April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—INTERNAL ECONOMY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, an approved minute of Council, appointing the Honourable George Eulas Foster, Minister of Finance, the Honourable Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, Minister of Justice, the Honourable John Graham Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Honourable Joseph Aldric Ouimet, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

Government House,
Ottawa, 18th April, 1895.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency's speech delivered at the opening of Parliament.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency in answer to the Speech from the Throne in this, what in all probability will be the last session of the 7th Parliament of Canada, I do so fully conscious of the duty entrusted to me, and likewise of the compliment paid to the constituency I represent, and also the compliment to my humble self. In referring to the Address from the Throne, I from the bottom of my heart, aye, Sir, from its innermost core, regret the sad occurrence referred to in the first paragraph, the untimely decease of the late Right Honourable Sir John Thompson. Coming as he did to this House little more than seven years ago, unheralded and unsung, soon it dawned upon the people of Canada as also upon the members of this House, that a master-mind had been placed in this arena. We all remember with what bounds and strides Sir John Thompson advanced. Step by step he passed on until at last the great goal of his ambition was reached, becoming the proud Premier of this vast Dominion. A short year ago we saw the hon. gentleman here, to all appearances, at least to all outward appearances in the possession of robust and rugged health, and little did we dream that on this our assembling again, he would not be with us, and his absence to-day recalls all more painfully and vividly. Need I recall his tragic death in historic Windsor Castle, aye, even almost in the presence of royalty itself, and the closing of a life and ending of a career not only as a colonial statesman, but in all probability in some future day, had he lived, as an Imperial Councillor. I do not propose to dilate upon his excellencies, that I shall leave to the historian of the future, and when the history of Canada is written no name will stand out in bolder relief than that of the brilliant parliamentarian, the great Premier, the patriotic statesman, Sir John Thompson, of whom well might it be said :

"His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him,
That nature might stand up to all the world and say : This was a man."

But as we speed the parting guest, so in turn we welcome the coming, and honour having been paid departed merit, it is now my duty to pay respect to existing worth. Thrice in three successive years, the Conservative party of Canada has lost its respected leaders, and thrice in that time has it been prophesied that the downfall of the party would be consummated. But, Sir, I say : that as upon the death of Sir John Macdonald, so upon the death of Sir John Thompson, the ranks were closed, the squares filled, and under the leadership of the talented gentleman who now leads the party, victory is assured, as victory has been assured in the past, when an appeal shall be made to the electorate of this Dominion. Now, Sir, to refer to some of the matters that are contained within the Address. It seems only right and proper that I should at the outset allude to that clause which speaks of the legislation recently enacted by the Imperial Parliament in reference to the Australian provinces, when it is borne in mind that the Rt. Hon. First Minister of the day had a great part in the bringing about of the Colonial Conference, which we were all pleased witnesses of last year. Under the constitution of Australasia, a charter was granted in the year 1873, conferring on those colonies the right of self-government, but for reasons best known to themselves, limitations and provisos were inserted in reference to trade, which resulted in commerce being restricted as between the Australasian colonies themselves. That, Sir, has been to the people of these provinces a serious and great drawback, and that undesirable condition of affairs has been terminated as a result of the intercolonial conference held here last year—a conference which was truly representative,

not only in its character from a colonial standpoint, but likewise by its being graced with the presence of an Imperial Councillor in the person of the Earl of Jersey thereby evidencing that interest which the mother land takes, and which we trust she will always take in the prosperity of her colonies. On that occasion resolutions were passed asking that the Imperial Government might be pleased in their wisdom to enact legislation which should give to those Australian colonies the rights and privileges which are enjoyed by the people of Canada in reference to commercial treaties, and I was pleased to hear it announced in the Speech from the Throne that such legislation had been enacted, and we trust and hope that by reason of it, there may be inaugurated between the Dominion and the provinces of Australasia, a stream of commerce and trade which will be an enduring benefit to both, and which will tend to bind in closer unity and to knit together these colonies of that great Empire of which we are pleased to be an integral part. In the Address there is a most pleasing reference made to His Excellency the Governor General. Coming here as the successor to distinguished noblemen, His Excellency found for himself no easy task: but, Sir, I believe that the conduct of His Excellency, since he has been in Canada, manifesting in all matters pertaining to the welfare of the commonwealth a deep and abiding interest, has caused the people to have for him a warm place in their hearts, and also for his most excellent consort, who has most ably seconded all his efforts. And when the time comes for His Excellency to pass from his present position to those high duties which we trust the Imperial Government will hereafter assign to him, I believe he will, like his predecessors, lend his hearty aid to the promotion of the material prosperity of this colony in the mother land. And now, Sir, I come to discuss a matter not pertaining to commerce, but involving one of those unfortunate questions which unhappily for the public of Canada, it seems are never to end. We in Canada had thought when the consolidation of the different provinces was brought about, that then once and for ever there would be a stilling of all discord in respect to questions of race and religion. We thought those differences would be quelled; we thought they would be buried in oblivion never again to be resurrected. But, unfortunately, differences of opinion on these questions have arisen from time to time, and within the last few years what is known to-day as the Manitoba school question has been before the people of this Dominion, and is at the present time more particularly before the people of the province of Manitoba for adjudication. In 1870, after negotiations, Manitoba was admitted into the confederation. Prior to that time there had been in that region no settled form of government, no institutions with provincial autonomy; and consequently there had been a school system free to all sects, and not owing thanks to any government for contributions or aid. The Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, and the Presbyterians each had their own schools; and so, when the province of Manitoba was admitted into the confederacy, and had engrafted upon its constitution all the rights and privileges which are conferred upon the other provinces, power was given to that province to deal with the question of education exclusively, subject, however, to those limitations and provisos which were contained in the Manitoba Act, which Act was afterwards approved of by the Federal Government of Canada. Under this system, from the year 1870 to the year 1890, educational matters in Manitoba pursued the even tenor of their way, and from neither one side nor the other were heard any complaints or remonstrances. There were the two religious bodies, those professing the Protestant faith and those professing the Roman Catholic faith, living side by side in unity, carrying on the institutions of the country, but reserving to themselves, as they each had the right to do, the educational system they preferred. But, Sir, it remained for the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and those with whom he was associated, at one fell stroke to interfere with all existing regulations, and to sweep away all the vested rights that up to that time existed; and then commenced this unhappy friction which has been disturbing that country from that day to this. When that legislation was put into effect in Manitoba the Roman Catholic minority of the province, feeling aggrieved, feeling that they had not been dealt fairly by, feeling, as the facts show, that the Manitoba Government had given a pledge that those vested rights should not be interfered with, appealed to the superior power, the Federal Government at Ottawa, to exercise the veto power of disallowance in their behalf. That appeal having been made to the Federal Government, what was their answer? it having been stated that the Act of the Manitoba legislature was not within the power of that legislature—that, according to the legal expression, the Act was ultra vires. That question having been raised and argued, the Federal Government declined to intervene, and left the matter to be adjudicated in the courts. Afterward, the case known as the Barrett case, which was submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada and afterwards carried on appeal to the Privy Council of England was instituted when it was decided by the highest court that the Act was fully within the power of the local legislature. Debarred from redress on their legal rights, the minority then had recourse to another form of appeal which had been suggested, and

which, during the consideration of the appeal in the Barrett case, had been referred to as applicable to the question—that was the power of appealing to the Federal Government for clemency and for redress. Now, Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen to mark well that latterly that phase of the question has been discussed, as it must be remembered, and the record will prove it, that when the question came before the Privy Council whether the Act was constitutional or not, it was openly stated and contended that even if under their legal rights the minority were estopped, they had at least left to them the right to appeal to the Federal power for clemency. Now, in 1890 this question was before the Parliament and the people of Canada; and, taking advice from cases of a somewhat analogous nature which had produced dissension and discord in this country on previous occasions, an hon. gentleman who then had the honour of representing a constituency in this House, and who was an acknowledged jurist—I refer to the Hon. Edward Blake—caused to be placed upon the statute-books of this country a resolution which reads as follows:—

That it is expedient to provide means whereby on solemn occasions touching the exercise of the power of disallowance, or of the appellate power as to educational legislation, important questions of law or of fact may be referred by the executive to a high judicial tribunal for hearing and consideration, in such mode that the authorities and parties interested may be represented, and that a reasoned opinion may be obtained for the information of the executive.

Now, Sir, I repeat that the Federal Government being appealed to, had no other course open to them than to hear the appeal that was presented by the minority of the province of Manitoba; and when that case came on in its proper course by way of petition or memorial, the Government of the day under the late Premier referred it to the Supreme Court of Canada for a decision as to whether or not that course should be followed. A series of questions were submitted, some six in all, and they were all negatived by a majority of the Supreme Court. Estopped in that direction, another avenue was open to the minority, and that was by an appeal to the Law Lords of the Imperial Privy Council; which appeal was taken in due time. It has been argued that the Federal Government in this regard, had done something that was not at all incumbent upon them, in fact that they had gone out of their way in listening to the appeal for clemency put forward by the minority of Manitoba. But, in answer to that, I have this to say, that throughout these proceedings, as I believe, not only were the Government of the day acting within the constitution, but, moreover, and beyond that, the very fact that in these proceedings, and in all subsequent proceedings, the Manitoba Government were represented by counsel indicated, that even in the opinion of that Government every step taken in the case was regular and proper. Now, Sir, what were the questions submitted, and to these questions what answers were given? I do not propose to read them at length, because they are in all the reports. But when the matter came before the Law Lords in England, among other questions, this one was asked:

Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council the power to make the declarations or remedial orders which are asked for in the said memorials and petitions, assuming the material facts to be as stated therein, or has His Excellency the Governor General in Council any other jurisdiction in the premises?

And another question propounded for answer was this:

Did the Acts of Manitoba relating to education, passed prior to the session of 1890, confer on or continue to the minority "a right or privilege in relation to education" within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, or establish a system of separate or dissentient schools, within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867; if said section 93 be found applicable to Manitoba; and if so, did the two Acts of 1890 complained of, or either of them, affect any right or privilege of the minority in such a manner that an appeal will lie thereunder to the Governor General in Council?

The answers to these questions were respectively as follows. To the first:

That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute.

And in answer to the second:

That the Acts of Manitoba relating to education passed prior to the session of 1890, did confer on the minority a right or privilege in relation to education within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of "The Manitoba Act," which alone applies; that the two Acts of 1890 complained of did affect a right or privilege of the minority in such a manner that an appeal will lie thereunder to the Governor General in Council.

Now, Sir, these were the answers delivered by the Imperial Privy Council to the two questions propounded, and I submit, and every fair-minded man will agree, that the duty was incumbent upon the Privy Council of Canada to hear the matter complained of. Well, Sir, in due course, that appeal was heard; in due course that appeal was argued. And once again did the province of Manitoba show that they believed that everything that had been done by the Government was right, that they believed the Dominion Government was acting within the strict letter of the law, was entirely within its constitutional rights and privileges by their acquiescence in having a representative and counsel at that hearing. I have recapitulated all the facts, I have recapitulated all the steps that have been taken in the case; and all that has

been done has been the handing over of the case by the Dominion Government to the government of the province of Manitoba. And, Sir, it is to be trusted by all those who would wish to see the disappearance from the arena of Federal politics of matters of this vexed nature that the province of Manitoba may be pleased to arrange amicably between the parties the rights or privileges of the minority in respect of the matters complained of, and which the Privy Council stated had been affected. Now, Sir, I come to deal with the phase of the Address in reference to the trade and commerce of the country as it at present exists, and as it has existed during the past year. And, referring to the phraseology of that, I do regret, in common with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that there has been in this Dominion a depression in trade that has resulted in a decrease of our revenue; that has resulted in this year of grace, in a deficit in the income of the Dominion. Sir, the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite light up at the prospect of a deficit. That is to be little wondered at, because in a deficit they recognize an old friend. Year after year they sat on the Treasury benches, and year after year they had to announce to the country that deficit after deficit was piling up, but they consoled themselves with the reflection that they had transferred them to capital account. Contrast that with the other picture. Year after year, instead of deficits of from one to two millions piling up, we found, under a Conservative Administration, a surplus announced annually, reaching in one year nearly the colossal sum of $4,000,000. I am not, at this time, going to discuss whether it was right or wrong to pile up those surpluses. But this I do say—that the surpluses so piled up were of benefit to the people in this way, that, while they had the capital on hand without unduly taxing the people, the Government expended those surpluses in great public works which have been, and will be for all time of enduring advantage. Now, Sir, there must be reasons for a deficit. And I have no doubt that before this session closes, hon. gentlemen, very fruitful in charges, very prolific in contentions, will allege many reasons why a deficit has occurred. First, throughout the whole civilized world, there has been, during recent years a most wonderful depression. Situated as we are, close to the great republic to the south of us, feeling as we do the very pulsations and throbs of the commercial life of that country, little was it to be wondered that such depression would not penetrate within our borders. But I am proud and pleased to say that the depression in the Dominion of Canada has not at all reached the extent of the depression which has been felt throughout the length and breadth of the United States of America; and to-day no country in the world has a more fair distribution of wealth, has a more fair distribution of prosperity, has a more fair distribution of comfort, than Canada. And I say that it is in great measure due to the fiscal policy which not only has predominated in this country for years past, but which shall predominate, I believe, for years to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been crying for an opportunity to test in a constituency the trade policy of Canada as it has been under this Government. Where were the gentlemen opposite when there was an election in Haldimand the other day? Echo answers, "where?" And though the hon. leader of the Opposition was almost within a stone's throw of the Liberal stronghold of Verchères, his silence on that occasion was golden. And, although he has the honour of representing one of the constituencies of the city of Quebec, he permitted two Conservatives to make the fight to a finish in the adjoining riding to his own. Sir, these are signs of the times, and most unexampled proof that when the appeal is made to the people of this country they will endorse the fiscal policy which has been in force since 1878. Now, Sir, I have an authority under my hand, a most eminent authority, that of Mr. Sauerbeek, who, in a recent issue of the "London Times," has made this statement: and being a statistician of the very highest order, and an acknowledged authority in the old country, to his statements some reliability must be attached; and he has proved conclusively that within the last 100 years there have never been lower prices realized for the exports of Great Britain than in the past year. Moreover, he has proved that in the years 1878 and 1879, as contrasted with the present year, prices of exported goods from England were 20 per cent higher than they are to-day. Well, Sir, what has that to do with Canada? I say that has a great deal to do with it, for in that time we were importing from Great Britain at prices which were one-fifth higher than they are to-day, and it must be borne in mind that if duty is paid on an article of the value of only $50, the same duty paid on an article of the value of $100 will produce more revenue to this country. So in the decreased price of every article we have purchased, and, while our consumption may not have been less, the value of the goods so consumed has been less, and, as a result, there has been a lessening of the revenue. Then, it must be considered that on many articles the tariff of this country has been greatly reduced in the last year or so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member says "Hear, hear." I trust he says it approvingly, and I believe he does. But as a result, what do we see? We see that the revenue derivable from a great many of the large staples

has been most materially reduced. Take, in the first place, the goods that have been entered for consumption. In this year, as against last year—and I am speaking as to values—there has been a decrease of eight millions and a half worth of goods; then, the duty collected on these goods, as contrasted with the preceding year, has been less by a million and three-quarters of dollars. But the most noticeable changes have been in respect of the very goods which were affected by a reduction in the tariff, as witnessed in the fact that the revenue derivable from woollen goods has decreased, as compared with the preceding year, by a million and a half; the revenue in respect of iron has decreased by a million and a quarter; and that in respect to silks, by $300,000. The great falling off in the excise this year of $1,000,000 as compared with last year, has, too, helped to increase that deficit. Now, Sir, on the whole there is a deficit, but the reasons are ample, the matter is explainable; and the fact that there is a deficit this year will not be looked upon by the country as a proof that such a state of affairs must exist under a Conservative Administration, but the people will regard it as a rarity and a novelty. I trust, Sir, that the deficit will not amount to what has been prophesied, and that, having a due regard to the efficiency of the public service, economy may be practised to such an extent as to make that deficit as small as possible. Now I come to another clause in the Address, that which makes mention of the probable admission of the oldest British colony in America as part of the confederation. When the scheme of confederation was broached and when it was effected in 1867, aye, and even before that, it was thought by the fathers of confederation that this great work would never be consummated, would never be finally completed, until within our borders was embraced every colony in North America under the flag of Great Britain; and from time to time overtures and propositions have been made to that end. I am pleased to see that at last they have taken a tangible form, and in this city, as the capital of the Dominion, a very important conference was held a few weeks ago, from which we trust beneficial results will follow. The terms of the offer upon which Newfoundland proposes coming into this confederacy, and the terms which were offered by the Federal Government, have not yet been made public; but I think I echo the hope of every Canadian, and of every parliamentarian, irrespective of politics, that those terms may be of such a nature that a consummation of that union may be brought about. We, in this portion of the Dominion, particularly in the province of Ontario, not having been in touch with the people of Newfoundland, have only known it as rather a sterile, bleak and inhospitable island; but I am happy to say that our views in that respect have been entirely changed by a speech delivered in Ottawa last week by the Hon. Mr. Bond. With their thrifty, industrious and hardy population, of somewhat over 200,000, engaged, as they are, largely in the greatest of all hardships, the fishing industry, also interested as they are interested in the lumber business, and interested as they are in the great industry of mining, in which $5,000,000 is invested; not having, as we, in the western provinces have, great manufacturing enterprises, it must of necessity result that they should be, and would be in due course of time, if any considerable interchange of commodities took place, good customers of ours, as of the $7,000,000 worth of goods imported into that island, only $2,500,000 worth came from these provinces. So I believe that, if that consolidation is brought about, if that colony is admitted, a union will be accomplished which will greatly add to the material prosperity of the whole Dominion. Moreover, Sir, we will then guard and control every entrance to the British possessions on the Atlantic; and then it will be the proud boast of every Canadian, that from the western shores of this continent, where the waters of the Pacific lave the golden sands of British Columbia, to the far east, where Newfoundland's rock-bound coasts are dashed by the billows of the Atlantic, all shall be under the sway of the confederation of Canada.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) In rising to second the motion just moved by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I must say that the Manitoba school question referred to in the Speech from the Throne has given rise to that other question whether the moment had not come to break the tie which unites us to the Dominion and seek elsewhere other destinies for us. Many wise and enlightened people, men from all sections of the community and from all races, have had, in the face of the general mistrust which for nearly five years now has unsettled every mind, to painfully consider whether the Dominion could last much longer, and whether the time had not come, as I said, to break the tie which unites us to it, should not Manitoba or the Federal Government remedy the injustices done and replace, so to say, in its former position the fundamental stone which the Manitoba Government had taken out of the very basis of the Dominion structure. Thank God, owing to the spirit of justice of the people, owing to the common sense which prevails everywhere in the Dominion, owing especially to the courage shown by the Government with respect to that school question, the minds may now regain their composedness, uneasiness may disappear and hope revive among all the races which have made this country their own. For these reasons, I might be allowed to tender to the executive our most sincere thanks on

behalf of the righteous men of the province of Manitoba, and of the whole Dominion. The Government is entitled to the gratitude, not only of the Catholics, but of all the righteous men, whether Catholic or Protestant, Mohammedan or Turk. Notwithstanding the clamourings of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the Government were not afraid to do their full duty from beginning to end. They pledged themselves to render justice, notwithstanding the opposition they met with in every province, notwithstanding the opposition made in this House by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The Government is now rebuked for not disallowing the school law, because they are powerless to upbraid them in any other respect. This is what the Liberals have cried out everywhere in the province of Quebec; the Government, they said, was too slow, it ought to have disallowed the law. Well, I say the Government did their duty to the end. They were bound not to disallow the law, in the first place, because the Catholics of Manitoba had decided to apply to the courts for the rescission of the law of 1890, which was thought unconstitutional. When the Supreme Court delivered its judgment as regards the constitutionality of the law, the time for disallowance had lapsed. I may add that the Government were bound not to disallow the law, because in that they were forbidden by prudence and wisdom. They would not have failed to denounce, in the province of Manitoba, as well as in the other provinces, such an attempt from the Federal power against provincial autonomy. And finally, I say that the Government could not disallow that law because it was constitutional, and the judgment of the Privy Council does not utterly do away with it. Therefore, while there is now an injustice to remedy, it is none the less true that the school law may continue in existence if the Manitoba Government is satisfied with it, provided the injustice complained of by the Catholics be remedied. Therefore, the Government could not disallow that law simply on account of the injustices done to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. As for that, it was the practice adopted and followed by both the political parties in this House not to disallow the local laws with respect to education. As to this, I will quote from the speech delivered by the Hon. Edward Blake in 1890, when he brought before this House his famous motion referred to, a moment ago, by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). In the course of his remarks, he said:

> Those members who have long been here will well remember the New Brunswick school case, which was agitated for many years, in the course of which agitation I have hoped that some political aspects of that and of analogous questions were finally settled—settled, at all events, for the bulk of the party with which I act, and for the humble individual who is now addressing you. I regard it as settled, for myself at any rate, first of all that, as a question of policy, there shall be no disallowance of educational legislation.

This practice having been approved by all parties, it ill-becomes any one now to reproach the Government with not having disallowed that law. But I ask by what right the Liberal party could now reproach the Government with not having exercised the right of disallowance since they are the very party which rendered useless, inefficient and dangerous the exercise of such a right? They are the party which cried out in every province that the disallowance could not be exercised. It is the Liberal party again which, at the interprovincial conference held in Quebec in 1887, included in its platform the wiping out of the right of disallowance from our constitution. Let us see what Mr. Mercier, referring to provincial autonomy, said in 1886, before the Quebec Legislature:

> The right of disallowance of local laws granted to the Federal Cabinet, is the negation of provincial autonomy, and it should be abolished, or confederation will disappear. The right of veto should reside not in the Executive power, but in the judicial power as the sole sure refuge against the passions of the political arena.

Later on, in 1887, at the time of the interprovincial conference which was attended by the Prime Ministers of all the provinces, I think, and even several other ministers from these provinces, and at which, if I am not mistaken, every province in the Dominion was represented, all the members of this conference, I say, were agreed on the necessity of drawing up and adopting as one plank of the platform of the Liberal party the following, which is to be found in the report of the proceedings of that conference:

> That by the British North America Act exclusive authority is expressely given to the provincial legislatures in relation to subjects enumerated in the 92nd section of the Act; that a previous section of the Act reserves to the Federal Government the legal power of disallowing, at will, all acts passed by a provincial legislature; that this power of disallowance may be exercised so as to give to the Federal Government arbitrary control over the legislation of the provinces within their own sphere; and that the Act should be amended by taking away the power of disallowing provincial statutes, leaving to the people of each province, through their representatives in the provincial legislature, the free exercise of their exclusive right of legislation on the subjects assigned to them, subject only to disallowance by Her Majesty in Council, as before confederation; the power of disallowance to be exercised in regard to the provinces upon the same principle as the same is exercised in the case of Federal Acts.

So it can be seen that they claim the transfer of the power of disallowance to England. And why was this claim made? Because it was considered that the disallow-

ance would thereby be abolished if it could only be exercised by the Imperial Government. Such was the construction put upon it by the Provincial Secretary of Quebec, Mr. Gagnon. Here are his own words, when commenting this resolution adopted by the interprovincial conference :

> As worded, this resolution is practically the abolition of the right of disallowance, for we say that this power will only be exercised with respect to the laws possibly affecting the general interests of the Empire, that is to say, we assimilate the position of the provinces to the one now occupied by the Federal Parliament. Now, as we cannot make laws which affect the general interests of the Empire, it follows that the Imperial Government will not have to exercise against us this power of disallowance.

Thus, if we cannot now claim, or rather if we ought not to claim the exercise of the right of disallowance with respect to a question as that which we are now discussing, it is because the whole Liberal party succeeded in rousing the public opinion in every province by exaggerating the right of the provinces to enjoy a full autonomy, and even to escape the right of disallowance conferred by our constitution to the Federal power, in educational matters as well as in any other difficult questions. But I say, moreover, that no motion was brought before this House with the object of censuring the Government for not disallowing such a legislation. I say, moreover, that it is yet time to make such a motion, and I invite those who are fond of motions of censure directed against the Government to bring about such a motion because they have not disallowed Manitoba's legislation as they are blamed from all over the hustings. Therefore, to sum up, we could not exercise the right of disallowance because, as I have just said, it would not have been wise for the Government to do so, and because it was not claimed by the Catholics who took another way to obtain the redress they sought, and finally, because the disallowance weapon was made useless and inefficient by the doings of the Liberal party. Now, there remained an appeal to the courts of justice. After the Manitoba legislation of 1890 had been declared constitutional, the Catholics took an appeal to the Government, and the latter resolved in the first place to cause to be proclaimed or defined their right to interfere, and should the occasion arise, to pass a remedial legislation. Never was a motion brought before the House to blame the Government for their recourse to this mode of proceeding, but they were studiously reproached, in popular meetings, with having taken this means of having the question solved. Nevertheless, this way of proceeding was the only reasonable one ; it was the only one dictated by common political sense and reason. The fact is, with respect to such a question, it was absolutely necessary that we should know whether we had a right to interfere ; it was the main point. Why ? Here is the reason why : Had we immediately passed a law to set aside Manitoba's legislation and had the legislature of that province disputed its constitutionality, in what position would we find ourselves now, had the Privy Council decided as it has contrary to our contentions ? The Government and the Federal Parliament would then have found themselves in the most humiliating position. On the contrary, the Government wisely decided that prior to interfering they should know whether they had a right to interfere ; the Government wanted to know the extent of their rights prior to helping the minority, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that they had such a right under the constitution. The Government acted therefore in compliance with the constitution, as explained by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. As regards the mode adopted by the Government nobody can blame them for doing what they did, for it was the mode suggested by the Liberal party itself. Indeed, when the Hon. Mr. Blake brought up his motion in 1890, he had in view that very question of the separate schools in Manitoba. If the Government was not to be bound by this motion of Mr. Blake, then it was useless. We all know that this motion was moved and agreed to by Parliament precisely in view of this Manitoba school question. The Government have passed the remedial Order in Council and they have done right. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no one to be found in this House who will reproach them with this act. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that we had a right, not only to interfere, but also to remedy an injustice done to the prejudice of the minority in Manitoba ; the Judicial Committee pronounced that we had both the right and the duty to interfere. This Government are the custodians of the rights and privileges of each and every class, and therefore they are in duty bound to protect the minorities. It is for them to say to the persecutors : Cease your persecutions, to say to the infringers of the constitution : Cease to cause the minority to suffer in the exercise of a right which is guaranteed to them by the constitution. It was said somewhere that an interference would not be expedient. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is always expedient to remedy an injustice. There is no middle course to follow, in such matters, one must be either friend or foe. I think any honourable and honest man owes it to duty to remedy an injustice when his duty is clearly laid down. Assuredly now that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has been delivered, the question is not whether it is favourable to the Protestants or to the Catholics of Manitoba, but our duty is to inquire whether there is any injustice to remedy. The question is whether the oppressed ought to be protected. I say it is

the duty of this House to come and help the Government which has interfered in favour of the oppressed. When, in 1892-93, the Government and the Conservative party agreed to the mode of interfering through the courts, the party and the whole House committed themselves to such a mode, and therefore they virtually adhered to any judgment that might happen to be pronounced. Had the judgment been against the minority, the minority would have yielded to it. Likewise, if the judgment should go against the contentions of the majority, the majority had to bow down. Now, it is for the majority to yield to a judgment favourable to the minority, a judgment delivered by Her Majesty herself; and I think every hon. member of this House, especially those from the Conservative side will be happy to vote for a remedial legislation should the Manitoba Legislature not do its duty as it was called upon to do. This, Mr. Speaker, is a question which has moved the public mind with passion. Moreover, the policy of the Government with respect to it has already received the approval of the people of the Dominion. In Haldimand, the contest was fought on the school question, and it did not prevent the brilliant Secretary of State (Mr. Montague) receiving a majority of nearly six hundred votes. In Verchères, in Antigonish, in Quebec West, it is the Government policy which won the day. It is the remedial order which is accepted by the electorate. And, if I am well informed, in Verchères especially, had not the opposition candidate completely endorsed the remedial order, he would have been defeated and left in a minority of hundreds of votes. The public sentiment in that county was so overwhelming in favour of the remedial order that, in spite of opposition ideas, the candidate, Mr. Geoffrion, had to accept the policy of the Government and promise to his electors that he would vote for the Conservative Government, going even further, possibly than the gentlemen on this side of the House, should the Government introduce a remedial legislation. In Quebec West and Antigonish, the same thing was noticeable. I therefore say that on the 17th April instant, the Government carried the day. I must confess that the Catholics of Verchères could have acted a little better. I think they could have shown a little more generosity to the Government by returning its candidate, especially when the Liberal candidate was endorsing the course followed by the Government. But, after all, there was no matter for surprise, Verchères having been a Liberal county for twenty-five to thirty years. In the very local elections of 1892, when the whole people was aroused, Verchères remained Liberal and would not follow the rest of the province. Well, it is its own business, but I think the great majority in the province of Quebec approve of the course followed by the Government as did the voters in Verchères and that, at the next general election, it will give to the Government an enormous majority. There is now rejoicing everywhere. However, we do not rejoice because we think we have won a victory over the Protestants. There can be no question of Catholics or Protestants in this House, but we are simply dealing with the right of the minorities and due regard for public faith which no honourable man can violate. When we came into the Dominion, we relied on this that the rights of every class would be respected. We signed a compact which we are pledged to respect, and he who violates this compact is derelict to faith. If the minorities should not find in this Parliament the protection to which they are entitled, how could we hope to form a people? How could we go along in peace and harmony? How, for instance, could we hope for the coming of Newfoundland into the Dominion if the people of that Island could not rely on our respect to faith, on the observance of the compact to be signed with them, and if the minority of that Island could not find under our flag that liberty which they now enjoy under their present government? This Parliament is in duty bound to show the greatest respect for faith, the greatest respect for the pledges we commit ourselves to. I join with the hon. member who just sat down in the praise he has given to the memory of the late Sir John Thompson. When the news of his death spread throughout the country, it was the cause of a great surprise coupled with a great pain. He was not only the honoured leader of the Conservative party, but he ranked also amongst the foremost men of our political world. Our whole people will be faithful to his memory and will keep in store the encomiums he so well deserved as well as remind his lofty nature, his powerful logic, his eminent abilities and his respectability. We will, all of us, long remember him as one of the most precious men Canada has ever produced. Reference is also made in the Speech from the Throne to the French treaty. Last year, that question was discussed, and this House approved of the treaty. The Government who is perfecting this commercial engagement will meet with the approval of this House and that of the country at large. The business men are now all one in requesting the ratification of this treaty which establishes closer commercial relations with France. Agriculture has now a good market for its products, but it will soon want a new European market for its cheese and butter, the export of which is now mainly directed towards England. By means of this treaty, the Dominion will secure a very advantageous market for its produce.

Mr. LAURIER. While I have no fault to find with the manner in which the mover and seconder of the Address have presented their views to the House, whilst, on the contrary, it is a pleasure for me to testify that they have discharged their duty with great credit to themselves, with great satisfaction, I am sure, to their friends, and with perfect acceptance to their opponents, still I cannot but express my astonishment that having undertaken to review the political situation, such as it exists to-day, they should have entirely failed to notice in any way whatever the late, the inconvenient, the unfortunate season at which Parliament has been called for the despatch of business, that they should have failed altogether to offer, I will not say a word of criticism, which perhaps it would be impossible to expect from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but I will simply say a word of remonstrance such as might perhaps have been expected that they might have offered against the breach of duty of which the Government stand guilty towards the House and the people. Sir, what is to-day ? To-day is the nineteenth day of April, and the simple mention of this date means this, that we have now reached a period at which, if Parliament had been called at the proper time, the well-understood time, the time fixed and determined by long usage of Parliament, by the unwritten law of Parliament, the members of the House, who, as a rule, are not millionaires, who are, as a rule, engaged in the ordinary occupations of life, who, as a rule, now all depend on their daily labour, might look to an early prorogation and might expect to return to their business occupations at the opening of the business season. Why, the first paragraph of this Speech which is placed in the hands of His Excellency is strange almost to ludicrousness. It reads :

> It is with much satisfaction that I again have recourse to your advice and assistance in the administration of the affairs of the Dominion.

Why, Sir, if it was so much satisfaction to the advisers of His Excellency to have the advice of the faithful Commons and Senate of Canada, it was within their power to have had it long ago. Why did they not get it ? I submit this with all respect, that instead of having framed this mocking paragraph, the first thing the advisers of His Excellency should have done was to offer a statement of some kind to explain, to justify and to excuse this unpardonable dereliction of duty on the part of the advisers of His Excellency. But, perhaps, and I rather think it was so, it was altogether too much to expect that hon. gentlemen would make such a statement. What reason could they urge, what explanation could they give, what excuse could they offer ? Why, Sir, it is well known, it is a matter of public notoriety, that if Parliament was not called at the proper season, at the usual season, at the season at which it should have been called, and at the date often promised, it was not from any consideration for the public weal, it was not from any motive which could stand the light of day, but it was simply because it was altogether too much to expect from the hon. gentlemen who now adorn the Treasury benches that they would arrive at an opinion of their own so long as they could put off the day. It is a matter of public notoriety that during the whole winter the Cabinet has been divided into two—what shall I say, two factions, two rival factions, quarrelling, squabbling, fighting, one in favour of holding a session and the other in favour of dissolution, both afraid to meet Parliament or to meet the people. This is the situation. But at last when the day came that they had to make up their minds to do something, when they had to face the issue and have a mind of their own, when they could no longer postpone and put off and delay, when they had to take some action, the faction in favour of dissolution, which had almost triumphed, was upset, and the Government decided in favour of holding a session. I must pay this compliment to them, that from their own point of view, they were wise in their generation. It was true that during a session there might be some very bitter pills to swallow, it was true that during a session the Finance Minister would have to face that spectre, that monster, an ugly ill-visaged deficit, that spectre which indeed we had seen last year lurking in the distance, but which the hon. gentleman had promised to ward off by economy and entrenchment, but at all events, my hon. friend could depend upon it that the majority would be equal to the occasion, that they would swallow the pills, bitter as they were, and even finding a deficit in their minds, a new friend to them, as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said, they would think that this new friend when seen among themselves, was not so ugly, not so ill-visaged as it was seen on the other side, and even had some redeeming features, whereas if they had dissolved the House and gone to the country, their majority would have disappeared, would have vanished, would have melted away as snow under the rays of an April sun. The wisdom of their course was fully vindicated on the 17th April, just two days ago. There were four elections on that day. As to one I shall not speak, because the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennet) said a moment ago that the Liberal party offered no fight in Haldimand, it was a little family quarrel which they agreed to settle among themselves. But in the other three constituencies I claim a victory for the Liberal party. I claim a Liberal victory in Verchères, although there is not much to be proud of there because it is an old rouge county ; but I also claim a Liberal victory in Quebec West, an old Conservative constituency. My hon. friend

from East Simcoe said a moment ago that the candidates were two Tories. To some extent it is true; but there are Tories and Tories. On the one side there was Mr. Dobell, whose record I am sure is above suspicion; and on the other side there was our old friend Mr. McGreevy, who is well known in this House. I will quote to the hon. gentleman what was the programme of Mr. Dobell. He said:

> And if you send me to Parliament as your representative I shall not allow party spirit to warp my judgment, and shall record my vote upon all questions as in my belief the best interests of the country demand. * * * * I shall use my best endeavours, if elected, to have measures carried which will benefit the Dominion, increase its foreign trade,—

What a departure from sound principles is that.

> —remove obstacles to closer and freer trade with our sister colonies and the mother country, and I shall not cease to advocate reciprocal trade, on fair and just terms with our great neighbour, the United States.

I do not observe much cheering on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to that programme. Now, let me take the comments of the ministerial organ in the city of Quebec upon this paragraph of Mr. Dobell's address:

> Mr. Dobell's platform embraces reciprocity with the United States, freer intercolonial trade, and closer foreign trade relations, superinduced by more liberal terms than we now possess. Of course, this is a programme, to which Mr. Laurier could interpose no objection, since he has opinions of a similar nature himself.

Give me such Tories every day, and have them elected everywhere.

> Mr. McGreevy, we take it, has not lost faith in the National Policy, which he helped to create.

Well, Sir, it is a matter of record that the Liberal party unanimously supported the candidature of Mr. Dobell. It is equally a matter of record that the Conservative party from the leaders down supported the candidature of Mr. McGreevy, and I suppose at this time Mr. McGreevy's health is sufficiently restored to have allowed him to take his place among the Conservative members of this House. But, Sir, the Government decided in favour of holding a session. They were wise. But it was an effort to make such a decision. Why, it was such an effort that it almost broke the Government. We have it on good authority, we are not in the secrets of the gods, but we know one of the gods, and not the least among them, the one whom I take to be the god of war, would no longer soar on the Olympian heights, but that he declared his determination to come down to the level of frail, ordinary, mortal flesh. For three days the whole ministerial world was on the tiptoe of anxious expectation. "Will he return or will he remain out?" That was the anxious question which every ministerialist harboured in his breast. But as good fate would have it, peace was restored. The wandering one returned to the fold, and ever since there has been, at all events, peace on the outside, and the Government seems to me to be very much like one of those sulphur springs whose waters are calm and quiet on the surface, but whose muddy bottom is always boiling with mephitic gases. But, Sir, I see my hon. friend the Minister of Justice shaking his head at the statement which I have made. I make that statement upon authority. I make it upon the authority of the Conservative press. I know that my hon. friend said a few days afterwards that the story was not true, and that there was no dependence to be placed upon the ministerial press. I always thought so myself. That was no news to me. But I thought that so much smoke could not exist without some fire, and that the exception in this instance simply confirmed the general rule. But, Sir, there is more than this. We are all proud of our British institutions. My hon. friend to my right, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), speaking some seven or eight weeks ago in the western part of the province of Ontario, made an elaborate comparison between the American constitution and the British constitution, and he concluded, and rightly concluded, that the British constitution is more elastic and more responsive to the voice and to the wish of the people than is the American constitution. There are, under the American constitution, several powers which are fixed by law, while the same powers here, are left for their exercise to the intuitive action of the Executive. Thus, under the American constitution, the summoning of Congress does not exist, and Congress meets according to the very letter of the instrument itself. It is fixed by the constitution, whereas, under the British constitution the only provision that exists is that there should be a session at least once a year. But as to the time Parliament shall meet, the entire discretion is left to the Executive, and it is a discretion which should not be exercised except for cause adequate and in extreme cases. In England, though the period at which Parliament is to summoned is left to the Executive, the day on which Parliament will open is as well known to every voter in Great Britain as if it were fixed by law, and a Government would not be permitted either to postpone or advance the period at which Parliament meets unless there was strong cause adequate to show for it. If in England a Government presumed to violate the unwritten law of Parliament in that respect, that Government would be at once called to severe account by friends and foes. But in this country, although we have a similar law, that law is violated without the slightest concern by the Ministers of the day, as if the only

rule and law which they acknowledged was their own fantastic will. For my part, I would be sorry to see a single item removed from the constitution which would mar its elasticity. I would be sorry to see it more drastic. I would be sorry to see it follow the American precedent, but I remind the House, and I am sure in so saying no one can gainsay me, that if we want to work the British constitution in this country with the same benefit and advantage that it has been worked in the old country, the Canadian people must act in the same spirit as is shown by the British people, that is to say, that they must see that there are no undue liberties taken with the privileges of Parliament, whether they are written or unwritten. Though I have no fault to find with my hon. friends with the manner in which they have discharged their duties, I venture to believe that on reflection they will agree with me that they would have discharged these duties more effectually, and with more profit to their country, if they had spoken upon this subject, which I suppose is before their minds, as it is before the minds of everybody else, with the exception, perhaps, of the gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches. I venture to believe also, that better counsel would have prevailed if the hand of fate had not removed him, of whom my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) spoke so feelingly, and of whom it might be said, that though perhaps not altogether free from blame in that respect himself, yet Sir John Thompson always, while he was leader of the Conservative party, insisted on the maintenance and preservation of parliamentary laws and parliamentary rules. I think I might say also that on some occasions he defended those laws and rules against the encroachment of some of his colleagues. My friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) spoke eloquently and well, and most feelingly, on the death of Sir John Thompson. I can re-echo everything he said in that respect. The death of Sir John Thompson was a most shocking one. When a man is struck by the hand of death in the fullness of his years, after a long career, after a career of great usefulness to himself and his country, there remains a feeling even above the poignancy of grief, that after all death has dealt kindly with him. Such was the death of Sir John Macdonald. But when a man is struck down, when he has hardly reached the summit of middle life, when he has attained the full measure of his power, when his friends and his country could look to him for years of useful work, then, Sir, death carries with it a sense of inexpressible bitterness. Such was the death of Sir John Thompson. In that respect it is, perhaps, one of the saddest, perhaps altogether the saddest that our history records. In other respects I look upon it as one of the most glorious. This Canadian Minister, this colonial statesman died under the roof of the old Norman Kings, when he had just been sworn in as a member of the Privy Council of that mighty Empire, of which the old Norman kings laid the foundation, but which has reached dimensions which their wildest dreams of imagination never, I am sure, contemplated. Perhaps it is that such a death, under such circumstances, sad as it be, may be looked upon as a sacred consecration of the majestic principle of the unity of the Empire; unity, not only of land and water, unity not only of islands and continents, but a unity of all the creeds and races embraced in that mighty Empire, giving to all while preserving their individuality, a common aim, and a common aspiration and teaching to all the salutary lesson of tolerance and mutual forbearance. If the death of Sir John Thompson were to result in such a lesson being learned by the Canadian people, I am sure we must all agree that glorious indeed would be his death, and I am sure that for all ages, his name would be surrounded with a halo of imperishable fame. Now, Sir, coming to the Speech from the Throne, I do not know that it calls from me for any extended remarks. The Speech from the Throne has been, for some years past, a very dry skeleton. This year it is drier than ever, and the few bones that are in it rattle against each other with a most ominous sound. Perhaps this paucity of substance, this dryness of material, may be the result of the return to the fold of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, though, if we are to credit a certain press—not that scurrilous ministerial press that is not to be depended upon, but the Opposition press which has never been accused of unveracity, at least by its friends—one of the conditions of the return of my hon. friend to the ranks was that there should be no important legislation this session. Well, Sir, I do not know whether that be true; but, at all events, that would be a very light way of looking at a situation so full of gravity as the situation of this country is to-day; for I submit to the consideration of the hon. gentlemen opposite that we have reached a period of the very greatest importance to the interests of Canada. We have reached what perhaps we may call a day of reckoning. Yet on this grave subject the Government are silent. The altered tone of their speeches compared with those to which we have been accustomed to listen in former years on the occasion of the Address being proposed and seconded, is most significant. On previous occasions the burden of all ministerial speeches was a song of triumph, a paeon of exultation, even in the face of the most damaging record—even when the figures of the census had ruthlessly dispelled the illusions long cherished by the supporters of the ministerial policy. Even then the burden of all ministerial speeches

was that Canada was prosperous. To-day we have a different tone. To-day there is no song of exultation or of triumph. To-day there is the plaintive admission that Canada is suffering, though in a minor degree, from a universal depression. Depression, says my hon. friend from East Simcoe; but then, where is the virtue of the National Policy? What has become of the power of the National Policy? Was it not to remove the then existing depression and to for ever prevent its recurrence, that the people of Canada were induced to submit to that intolerable yoke of taxation which by a strange euphemism is termed the National Policy? What is the commercial situation, the economical situation, the financial situation of this country to-day? Sir, we have a deficit, the ugliest that ever made its appearance in Canada, an immense public debt ever increasing, an alarming falling off in the revenue, public burdens always increasing, a paralyzing commercial crisis and stringency, ever wider spreading, amongst all classes of the community. This is the situation which my friend characterized by the diluted term depression. Sir, it is high time that the Ministers and the friends of the Ministers should no longer delude themselves with the mere clatter of words, but should open their eyes to the fact that Canada has reached a most dangerous condition. It would be idle folly for the members of this House, sitting on that side or on this side, to imagine that Canada is simply suffering from one of those cycles of depression which come periodically. Sir, I am sorry to say, but it is a fact to which the attention of the Government must be called, since they persist in ignoring it, that the evils from which Canada suffers to-day are of a more alarming character than those caused by a mere passing depression; and the abiding cause, the source of all those evils, lies in the fact that the country has been burdened with an immense and alarming public debt, and equally alarming public expenditure and at the same time with a high tariff, imposed upon us under suppositions which have never materialized—under promises of development which, if it had taken place, would perhaps have made the burden bearable, but the failure of which makes the burden hardly bearable by our small and scanty population. Why, Sir, I recall to the memory of the House that in the early days of the National Policy, when the public debt was increasing at the rate of a hundred millions at a time, there were men in this country, not confined to this side of the House—men in all walks of life and in all conditions, politicians and non-politicians—who were staggered at the magnitude of the burden imposed on the shoulders of the Canadian people, who believed that it was too great for us to carry. But their apprehensions were removed by the assurance often given by the occupants of the Treasury benches, that immigrants would follow the track of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the immense territories of the Northwest would fill with a teeming population, and that the price of the lands sold would be more than sufficient to recoup the country for the whole outlay. That statement was made, not once, but many times by Sir Charles Tupper at that time, and repeated by his followers until it became a stock phrase. I remember, as everybody I suppose does, that Sir Charles Tupper fortified this statement with the opinion of a high civil functionary whose duties should enable him to speak with high authority on the question on which he wrote. I remember Sir Charles Tupper quoting the opinion of Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, to the effect that in a short time the sale of the public lands would cover the whole outlay. That letter has often been quoted, and it may be well to quote it again if only to show the House that the condition which the country has reached to-day is not the result of a casual depression,—to show the wide chasm which separates us from the high hopes which were held out to us at that time. Here is the letter of Mr. Burgess:

Ottawa, 4th May, 1883.

Sir,—Having given the subject my best and fullest consideration, I estimate that the receipts of this department from the sale of agricultural and coal lands, timber dues, rents of grazing lands, and sales of mineral lands other than coal, with the royalties from the minerals between the 1st January, 1883, and the 31st December, 1891, both inclusive, will amount to not less than $58,000,000.

A. M. BURGESS.

Sir, everybody who had a seat in Parliament at that time recollects that when that letter was read to the House by Sir Charles Tupper, endorsed as it was by the character, the ability and the reputation of that right hon. gentleman, it was received with wild cheers on the other side of the House. The hon. members on that side of the House affected to believe, and perhaps did believe, that there was a ready asset of $58,000,000, not yet in the coffers of Canada, but to be found in our coffers within eight years afterwards, and that therefore there was no cause for alarm if the public debt jumped up at the fearful rate at which it was then being increased. I notice that the same letter read again to-day, and read in the light of our experience of the last year, does not evoke any cheer at all on the other side of the House. Why, Sir, it would be almost ludicrous, if the case were not such a sad one, to refer to that letter now, to comment upon the statesmanship—because at that time it was called statesmanship—which could build up such castles in the air. I do not care to do so. I come to sober facts. How many millions, I ask the Minister of Finance, have been realized from the sale of agricultural lands, how

many millions from coal lands, how many from mineral lands, how many from timber dues and grazing leases? How many millions? Not one dollar. Not one single dollar. We are just fifty-eight millions of dollars astray. The sale of the agricultural lands, of the coal lands, of the mineral lands, the royalties, the timber dues, the grazing rents—all that has not produced enough to pay the salaries of the officers charged with the duties of administration. But, Sir, the debt is there; not to be wiped out with a fantastic asset, but to be paid in cold coin out of the hard earnings of the people of Canada, earnings wrung from them by a relentless system of taxation. And I would call to the attention of hon. gentlemen that that relentless system of taxation was introduced under the same hopes—hopes doomed to disappointment. Does not everybody remember how, in those early days of the National Policy, manufacturers were invited to clap on all sail, to manufacture, not for the small, restricted market of five millions of souls, but for the widespread market soon to be enlarged by hundreds, by thousands, and by hundreds of thousands of immigrants, who were to be brought in to fill the North-west Territories? That advice was readily acceded to by the manufacturers. Millions of dollars were invested in bricks and mortar and machinery. And what was the result? In a very short time the warehouses of manufacturers were piled with goods for which there were no purchasers. The population did not increase, and the manufacturers found themselves face to face with a very serious problem. But the manufacturers were equal to the occasion. I take the case of cottons, just as an example. In the summer of 1888 a meeting of cotton manufacturers was held in the city of Montreal. The reports of that meeting are to be found in the Montreal 'Gazette,' and there, amongst other things stated by the reporters, we find the following:—

> By actual comparison, good farmers' shirting can be obtained in Canada to-day at a lower figure than the same material can be purchased for in the United States. This is one effect of the National Policy, and it is a great boon to the agricultural community. The country, however, requires 600,000 more people in it to maintain the present number of cotton mills, but these are quickly coming, as 100,000 landed on our shores last year.

Yes, Sir, one hundred thousand had landed on our shores the previous year. Those were the happy, blind days when the Government of Canada was increasing the population by bringing in a hundred thousand emigrants every year. Those were the happy, blind days when the Government of Canada—according to its own statement—added to the population of Canada in ten years no less than 800,000 souls, who, however, were not to be found when the census was taken; they had disappeared; and with them, I am sorry to say, had gone a considerable portion of the native population. But what did the cotton men do then? They had declared that they needed 600,000 souls more to keep their mills busy, but this addition to the population had not been made. But the cotton men were equal to the occasion. They made a combination; they bought up all the cotton mills—except one, I believe—and brought them under the same management. Some of the mills they closed, paying dividends to the shareholders, though the mills were idle, and turning out the operatives to shift for themselves as best they could. Under the system that was to have given work to every man willing to work, we saw operatives turned out in the streets and shareholders receiving dividends for their idle mills. The production of cotton was restricted, and upon this restricted production extra profits were charged to the people of Canada, who were thereby compelled to pay taxes not only to the public treasury, but to the manufacturers of cotton also. Sir, there is the root of the evil; there is the cause of the depression. The public debt was increased under false pretenses, the tariff was imposed under false pretenses. The public debt was created under the promise that there would be such an influx of population into the North-west Territories that, in eight years at most there would be in the treasury a sum sufficient to wipe out the public debt. The tariff was imposed under the promise that there would be an influx of population such as would make the burden of taxation bearable by the people of Canada. Now, Sir, we know that all these expectations have been disappointed. In those early days we had centred our expectations and hopes upon those vast plains which extend from the craggy hills of Lake Superior to the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains. And, I am bound to say, it is a most magnificent heritage. Great as were the hopes entertained of it, they were not extravagant, but how those hopes have been blasted we know only too well. The immigrants came in, but the flow of immigration became less and at one time almost ceased. What is the primary cause? The primary cause, and I challenge the issue upon this, is the high tariff with which Canada is burdened. The high tariff imposed by gentlemen on the other side, and maintained by them has produced this result—it has made the tilling of the soil a thankless and profitless occupation. We cannot increase he price of cereals. The price of cereals have fallen and so have the prices of other farm products, as is admitted in the Speech from the Throne. We cannot increase the price of a bushel of wheat or pound of cheese. But there was a time when gentlemen on the other side pretended that they could increase the price of farm products. We cannot do anything for the farmer in that respect. But the tiller of the soil in the North-west, and, for that matter, in every

part of Canada, finds that while the prices of his products have diminished, he has to pay artificial prices for all that he has to buy. And this is the result of the policy of gentlemen on the Treasury benches. While he has to sell at free trade prices, he has to buy at protection prices. The result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is this,—that the farmer of Canada has to sell, not in the dearest, but in the cheapest market, while what he has to buy he must get, not in the cheapest, but in the dearest market. This is the cause of what is termed on the other side of the House, "depression." What then is to be done? What course shall we follow? The course to follow is to retrace our steps of the last fifteen years, to devise some sensible scheme of taxation. The course to follow is to make this country a cheap country to live in, and until this is done it is vain for gentlemen on the other side of the House to expect that we shall have such a thing as prosperity in Canada. Until this country has been made a cheap country to live in, we may expect anything but that the plains of the North-west will fill up, and we shall look in vain for the prosperity which has been promised us for the last fifteen years, but which has not come. This is the aim, this is the goal, this is the purpose. But it is an aim, a goal, and a purpose which it is vain to expect gentlemen on the Treasury benches to keep in view. But we can expect it when the little operation of two days ago is extended, and the whole people of the Dominion of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific express their opinions at the polls.

Mr. FOSTER. You are better on small operations.

Mr. LAURIER. Why do you not try the larger ones, if in those you have the advantage? I want to be a fair opponent and give every possible credit to gentlemen on the other side. There is an admission, at all events, in the Speech from the Throne of something that exists, there is an admission that the finances are not as good as they might be. Though you will look in vain through the four corners of the Speech for such a word as deficit, the word is not to be found, but the thing is there. This is what we read:

> Although this has not resulted in any considerable decrease in the volume of our foreign trade, yet, owing to low prices and recent reductions in and removal of taxation, it has been followed by a serious decrease in revenue derived from Customs and Excise. In order to produce equilibrium between revenue and expenditure for the coming year, it will be necessary to observe the greatest possible economy in the appropriations for the various branches of the public service.

Sir, it seems to me that we are somewhat familiar with this language. I do not know but we have heard it before. I think we heard it last year, perhaps, with some more rhetorical flourish than we see in this dry speech. We heard it last year from the mouth of the Minister of Finance himself, and the flowery language which my hon. friend then made use of is worth repeating to the House:

> If the expenditure from the 10th of March to the end of the year should be normal that would leave us with a deficit; but this Government has come to the conclusion—a wise conclusion, which I think will be echoed by this House, and in which the Government will have the co-operation and cordial help of the House—to endeavour to live during the year within our income, and if our income is less, to resolutely keep down the expenditure, so that in the end we shall not have that unwelcome visitation which so often made its appearance to my hon. friend who sits opposite me—an ugly and ill-visaged deficit. A prudent business man, any prudent business concern, any private gentleman, any householder, would take that course of action; and in the national housekeeping it is equally incumbent, it seems to me, to follow the same.

So it seemed to my hon. friend, and so it seemed to all of us, that he was using very resolute language. It could not be more resolute, and would to Heaven my hon. friend had been as resolute in his action as he was in his speech. But it is manifest that during the course of the year my hon. friend has not only had one moment of weakness, but moment after moment of weakness until it became chronic. I am quite sure that my hon. friend was covered from head to foot with good intentions, but he was besieged by those who had been in the habit of bleeding the treasury, and he yielded, and he yielded, until, between his language and his performance, there is a discrepancy of $6,000,000. Now, we have the same promises of economy and retrenchment, but to-day they are made in more sober language—not made in so pompous language as last year, but I am much afraid that whether made in sober or pompous language, the expenditure will always be the reverse of sober. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said in his speech a moment ago, there must be reasons for a deficit. Why, of course there must be reasons for a deficit, and what are they? They are simply that the Minister does not, as a prudent man, as a prudent business concern, cut down the expenditure to the level of the revenue. That is all there is about it. If my hon. friend had been as resolute in his conduct as he was in his language, my hon. friend from Simcoe would have an answer to his query. For my part, I must say to my hon. friend from Simcoe, and perhaps I will not surprise him if I say so, that I am not so much overburdened as he seems to be with confidence in the men who adorn the Treasury benches. He takes their promises as they are made, I take them as they are ex-

ecuted, and that gives another deficit. Now, Sir, the legislation which is promised does not seem to be of a very serious character. There is just one measure in all those that are promised here, which seems to be of some importance. I understand that the Ministry again this year are going to try their hand at an insolvency law. They tried it last year, but they did not succeed. I hope they will succeed this time. I hope so with all my heart, because it seems to me that an insolvency law is a fitting accompaniment to the National Policy. There are so many bankrupts in the country that it is an act of charity to extend to them the benefits of an insolvency law. There is another clause in the Speech, that with regard to the French treaty, which I do not altogether understand. It reads thus:

Satisfactory assurances having been received from Her Majesty's Government respecting the interpretation of certain clauses in the Treaty of Commerce with France, ratifications will be exchanged as soon as the necessary legislation has been passed.

"The necessary legislation has been passed." This is what I do not understand. The treaty has been ratified by this House, the treaty has been ratified by the French Corps Legislatif, and the French Senate. What more legislation is necessary? We all remember, the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) pointed out last year, the difficulty the Government were sure to meet in their treatment of third powers. I know that difficulty. That may be the one which is referred to, but the language is so vague that it is impossible to perceive what the Government means. I suppose it means that the treaty is not to go into force for another year or so, and in that respect the object of the Government will have been attained. Sir Charles Tupper will have been satisfied, he will have brought the Ministry to their knees. The supporters of the Ministry will be satisfied also, the treaty will not be passed by Parliament, and will not be put in force. As to Newfoundland, I am glad to say that I re-echo very cordially everything that has been said in the Speech from the Throne. The entrance of Newfoundland into the confederation was contemplated from the first as necessary to the completion of the Dominion, and I so regard it. But I must say that it is, perhaps, unfortunate that the negotiations have come at such an inopportune moment. It may be a misfortune, not only for Newfoundland, but for Canada as well, that these negotiations come at a time when Canada can ill afford to undertake any new burdens. I do not offer this remark in any spirit of hostile criticism. I will wait until the negotiations have been completed, and until they are laid before the House, and judge of the scheme upon its merits. But, Sir, there is one thing to which I would draw the attention of my hon. friends on the other side. There is a difficulty with regard to Newfoundland which it would be well to have removed before the island is taken into confederation. I mean the French shore difficulty. Heaven knows that we have causes enough of difficulty in this country, and here is another which, if the island were taken into confederation, might creep up at any moment and add to the numerous difficulties we have. It would be nothing but fair, I presume—I make it as a friendly suggestion, not at all in a spirit of carping criticism—it would be nothing but fair, I presume, that the Imperial Parliament, which is responsible for that state of things, should be called upon before the Island is taken into confederation, to settle that question with the French Government; because, so long as this difficulty is pending, we must not close our eyes to the fact that it is impossible at any moment that the whole confederation may be convulsed with one of those explosions of sentiments which unfortunately we have seen too often in this country already. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Simcoe, and also my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley) who seconded the Address, dilated at some length with the question which my hon. friend from Simcoe called a question of sentiment, the Manitoba school question. The language of the Speech is, in that respect, very discreet. The elections are over now, and the language is far more discreet and temperate than it was while the elections were taking place. This is what it says:

In conformity with a recent judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to the effect that the dissenting minority of the people of Manitoba have a constitutional right of appeal to the Governor General in Council against certain Acts passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba in relation to the subject of education. I have heard in Council the appeal, and my decision thereon has been communicated to the legislature of the said province. The papers on the subject will be laid before you.

That is not saying very much. I do not blame the Government for it—perhaps it was better not to say very much about it. A good deal, however, was said by the Minister of Justice, by the Minister of Public Works and by the hon. Secretary of State on this question in the recent elections.

Mr. OUIMET. Not much by you.

Mr. LAURIER. The Order in Council is termed a decision. I do not understand that term exactly. As I read it, and I read it pretty carefully, it can hardly be called a decision; it is simply an invitation to the Government of Manitoba to deal with that question, and to leave them to apply the remedy to the evil which has been created by their own legislation, an invitation I say,

though I am sorry to say it, couched in most unfortunate language. The language should have been framed, not in the dictatorial spirit which pervades the Order in Council, but it should have been an appeal framed rather in a conciliatory tone to the Government of Manitoba to remedy the grievances which their legislation has promoted. For my part, Sir, I think that in the whole of these proceedings the Government have shown a sad want of discretion. If they had acted in a different spirit, if they had taken any action, the first thing they should have done in my estimation was to have appealed to the Government of Manitoba to redress the evil which their own legislation had created. But at a later period I shall have to deal with this question. I shall not deal with it to-day at length, because after having heard to-day the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley), I ask myself, what is the meaning of that Order in Council which is termed a decision? I followed very carefully the language of the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address, and I found it to furnish a repetition of what has been taking place of late in the Dominion. The order has one meaning in one section and another meaning in another section; the order has one meaning in Catholic constituencies, the order has another meaning in Protestant constituencies. In Verchères and Antigonish it was a pledge to the people that the Government had determined upon interference; in the Protestant constituency of Haldimand the order was simply the first and last of the action to be taken by the Government, and the Government had thereby exhausted their intention. I took a note of the words of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) as they fell from his lips, and these are the very words he made use of—if I am wrong he can correct me. The hon. gentleman said: "All that has been done is handing over this case to the legislature of Manitoba, there to be amicably arranged." I took a note also of the words which were spoken by the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley), and they were words of thanks, of faith and of exultation because the Government had determined to render justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. Which is correct of these two interpretations? If the interpretation placed upon the language of the hon. member for Chicoutimi is the right one, does it mean interference actively by legislation? Or does it mean, as the hon. member for East Simcoe said, simply the handing over of the case to the legislature of Manitoba, there to be dealt with and amicably arranged? I may be pardoned if I refer for a moment to my own personality. I read the Conservative papers, and paper after paper has done me the honour of calling on me to advise the advisers of His Excellency. I confess I am ambitious of the honour, and perhaps, though unworthy, I may be ready to advise His Excellency, but I am not ready to advise the advisers of His Excellency. One of the papers said that if Mr. Laurier refused to advise the advisers of His Excellency it was through wickedness; another paper said it was through cowardice; and another it was through incapacity. I acknowledge at once that it would be very presumptuous incapacity for me to rush in where these angles fear to tread. But I have only this to say, and to repeat, that I have no desire to create political capital out of this question, I have no desire to go into power through it, if the Government solve it, as they should; but I am not ready to offer advice to the advisers of His Excellency. I shall wait until they bring in their measure. Sir, the Government never consulted me or my predecessor when they brought down the Gerrymander Act of 1882; they never consulted me or my predecessor when they brought in their Franchise Act of 1885; they never consulted me when they brought in the Gerrymander Act of 1892, and I spurn the idea of their calling on me to advise them as to what they should do in this instance. Let them act, and we will judge them according to their action. Before concluding I have a more congenial task to perform. I shall do myself the pleasure of extending to the hon. Finance Minister my sincere congratulations on the promotion that he has received to the seat which he now occupies. I must say I offer the hon. gentleman my own congratulations, and I believe I can speak for the party also in offering him the congratulations of the Liberal party. From the day that the hon. gentleman entered the House his advance has been constant and steady, and as he was elevated from post to post, it is not the language of flattery but the language of sincere truth to say that he always was equal to the expectations of his friends. He now has been promoted to a seat which has been illustrated—I shall speak only of his own party at the present moment—by men of great ability. From the very bottom of my heart I wish that he may discharge the duties appertaining to that seat with as much credit to himself as his predecessors did to themselves, and if I may be permitted to add also, with more benefit to the country, though of this I have but faint hope and no faith whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot do other than, at the very outset of the few remarks that I shall have to make, to thank the hon. gentleman for the very graceful, and what is still better, the evidently hearty way in which he was pleased to give me his own congratulations and those of his party. I augur from that more pleasure during the time that I may occupy this seat than if I had undertaken the position under

different auspices as regards the sentiments represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. It shall be my endeavour, although taking a seat which as he has said has been made illustrious by great men of both parties, to do the best I can to so perform my duties that I may retain the confidence of my own party, and I should fain hope also the confidence of the hon. gentlemen opposite led by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) who has so kindly extended his congratulations. My hon. friend paid a compliment which was not undeserved to the two gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address. It is true that in the case of neither of these gentlemen was his address a maiden one. We have heard their voices before in this House and we know their ready expression, and although we were pleased to-day with the manner in which they addressed themselves to their task it was nothing more than our previous experience led us to expect from them. My hon. friend, however, although complimenting them in general had to find some fault. What is the Opposition for, if not to find fault, and what would become of the leader of an Opposition, if he did not ply his trade? After complimenting my hon. friends, the hon. gentleman came down to the real business of the hour, namely, to criticise. He found fault with these hon. gentlemen in the first place because as the Speech from the Throne did not give any reasons for the late calling of the session, neither of them deigned to enlighten the House on that question. I do not know the motives which were in the minds of the two gentlemen who respectively moved and seconded the Address, but I have a shrewd suspicion that if the right reason were known, they probably did not take my hon. friend opposite into their confidence, because they would spoil, as the sequel proves, the delight of the pleasant five minutes that my hon. friend spent in giving imaginary reasons why the House was not called at an earlier period. The late calling of Parliament has been on several occasions the cause of complaint by my hon. friend, complaint couched in his usually pleasing and not at all bitter language. I do not think, however, that the charge is a very grave one. He instituted a comparison between the constitutional methods of the United States and this country and he proved to his own satisfaction and the satisfaction of the whole House that, constitutionally speaking, he had no quarrel with the Government as regards the time that they called the House together. Constitutionally, it is perfectly within our right to use, as he says, our discretion in this matter. The hon. gentleman may quarrel with our discretion, but on constitutional grounds he certainly has nothing to say against it. Well, Sir, I am willing to be quite frank with my hon. friend and to give him the reasons why the House was not sooner called. He may consider them insufficient reasons, but they are the real reasons and the only reasons why we meet on the 18th April rather than sooner. These reasons are three in number. In the first place there was the lamentable death of our chief, Sir John Thompson, which on account of the long and sad period which intervened between the time of his death and his burial, disorganized the Government, not only as to its headship and its membership, but as to its work as well. After that there was the question, which has been spoken of by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, admittedly an important question, one which had passed through all the phases of the courts, one which had reached that stage, where it was to be discussed and action to be taken, before the Canadian Privy Council. It is a question the judgment upon which involved certain action on the part of the Government to perform, which it intended to perform and which it has performed. It was only on the 29th of January that that judgment was given by the Judicial Committee of the Lords; it was not until the second of February that the Imperial Order in Council was signed and it was not until the 19th of February that the order was transmitted from London to Canada. It came here in due course of mail, and seven days afterwards, counsel appeared in prosecution of their appeal before the Committee of the Privy Council in Ottawa. At the request of the counsel of the majority in Manitoba, the hearing was postponed, and was disposed of on the 5th, 6th and 7th days of March. The discussion and consideration of these pleas and the formulation of the decision, and of the order, took no more time than should be decently given to it, and which should characterize a question of so great gravity and importance: and on the 19th day of March, the final Order in Council of the Government was passed, and a decision was come to within twenty-four hours thereafter to call the House together, and the House was called. Now, Sir, I say that there existed a very good reason why this matter should be disposed of before the hurly-burly and excitement and business of the session which brings together 213 gentlemen from every part of the country to discharge their legislative duties. There was another important reason. We had been in correspondence with the government of Newfoundland in reference to a conference with regard to the union of that ancient colony with the Dominion of Canada. Matters were gradually ripening towards a conference and a decision was come to to have that conference, and it was called, in order to have its discussion ended if possible before Parliament met. Those are plain reasonable reasons why it was better these matters should be got out of the way, and made ready as far as they possibly could be made ready for the House,

before the session opened. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition also complains of the bill of fare, and he says that it is very slim. Well then, the members of the House will be kept less time away from their ordinary business, and to that extent the gravity of the hon. gentleman's complaint is modified. It is not the invariable practice of the Opposition to facilitate in any extraordinarily generous manner the business of the House, if it is to their party and political interests to keep it in session. It is not a fact that the House has been invariably called together in the early months of the year. A look at the dates from 1867 down will show that the months of March and April play no inconsiderable part in the dates on which a Parliament has been called; but I do know of instances in which Parliament has been called together much earlier than this, and yet has sat on into the hot days of July and August before the members were permitted to return home to attend to their private business. Therefore, if we are here at this date, we are here under the reasons of which I have spoken, and not on account of the fanciful reasons of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) that we could have no mind of our own, and that we were balancing as between the better prospects of going to the country without a session or having a session without first going to the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) says that it would possibly be an unthinkable thing that the Government should have a mind of its own, and he attributes the lateness of the session to the instability of the Government in making up its mind. Well, I may say to my hon. friend that if it were unfortunately true that we had no minds of our own and could not make up our minds, we should find ourselves in very good company, for I have a suspicion that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has put himself in that category very often within the last few years. And I am not sure, that from anything he has said yet on the important question, upon which he last dilated, he has had during the last three or four years, any mind of his own. If he has he has taken precious good care to let no person else know what that mind may be. My hon. friend was very crafty in getting out of the necessity of having, as the leader of his party, a mind of his own and expressing it, by saying that it was an unheard of thing that he should be asked to advise the advisers of His Excellency. Well, we do not wish him to do that. For many long years he has not done it except across the floor. For many long years to come, we hope, he will not be in the coveted position of advising His Excellency upon the current affairs of the country. As to that we may have different views, according to the side of the House upon which sit; but there is one thing certain, that in every constitutionally governed country, and in this Dominion, the electorate might reasonably expect that the hon. gentleman would advise his constituents, his party and the electorate of this country as to what are his views on a great public question. We will allow the hon. gentleman for many years to come to do without advising the advisers of His Excellency: but we do ask him to make up his mind upon this and sundry other questions,and advise the people of Canada just where he stands, and where his party stands. Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke of the trade issue; he rang the changes upon the iniquity of protection; he declared that it was the root of all evil; he said that it destroyed the farming interests of this country particularly. But when the hon. gentleman came down from these definite maledictions, and began to talk about what the remedy should be, how delightfully indefinite he became. I appeal to gentlemen on this side of the House, I appeal to gentlemen on that side of the House, I appeal to 'Hansard' and the readers of 'Hansard,' if they can make out from the few sentences with which he finished his tirade against protection, as to his panacea for the ills of the country, if they could take the prescription which he gave to any political druggist and have it made up in a form in which it could be given to the body politic. My hon. friend, instead of plunging all at once into the heavy political questions of the day, which he said the mover and the seconder of the Address had slighted, indulged in a good deal of persiflage with reference to the position of the advisers of His Excellency and the amusing incidents which he assured us are taking place and have from time to time been taking place in the Council chamber and elsewhere. He made allusion to wars and fighting that were going on between two factions in the Cabinet. I can assure my hon. friend that though he imagines there have been wars, and that there are two factions, and that there has been fighting, so far as I am concerned, I have escaped without a scar or a scratch——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And, looking around on the healthy and serene faces of my colleagues, I think they can say the same for themselves. My hon. friend has one fault: he is too imaginative. I have no doubt that in certain adverse political situations, when no great satisfaction can be derived from the actualities, it is a great help to my hon. friend to have a strong imagination and to be able to soar away from the sordid and not very pleasant realities into the regions of airy fancy where he may disport himself at his pleasure. I remember that the hon. gentleman lately engaged in such a flight in the city of Toronto, where, happening to read a paper in the afternoon and making a speech in the evening, and having seen in the paper that my humble self had been

interviewed and had made a very positive statement in regard to the coming elections, he thought it worth while to take up fifteen minutes in his speech before a great audience to point out how the Minister of Finance had made certain statements which he should not have made, and if he had made them how diametrically opposed they were to the facts of the case and to the statements made by other Ministers. Sir, the fact as regards that was that I had never seen the reporter to my knowledge, and I was certainly not interviewed.

Mr. LAURIER. I apologize to the hon. gentleman certainly, and I beg to assure him that I will never believe another report that appears in a Conservative paper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. After the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House get through with the satisfaction which this illusion has given them, I think it will be my duty to prick that bubble as well, and to say that unfortunately for that version of the case, the interview did not appear in a Conservative paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What paper was it?

Mr. FOSTER. If I wait a little while, I am sure I shall get from hon. gentlemen that same delightful consistency and concurrence of opinion as to the paper that characterizes their utterances on other parts of their policy. The hon. gentleman then spoke of the elections which have taken place on the 17th day of April, and endeavoured to draw a good deal of comfort for himself and his party from the result of those elections. Amongst other things he claimed a victory in the city of Quebec in the election of Mr. Dobell; and, to prove that a victory for his party and his policy, he read the principal planks in the platform placed before the electors by Mr. Dobell, in which platform the hon. gentleman read word for word, article for article, what has been in the main the political creed and faith of the Liberal-Conservative party for the last thirteen or fourteen years. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Dobell is in favour of an increase of foreign trade. So is the Liberal-Conservative party, and so it has been; but in every endeavour the Liberal-Conservative party has made to increase our foreign trade, by great lines of railway to open up and develop the resources of the country, without which our products could not be sent to foreign countries—in every effort which this party has made to subsidize great lines of steamers to make quick and regular communications with the great trading countries of the world—my hon. friend and his adherents have opposed us tooth and nail upon the floor of this House; and yet, forsooth, he claims Mr. Dobell as a supporter of his policy, because Mr. Dobell very wisely is in favour of an increase of foreign trade, which foreign trade has been continually increasing under Liberal-Conservative rule, which foreign trade under the regime of the hon. gentlemen who had power in this country from 1874 to 1878 decreased from $200,000,000 odd down to about $154,000,000, and has increased from that small sum $250,000,000 under Conservative rule. We are quite satisfied with Mr. Dobell, and we shall be quite satisfied with any gentleman who comes to this House as a representative who has for one article of his faith a desire to increase the foreign trade of Canada, for the foreign trade of Canada can only be increased by the development and the increase of the internal resources and the internal trade of this country. Well, Sir, he says that Mr. Dobell proved his sympathy with the party of gentlemen opposite by saying that he was in favour of reciprocity with the United States on a fair and equal basis. These are almost the very words that have been in the platform of the Liberal-Conservative party for these many years. But Mr. Dobell did not say that he was in favour of Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States. He did not say that he was willing to pull down the tariff wall between ourselves and one country at the expense of putting a discrimination amounting to prohibition against every other country in the world in its trade with Canada. And although Mr. Dobell did say that he was in favour of lowering the tariff rate, in so far as it could possibly be done, consistent with the best interests of the country, we do not see in that expression of his, nor can it be found there, proof that he favours free trade as it exists in Great Britain. Well, Sir, my hon. friend was rather mild, and, for him, somewhat tame in his criticism up to this point. But he braced himself for the occasion, and he regained his old vigour when, by some good fortune, he happened to light upon the idea conveyed by the word depression. In one moment the exultant spirit of the war-horse returned, and he laid about vigorously to show into what a terrible state of affairs Canada had been plunged. He sought to show that this was a most serious time in the history of Canada; that we were burdened on the one hand with a national debt which was crushing the life out of us, and on the other hand by the taxation which must be imposed to meet the expenses of the country. And he ended up with the statement that it was this protective tariff and this protective principle which was the root of all the evil, which was despoiling the country, and which had brought it to this crisis. But, curiously enough, he went on directly afterwards to say that it was impossible to avoid periods of depression. But he stated, and wrongly stated, if he will allow me to say so, the belief of the Liberal-Conservative party by whom the National

Policy was introduced. We have not said that if there be any necessity for it, if there be any argument for its continuance it must be that it is powerful enough to keep off depression from a country, powerful enough to ward off these cycles of depression which sweep over the whole world, no matter what fiscal system, no matter what system of government may be adopted. No, Sir, that is an extreme statement which Liberal-Conservatives do not make. But what they do state and that in which their position is impregnable according to sound reasoning and good theory, impregnable according to the experience of this country and other countries, is this, that the National Policy—bringing it down to this particular country—has moderated the force and effect of cycles of depression, and has kept this country steady, and has kept it strong in the midst of four years of commercial depression deeper and more far-reaching in its consequences, and causing a wider and deeper distress than any other period of depression for the last twenty-five years in the history of the commercial nations of the world. That is what we stand upon, that is what we are willing to be judged by as to the effects of the National Policy. I am not going to make a speech upon the budget; I am not going to discuss the trade question within the narrow limits of time that is allowed me upon the Address. But when we come to that question we shall have ample time to contrast ourselves with other countries. Let me just now give to my hon. friend a text which he may think about, one upon which he may be called upon to say something when the discussion comes on. If his policy is, as he says, free trade as it is practised and as it exists in Great Britain, when he denounces the National Policy here, because he declares that it does not ward off but induces depression, we shall ask him, by and by for a satisfactory explanation of his assertions and ask him to point out why it is that in the greatest and almost the only free trade country, our own mother country, Great Britain, there is to-day, and has been for the last four or five years a series of depressions in agriculture hitherto unknown in the history of that island, and which have brought about a state of affairs which is exercising more serious thought among the statesmen and economists of Great Britain than any other question which is to-day pressing for solution there. That is a question of practical politics which it will be incumbent upon my hon. friend to make very clear to the House and the country before he can get either the House or the country to believe that free trade as it is in England is a better system for Canada than that we have adopted. The hon. gentlemen made merry over a prediction which had been made by Sir Charles Tupper in this House with reference to what was to take place in the future as to the development of the North-west, and the settlement of its fertile lands. Now, if the hon. gentleman will read the letter he will find that it was not a prediction of a Minister, or of Sir Charles Tupper, but a statement drawn up in cool blood by a departmental officer without political bias, to say the least, who, from the data that he had in hand at that time made up what he thought would be the line of development in the North-west within the next few years. That was a statement which a Minister is bound to take, and is bound to give his adhesion to unless——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Wait until I get through. That is a statement which a Minister is bound to take, and is bound to give his confidence to unless he has the best of ground for believing that the departmental officer is biased or is mistaken in his opinions. But, Sir, that was a statement made up by a departmental officer, made up without bias, made up under circumstances which, at the time, he thought predicted the result, and I am bound to say that he made it up in full faith that the next few years would realize the truth of his statement. The result was different. But there are statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite that might be criticised in the same way, statements made by them upon their own responsibility. Let us examine one of these. I remember that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) in 1883, I think it was, speaking in this House in opposition to a loan which was proposed to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of $30,000,000, opposed it on the ground that it was not a loan in reality but a gift. And he made this oracular prediction, that he was as likely to see the waters run up hill as to see one dollar of that $30,000,000 recouped to the Dominion treasury. Now, this was a statement made, not by a departmental officer, but made by the hon. gentleman himself, and testing his own powers of prediction. And it failed. Having fallen into error himself he ought to be wondrous kind in the case of an error in prediction made upon far better grounds, by a political opponent. I remember later than that, when the hon. gentleman, the political leader of his party, supposed to give them the word of faith and guidance, which they were to follow with implicit obedience, looking over the whole political field, studying the whole economic problem, looking at the state of agitation and the state of opinion in the republic to the south of us, came here, and went through this country, and made the prediction without any ifs, or buts, or qualifications, that the United States, the first born daughter of England, had pronounced for, and would speedily realize, free trade; and the next daughter of

England to follow her example would be this Dominion of Canada. Well, Sir, the eldest daughter of England has not pronounced for free trade, has not got free trade, but rejoices under the iniquity, as my hon. friend would call it, of a 40 per cent tariff on dutiable goods. And, Sir, I am of the opinion that he is just as much mistaken in thinking that the second daughter of Great Britain, Canada, to wit, will not follow in the line of the United States, upon more moderate grounds, and consider it to her advantage that as long as the United States keeps up a high protective tariff against Canada, Canada in self-defence to her manufactures, her industry, her development and her future, must keep up a moderate and reasonable protection against imported goods.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend made a legitimate criticism of a statement of mine with reference to the finances, as to the expenditure of the current year compared with the falling off of revenue and the consequent deficit which he anticipates, and rightly anticipates. But, just at this point, I would like to disclaim the statement of my hon. friend that the deficit would be, in round figures, about six million dollars. I think my. hon. friend has had bad advisers in that respect. He has buoyed himself upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who in this respect, as in some others, is not the best guide in matters party and political which are meant for campaign work against his opponents. It is true that a deficit to a Finance Minister and to a Government is never a welcome thing. Probably there will result from this decipline in the occurrence of the year to myself and the Liberal-Conservative party, that we shall hereafter have a little more sympathy and fellow feeling with hon. gentlemen opposite, and having had the casual, and, I hope, but temporary acquaintance with one of those ill-natured and ill-visaged deficits, we shall be better able to appreciate the misery of hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to have made constant companions of them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. There is, however, a word more to be said. A greater authority than myself has stated that execution often lags on promise ; and perhaps the promise that I made, the statement that might be construed into a promise or pledge to the House and the country, was made without sufficiently weighing the difficult circumstances in the case. One thing is certain, that after moneys have been voted and appropriations have been made, it is much more difficult to economize then, than to begin to economize at the start, when the Estimates are being passed and appropriations are being made. It is also a fact that these obligations in expenditure accumulate, that one year never sees the completion of the works begun in that year, and that any one year that may be taken shows obligations in the shape of contracts which have been begun and must be finished, in the shape of preparations which have been commenced and which must be carried out, if loss is not to accrue. So the Government found these accumulations of contracts or obligations, and it becomes very difficult indeed to forego their completion. There were also some extraordinary expenditures which occurred in the past year and added to that difficulty. More than that : the extraordinary falling off in the revenue was of such a nature that it was quite impossible for the Government to have made the expenditure tally with the income, which went so rapidly downward during the last six months of the fiscal year. There is, however, a difference that I should like the House to note in the position at present and that of the regime from 1874 to 1878. It is a fact that the deficits which took place from 1874 to 1878 were deficits accompanied by the laying on of taxation upon the people and were not in any sense deficits which were contributed to by taking off taxation that had formerly been placed upon the people. But with respect to the events of the last three years, and with respect to the deficit of last year, and the deficit of the present year, this must be understood, that that deficit would not have occurred, even in part, if the same rate of taxation which existed in 1890 had been kept on through 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894. Sir, if the sugar taxation alone had been kept at its old figures for these years, we would not only have had the deficit, but we should have had a clear record as between expenditure and income, and have paid off from six to eight millions of the public debt. So, if a deficit has occurred last year and this year, out of the people's pockets it has not come, but along with the people's savings. It has come with the people's savings in two ways : savings from taxations which was removed, the raw sugar taxation which was a direct tax, and savings from decreased purchases owing to economy practised, which always occurs in times of trade difficulty and depression. That marks a distinct difference between the deficits which have occurred in the past year, and will occur in the present year, and those which marked the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear. Was there no shrinkage then ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. Was there any taxation laid on then ? The hon. gentleman should say, " Hear, hear," again. What I stated is perfectly true, that the deficit is

due to two causes, the removal of taxation, and that is in greater part, and the reduced purchases owing to economy practised by people in general. Let us hope, and I think I can confidently express this hope, that we have seen the last of our deficits, and that, having cleared off the residue of accumulations for past years, of contracts entered into, we shall, during the next year not only make, which I trust we shall do without fail, an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, but we shall get back to our normal and our proper position, where we shall have met all expenditure and have a little sum to the good as well. The hon. leader of the Opposition made some remarks with respect to the French treaty, which calls for an explanation on my part, an explanation which was not given in the Speech from the Throne, but which is pertinent and proper to be given at this stage. My hon. friend was right in saying, that, so far as the French Chambers were concerned, they had passed the Treaty Act, and that, so far as Canada was concerned, that legislation was consummated. Ratifications, however, have not yet been exchanged, and the proclamation of the Governor General in Council calling the Act into force cannot be issued here until the ratifications have been exchanged. The satisfactory assurances that are spoken of have reference to this fact, that during the progress of the conference with the delegates of the colonial Governments, which took place last year, our Australasian and Cape friends criticised the treaty which was entered into with France on this ground, that they believed, and they expressed that belief that it would be found to be the fact that it would prevent the making of treaty arrangements between those colonies and Canada in which wines, the native products of the Cape and of some of the Australasian colonies, might be a factor in the interchange of products on the basis of better trade relations, their contention being that France would require, that if better terms on these articles were given to the colonies than were stated in the French treaty, under the third powers clause or phrase, she would be entitled to ask that the same treatment be given to her. That contention was so strongly made that the Minister of Trade and Commerce thought it his duty to formally communicate with the Colonial Office. That was done, and assurances received that the third powers did not include the colonies, and that the treaty, if passed, would not militate against any arrangement that it might be thought well to make between the colonies and Canada, even if it involved a lower rate of duty for the articles which were mentioned in the French treaty. That is the explanation in regard to that matter, in part. There is, however, another explanation. Great Britain has most-favoured-nation clause treaties with some powers, and she is also anxious that her other colonies should have as good treatment as is given to France in this respect, as to any other foreign power with which Canada makes a treaty. With respect to the most-favoured nations and the treaties with them, it is absolutely necessary, under the treaties, in which Canada is included, that their articles which are of the same nature as those mentioned in the French treaty should receive the most-favoured-nation treatment. The Canadian Act of Parliament in which the tariff is embraced does not make provision for that, and the fact of the existence of the treaty does not override the tariff law of the country. So that Great Britain wishes that, before ratifications are exchanged and the treaty proclaimed, the actual law shall make that point clear as regards the most-favoured nations and the colonies. That is the legislation which is hinted at in the Speech and which will be brought before the House for its consideration. My hon. friend was good enough to say in his criticism of the French Treaty that the members of the Government had been brought to their knees in this matter by Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner. If the hon. gentleman had not had a lapse of memory he might have recollected that others besides the Government—if that be true—had been brought to their knees by this same French treaty; for, if I remember aright, my hon. friend very vigorously opposed the treaty. I am not sure that he did not vote twice against the treaty, but by and by, for sentimental reasons—and he is the hon. gentleman who has repeatedly declared that there is no sentiment in trade—for sentimental reasons he swallowed the treaty and came to his knees with the rest of us. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend's statement of friendship with regard to the colony of Newfoundland. I think he echoed what are the feelings of Canada as a whole; that if treaty terms can be fairly, honourably and amicably arranged, without coercion either of circumstances or of power, and with all proper provisions, it would be an excellent and much to be desired consummation, if Newfoundland be added to the confederation, and thus, that all the British possessions on this part of the North American continent should be brought into one united and harmonious whole. It was with this view and with this desire that the Canadian Government were happy to respond to the proposition which was made by the Government of Newfoundland that delegates should meet and discuss the matter. They have met and they have discussed the situation in a thorough and exhaustive and friendly way, and although negotiations are not as yet concluded, it will be, as the Speech from the Throne says, a matter of congratulation on all sides if this union can be consummated with fairness and with friendship between all. My hon. friend, however, made the proviso, that he should like to see

the French shore question settled before the colony came into Canada, if it so happens that the colony be united with us. The hon. gentleman thought that that question should be settled with Great Britain and France. There is a treaty, there is the plain wording of the treaty, there are the rights which France claims under the treaty, there are the rights which so far as the English contention is concerned, she sometimes exercises but which are claimed not to be within the four corners of the treaty, and on these matters long negotiations and repeated negotiations have been going on and they have assumed—I think I may say without violating any confidence, because the blue-books have been already published—they have assumed a position at the present time, where we may fairly say, that with agreement between the Newfoundland Government and the Home Government, legislation is likely to be passed at the coming session of the Newfoundland legislature which will settle that question agreeably to the government of Newfoundland and to the government of Great Britain on a basis which will be accepted by France. So much with reference to that question. I desire to say a word, and but a word with reference to the last allusion but one, of my hon. friend, and that was his reference to what is known as the remedial order and the Manitoba school question. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) touched that very gingerly. He stated that the Ministers, some of them at least, had been making very decided utterances in different parts of the country, and that they had been talking a great deal. Evidently that criticism does not apply to my hon. friend for he has been making no very decided utterances about this question and he has not been talking much about it. In fact, it is a matter which is somewhat significant and somewhat unusual, that in a series of election contests undertaken in different parts of the country, in constituencies of different temperaments and different complexions, after the passage of the remedial order and after the Government's decision, it is remarkable I say, that four contests should take place and that in two of the constituencies the leader of a great party did not put candidates in the field. My hon. friend says that he looked upon it as a family quarrel down in Haldimand. A family quarrel in Haldimand! Left to the Liberal-Conservatives alone, in a county which has been the closed home, the castle of the Liberal party for many and many a year, and the hon. gentleman has allowed the Liberal-Conservatives to go into his own home, his own castle, and without a word from him to settle a family quarrel between themselves! I am afraid that that excuse is not sufficiently strong to base my hon.friend's conduct upon before the electors of this country. I would not go further in reference to this question were it not that the hon. gentleman had stated that the Government had been guilty of indiscretion all the way through. Now that is one of those broad statements that I do not think can be sustained, and I shall present two or three considerations to the House to show why it cannot be sustained. My hon. friend says the Government has shown a lamentable lack of discretion all through this matter. In what respect, let me ask him? Manitoba, a province having exclusive rights limited by certain restrictions under the constitution, having dealt with a certain matter relating to education, passed a law and the law came for revision, as provincial laws do come, to the Minister of Justice for the Dominion of Canada. The Dominion took the ground, well established—does my hon. friend controvert that ground or will his party controvert that ground—the Dominion Government took the ground that that Act passed on such a question with such powers behind it ought not to be disallowed, that it ought to be left to its fulfilment and the courts would very soon say whether it was ultra vires or not. The Dominion Government, therefore, did not disallow the Act. Does my hon. friend count that as one of the indiscretions? I do not think he will say so. Well, Sir, after that legislation had gone before the tribunals, and the first decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was given with reference to the Barrett case, our friends in the minority in the province of Manitoba having loyally accepted the decision of the Government not to disallow, having then had recourse to the courts, as they were told they had, and as they knew they had, having fought out that matter in the courts, and had a certain decision which satisfied them, at least as to the law on one point, they have availed themselves of—what? Of the constitution of this country—of their own constitutional act, as every minority has a right to do. They availed themselves of its express provisions in their petition to the Dominion Government. Now, Sir, that was perfectly right. The action of the Government upon that was simply this: it is better to be sure than sorry;—is this a matter which comes under the right of appeal—under that provision of the Manitoba Act or the British North America Act? It was best that that should be decided by the courts under a law which was introduced by the leader of the party opposite, the predecessor of my hon. friend, and acquiesced in on both sides of the House. Under that they proceeded, and under that the Government of this country made them this answer: We will defer the hearing of the appeal until every difficulty is settled and the clear legal answer is given, the clear legal ground is shown. Was that in the opinion of my hon. friend an act of indiscretion? The minority in Manitoba loyally accepted that; they took their case to the Privy Council; they argued it there, and they got their decision. That

decision having been given, the case was clear. The Government of this country knew then, if they acted, exactly upon what ground they were acting. Suppose they had acted in the first instance and allowed the appeal, and the case had then gone before the courts and it had been proved that the appeal did not lie in that case. Would that have been a discreet act? Would that have been a wise act? But after the whole ground was cleared, after the decision was given, then the Government heard the appeal. Will my hon. friend count that as an act of indiscretion? If he does, I think the reasonable people of this country will say that that was the only step for the Government to have taken—that as it was best for it to know exactly its powers in this case before it sought to carry them out. So it was necessary when these powers were made known to give the minority their constitutional right to appeal. After that the appeal was heard in due course, and the decision given; and the only criticism my hon. friend has to make upon the decision is that it was dictatorial and not conciliatory. He pointed out that the order had two sides to it. He is wrong: the order is simply the order. It has two sides to it if two people from different standpoints read it and come to different conclusions. It has two sides to it in my hon. friend's own camp. What does "La Patrie" say about it?—that it is peremptory and dictatorial? On the contrary, that it is nerveless and no order at all. What does "L'Electeur" say about it?—that it is dictatorial and peremptory? Not at all. That it is simply the act of a sheriff passing on an execution or something to that effect. What does the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) say about it?—that it is dictatorial or peremptory? No. That the Government simply get down on their knees and make a prayer to Manitoba—why do they not order Manitoba to do so and so? So there are two sides to it amongst my hon. friend's own people. There were not two sides to it in Verchères, where the candidate of my hon. friend went ahead of his leader and made a clear statement where he stood, and implied a rebuke, and I think a well merited rebuke, upon his leader, who in these important contests and on this important question had no word of advice, no suggestion to guide the conduct of his followers who were looking to him for guidance. In one thing I do agree with my hon. friend, that I hope this question will be settled as far away from the heat and bitterness of sectarian and party strife as possible; and to that end I deprecate extended discussions on that question at the present time. On that account I deplore the action of a member of the Manitoba Government of the province of Ontario within the last ten days. What was the case? What is the case to-day? That subject is remitted to the legislature of Manitoba. Call it dictatorial, call it nerveless, look upon it as you please, it is simply this: a decision of the law; and if there is a request implied, it is a request implied by courtesy to the fuller powers which Manitoba has, as compared with this Parliament, to settle the question. The difficulty arose in Manitoba legislation; the difficulty, if it is to be cured completely, can only be cured completely by Manitoba itself, on account of the peculiar and far-reaching powers which Manitoba has in that respect. There it goes; it is there to-day; and when it went there it was considered a grave and serious matter—so grave and serious that outside of all defiant expressions that had formerly been used, the Government and the legislature which had the responsibility did a wise and proper thing, in my view, in taking time to consider the question. In their calm and cool moments they are to deliberate upon it, and come to their conclusion; and by and by they are to formulate their decision. And yet, Sir, we find the Attorney General of that province—one of the Cabinet who is to take this subject into consideration and look over the legal points and peculiar circumstances of the case, and come to a conclusion involving the peace and prosperity not only of that province, but of other parts of this Dominion—we find that gentleman instead of giving it that calm and cool consideration, hieing himself down to Haldimand, going upon the stump, and saying that the Dominion Government has no object in view except to buy votes, and hurling his defiance from every platform in that county. Now, Sir, I think that as political conduct deserves condemnation, and I have no hesitation in saying that I do not know of a single instance in which political indecency has gone further towards outrage than the instance I have just detailed to you. That, Sir, is not the position which my hon. friend takes to-day, and is not the position which any statesman ought to take. Until the 9th of May, when the decision of the Manitoba Government may be come to and the legislature will be convened to hear it, let Manitoba think over that matter with as little passion and as far from strife and bitterness as possible; let her come to her conclusions apart from the heat of fiery and inflammatory declamation; and until that day comes and those conclusions are formulated, I am bound to maintain, as I certainly hope, that she will do her own work as she best can do it, and that she will find a way for making smooth these waters which are now rough and troubled. Now, Sir, I have but one word more to say, and I commence that by thanking my hon. friend for his allusions to our late lamented leader, Sir John Thompson. So hearty and so eloquent a tribute as he paid to Sir John Thompson's memory shows us, and shows us in a most pleasing manner, that whatever may be

the bitterness of party and political life, whatever may the strifes between different camps and on different sides of political questions, there is yet deep in the heart of Canadians this feeling that ever and anon there arise amongst us on one side or the other men who do not belong entirely to any party but who belong emphatically to their country, whom all are proud to know as Canadian citizens, and to whose worth and merits all are glad to pay tribute. And after that eloquent tribute which the hon. gentleman has paid to the memory of Sir John Thompson, what can words of mine avail. What can any words avail in the face of that splendid exhibition of sentiment which commenced at Windsor and flashed itself out along the chords of sympathy, under sea and over land, until in the remotest parts of the world wherever British institutions are established and the British flag waves, there vibrated the plaintive lament for a great man who had lived and, alas, was now dead; a man distinguished above others in the greatest of the possessions of Great Britain, a man honoured above others in the Empire itself, a man whose life contributed great and invaluable factors to the public spirit, the development and the future greatness of both? What words can avail in the face of that tender solicitude and that unfeigned sorrow of Her Most Gracious Majesty herself, and of that significant pomp and circumstance which followed him from the scene of his tragic and sudden death, accompanied him across the sea panoplied in the symbols of Britain's might by sea and land, and never left him until, in his native city, the tender blue sky and sorrowing multitudes of friends bent over the grave in which his mortal remains were laid to rest. We may strew our flowers, we may drop our tears, we may keep the last sad vigils with the dead, and after all is done, what remains? In one sense, nothing; but in another and better sense much remains. There remains to us his memory, instinct with loving reminiscences, pregnant with noble impulses and ideals. For, after all, when we think of it, the career of Sir John Thompson was a phenomenal career. Known and loved by his circle of intimate friends for many years before he was widely known to Canada, it may be truly said of him that he came to be known to the larger public in 1885, and the short span of ten years saw his rise and his glorious and tragic death. In 1885 he entered the Ministry. In 1886 he took first rank as a debater and statesman in this House. In the few years that passed he gained the confidence of both sides of this House, and he went from honour to honour until he became the Premier of this country, in judicial matters attaining proud pre-eminence and on one of the greatest tribunals that the world ever saw, and upon a most important case—easily the peer of any who sat with him, until, at the last, under the highest honours that his Sovereign could bestow, his life went out like the noon-day sun—shining one instant bright and glorious in mid-heavens; in the next, hidden for ever from view, with the soft effulgence of its light flooding the horizon far and near. Let us hope, that seeing now most clearly the virtues of the man who was so loved by us, and who has for ever gone from us, we may emulate them, and that there may never be a decade in the history of this country when there shall not be equally strong, equally true, and equally grand and patriotic men as the late Right Honourable Sir John Thompson.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. Minister of Finance is prolific in nothing else, at any rate he is very prolific in excuses, but I am bound to say that on the present occasion I think he might well have spared us, and spared himself, the trouble of enumerating them. Sir, we are perfectly well aware on this side of the House that the hon. gentleman for one was not in the slightest degree desirous of inflicting this session upon us at this inconvenient time. We are perfectly well aware of that and the House fully appreciates the excellent reasons which the hon. gentleman possessed for not desiring at this particular time to confront the assembled wisdom of Canada, or to give us an opportunity of showing how thoroughly and completely the hon. gentleman had made good his claim to the title of a skillful financier by the prophecies he was good enough to make to us with respect to the probable results of his fiscal policy for the current year. Sir, I do not pretend to say that the several excuses which the hon. gentleman presented to the House, or the several reasons he alleged for summoning Parliament together at this time, are not without a certain foundation in truth. But this I will say, that if the hon. gentleman has told us the truth, he has not told us the whole truth as to the reasons which impelled the hon. gentlemen to hold this present session. Sir, I think not only on this side of the House but on that side, there is a tolerably good idea of the reason why this particular session is held. It is the fate of hon. gentleman to be considerably better known than trusted, and there is not the slightest doubt that in certain of the intricate negotiations which have attended the settlement of the Manitoba question, certain influential personages who knew these hon. gentlemen, and who, I have reason to know, had very good grounds for their distrust of these hon. gentlemen, had intimated to them in the most unmistakable language, had, in fact, conveyed their mandate, or, shall I say, their "mandement" to them, that on this occasion they were not going to be granted any credit, on this occasion no promises would do, on this occasion they had to hold a session, and they had to implement their promises, or certain personages would know the reason why. Now, Sir, I do not object

to a session 'per se': on the contrary, I am very glad indeed that we will have an opportunity, before we meet the electors, of proving from these hon. gentlemen's own mouths, of proving from their own official records, how absolutely and correctly every statement made from this side of the House, every prediction as to the ultimate consequences of the villainous policy of which these hon. gentlemen are the exponents, have come to pass and are verified to-day. But, Sir, while I have no objection at all to a session in itself, I have the very strongest possible objection to the course which the hon. gentlemen have pursued in defiance of custom, in defiance of precedents, in defiance of their own repeated promises in summoning the Parliament of Canada together at about the date when, with ordinarily good business management on their part, the Parliament of Canada ought to be ready to prorogue. Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that it is not a very grave charge at all, not a thing that is much worthy of the consideration of an important body like ourselves, if Parliament is summoned together nearly three months after its proper time. To the hon. gentleman's mind it is of very little consequence whether the 200 other gentlemen forming the great body of this House, are put to grave and serious inconvenience by the incompetence of himself and his colleagues; it is of very little consequence in the hon. gentleman's mind whether the whole mercantile community of Canada, whether every business man in Canada, is put to grave inconvenience by reasons of this extreme delay in meeting Parliament; it is of very little consequence in the hon. gentleman's mind, I suppose, whether the whole public service of Canada is gravely disorganized by reason of the extreme delay in summoning Parliament. Now, as to the idle pretense that there is any real difficulty, as to the idle pretense that these gentlemen if they were really possessed of the business capacity they claim, could not have met Parliament at the proper time, let me call the attention of the House to the way in which the public business was administered at a time when there were genuine business men in charge of the Government of this country. In the year 1875, Parliament met on 4th day of February; in 1876, Parliament met on 10th February; in 1877, Parliament met on the 8th of February; in 1878, Parliament met on the 7th of February. Sir, there are four successive years. We had important questions to deal with, we had deficits to face, we had a world-wide depression, a far greater depression than exists to-day, to contend with: but we never hesitated to meet Parliament, we never hesitated to meet the hon. gentleman's predecessors, we never hesitated to explain clearly what our policy was, we never hesitated to stand or fall by the course which we, in our conscience believe, and which the history of Canada has since conclusively proved, was the policy which alone Canada could look to for safety and salvation, if Canada is ever to make a worthy and fitting use of the resources which Providence has placed at our disposal. The hon. gentleman is good enough to tell us that the lamented death of Sir John Thompson was a reasonable ground why Parliament should not be summoned together. Well, Sir, was there any change of policy caused by the death of Sir John Thompson? Did not these gentlemen tell us on all occasions that their policy is the same as his? Was there any very great alteration in the personnel of the Cabinet? Was there any great alteration in the offices held by these hon. gentlemen? Not, at any rate, so far as I am aware of. Sir, let their own acts, as usual, be the best answers to their own arguments. Sir John Thompson's death and the disorganization consequent thereon, the Minister of Finance tells us, was a ground for delay in meeting Parliament. If the sorrow which he and his colleagues, I do not doubt, sincerely felt, prevented them from attending to public business, their sorrow and this disorganization did not in the slightest degree prevent them from starting out and carrying on an electioneering tour from one end of Canada to the other during the months of January and February, and so much of March as was not occupied in other negotiations. Now, Sir, if these hon. gentlemen when they traversed Canada from end to end, when the Jamaica car, and the contents of the Jamaica car, was daily and hourly seen perambulating Ontario, when these hon. gentlemen were stirring up the country from one end to the other, these hon. gentlemen, I beg to tell them, were doing an extremely foolish act in their own interest if they really meant to have held a session. In the first place, these hon. gentlemen knew, and the Minister of Finance knew best of all, that by postponing the session to the 19th April, he had practically rendered it impossible that one single vote for the public service could be got through before the 1st of July of this year. He knows, and I know, and you know, and all hon. gentlemen who have any experience in public life, know, that we can hardly hope to see one single vote passed until the termination of this fiscal year. He knows, and I know, and all men of experience know, that the result will be to gravely incommode and gravely delay the public service; and the hon. gentleman considered all that a perfectly insignificant thing provided the temporary convenience or the political advantage of the Ministry were not disturbed or interfered with. Sir, I must say for my part—and I make the remark for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite—that it does look to me to be a very curious piece of strategy indeed. Why, Sir, what have these

shepherds of the people been doing all this time ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Shearing the sheep.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Trying to shear the sheep. They have spent the months of January, February and a part of March, in providing opponents for their own supporters and followers. It is going to be a very interesting experiment. You will take an interest, and a good many other of our friends will take an interest in it. For the first time in my memory—and it goes back tolerably far on political subjects—we are going to see what the results upon the public mind will be of having 200 gentlemen sitting here at Ottawa voting away the people's money, and 200 other gentlemen prowling along the concessions, explaining to the people how their money is being voted away, and what for. Sir, I saw the other day, in one of the subsidized organs which support the hon. gentlemen, a statement that the mantle of the late Sir John A. Macdonald had fallen upon them. It may be so. If so, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that it has covered them all up, with much the same results which were observed, if I recollect aright, when Gulliver's cloak descended on the Privy Council of his sacred majesty, the King of Lilliput, Mr. Speaker. I may say that we are glad to learn from so high a source as the Minister of Finance, firstly, that the Cabinet is in harmony, and next, if I understand him aright, that he had escaped all personal damage in any little collisions which may have occurred. Let us trust that the same may be said of all his colleagues, or that, if any of them were called upon to seal their devotion to their opinions with their blood, their wounds were all received in front. Now, as a rule I object, and I think hon. gentlemen will admit that I have not been forward, as a general thing, to anticipate the discussion on the Budget in the course of the debate on the Address ; and I will so far relieve the mind of the hon. Minister of Finance as to tell him that I do not propose on the present occasion to go into any discussion of the trade question further than, possibly, to offer a remark or two in answer to some statements of his own. But while I say that it is not desirable, as a general rule, in the public interest, that you should anticipate a discussion on the Budget in course of the debate on the Address, I say that the present occasion is thus far an exception, that it is in the highest degree of importance to this House and to the country at large, that we should understand exactly the present financial position. Sir, according to my view of the case, the situation is most grave. Whatever the hon. gentleman may say, whatever the hon. gentleman may think, all who have studied the question know well that our present taxation is extraordinarily onerous. We know right well, and I shall have, perhaps, a word or two more to say on that subject, how utterly, hopelessly and completely the recent efforts of the hon. gentleman, well meant as they may have been, and though prolonged through several months of the last session, failed to relieve the pressure of that taxation. It is only too true, and I do not hold him to blame for it, that the income of very large classes in the most important sections of this country have been enormously reduced within the last three or four years. It is likewise true that the total indebtedness of Canada abroad, and by that I mean, and the hon. gentleman ought to take it into account, not merely our federal debt, but our municipal debt, our private debt, and our provincial debt, the general debt of Canada, in short, has enormously increased within the past few years. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows only too well, there is no hon. member in this House who ought to know it better, that over large sections of Canada, not merely has the increase of population fallen below that which prevails in old and thickly peopled countries elsewhere, but it has come to a positive and absolute standstill ; and that most of all is true of the province he represents, and of the particular riding for which he sits in this House. I do not wish to enlarge upon these subjects at present ; it requires more time than I have at my disposal, and I dare say before the House rises there will be very full opportunities, indeed, to point out the bearing of these facts on the present situation, and to show how utterly and totally fallacious is the view which the hon. gentleman holds out to himself and to the country that this depression can be looked upon as one which is likely soon or easily to pass away. Sir, as I have said, the conduct of the Government itself makes it impossible for us on the present occasion to avoid commenting on the existing financial situation. One of two conclusions must be arrived at : either the Government of Canada, and notably the Finance Minister, have been most gravely mistaken, or they have been most reckless in making provision against the present deficit. The hon. gentleman had warning after warning, time and again, not merely from myself, but even from members on his own side of the House ; and it was pointed out that the position last year in particular was one full of peril. Time and time again it was pointed out, and I see that some of the hon. gentleman's friends are using the argument as an excuse to-day, that there is an intimate connection between Canadian trade and the trade and business of the United States, that it is almost an axiom in our commercial economy that wherever there

is serious financial distress in the United States, or a prolonged period of distress there, a similar distress, generally equally prolonged, is almost certain to follow in Canada. I shall not repeat the statement which my hon. friend read of the professions of the Minister of Finance. They are fresh in the memory of the House. I have no doubt the House recollects quite distinctly the excellent advice which the hon. gentleman gave to his colleagues and to the House. Sir, there is a frightful contrast, I am sorry to say, between the profession and practice of that hon. gentleman. Before the House rose last session, the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well, it was patent on the face of the returns laid on the Table, that a deficit of over one million dollars was a certain and fixed fact. What did the hon. gentleman do? What did this preacher of economy do? What did this hon. gentleman, who thought it was the first duty of a Government to curtail expenditure so as to meet the deficiency in the revenue, do in the way of making provision for an ascertained deficit of a million and a quarter? His first proceeding was to throw away half a million of dollars. One quarter of a million for the purpose of conciliating the liquor interests, and another quarter of a million for the purpose of concilliating, what I may call, without offence to the Minister of Justice, the Tupper interest, and a very unprofitable investment is appears to have been, according to the last electoral returns. Then after effecting needless loss of half a million dollars of revenue in the face of a deficit of a million and a quarter, the hon. gentleman proceeded by statute to add one million dollars a year in all to our fixed charges, in the shape of an Atlantic subsidy of $750,000, and of subsidies to railways involving a total expenditure of four or five millions more. Finally, and by way, I suppose, of an appropriate finish and wind up, the hon. gentleman, this advocate of economy, brought down further Supplementary Estimates to the tune of $1,300,000. These are the precautions taken to secure economy, this is the way the hon. gentleman carried out in practice the economy he professed. Let the House compare these facts with the statement which my hon. friend read. Now, the hon. gentleman is confronted, and he knows he is confronted with a huge deficit. Let us know the facts. I have observed with some amusement the desperate contortions and evasions made on the part of the hon. gentleman's organs to escape the pressure of this deficit. I have observed something more. Newspaper correspondents and newspaper editors are not supposed to be very well versed in the mysteries of the Finance Department, and, according to the Minister of Justice they could not always be relied upon, even if they were. But, Sir, what shall we say when we find in the last copy of the "Official Gazette" a statement like this: Revenue and expenditure on account of consolidated fund; expenditure to the end of 31st March, 1895, $24,553,000; revenue at the end of 31st March, 1895, $23,844,000; surplus, $708,107. I beg to state to the House that I believe this is the first time since confederation that the word "surplus" has ever been inserted, or this line ever appeared in the Public Gazette at this date. What does it mean? Why was it inserted? There were four bye-elections —of course that is a matter of detail—about to come off a few days after this first appeared. But what does the hon. gentleman mean by it? Here is the official statement of the department that on 31st March, 1895, there was a surplus of $708,-107. If that means anything, if that has been inserted for a purpose, I am sorry to say I can conceive of no purpose except the purpose of confusing the minds of the people at large, and creating an absolutely false impression as to the real state of the case. It is true, no doubt, that the audited expenditure, certified by the Finance Department up to 31st March, 1895, may only show what is stated here, a total expenditure of $23,844,000 as against a total receipt of $24,553,000. But every man who knows anything at all of the Department of Finance or of the way in which our national book-keeping is managed, knows perfectly well that from the nature of the case a very large portion of the expenditure which has actually been incurred and which is payable at that moment is not included in these statements of expenditure and that in the later months of the year this is never entered in the public accounts until some few weeks after the termination of the financial year; and that therefore, although this may be a correct statement as regards the audited expenditure, yet this statement which I hold in my hand is most unquestionably a very false statement, as to impression which any ordinary reader will take from it on seeing for the first time in twenty-seven years a declaration that there was such and such a surplus in favour of the Government on the 31st of March. Now, Sir, I am going to show the House what the real state of the facts are, and I challenge the hon. Minister to contradict these facts. I desire the attention of the House because this is a grave matter. If I am wrong I desire to be corrected, and if I am right, I desire that every member of this House should bear in mind what it means, that to-day, after nine months receipts are in, after nine months audited expenditure, so-called is in, so far from having a surplus of $708,000, we have to-day, as I will presently show, an ascertained deficit of $5,-016,000 on the transactions of these nine months. I do not think that the hon.

gentleman will have any ground to complain of want of plainness with respect to the statement that I have just made. It is well known to every member of this House that we unfortunately closed the last financial year wtih a deficit of $1,200,000 in round numbers. Now, on the 31st of March, the date on which a surplus of $708,000 is claimed by the "Official Gazette" and for which the Minister of Finance is entirely responsible; on that date the revenue received from all sources fell short of the revenue for the nine months of 1894, by the sum of $3,292,747. The expenditure for the same period exceeded the expenditure for the first nine months of 1894 by the sum of $513,236. We started therefore with a deficit of one and a quarter millions in round numbers. We have got in these nine months a revenue of three millions and a quarter less, and we have spent half a million dollars more, and if you add these three sums together you will find that if it is the desire of the Department of Finance to enlighten the public as to the real state of the case, instead of putting in a fictitious and imaginary surplus of $708,000, they would state that in those nine months there was an ascertained deficit of $5,016,000. What the remaining three months may have in store for us, I do not know, and the hon. gentleman does not know; but I am afraid that it is extremely improbable that any material portion of this $5,000,000 will, under the most favourable circumstances be reduced; and on the other hand, if the same expenditure continues in proportion, and the same falling off in the revenue continues, it is extremely probable that in the ensuing three months the figure which was named by my hon. friend, is likely to be attained. I make no prediction about it, I simply point out that it is extremely likely to occur. It it is true, no doubt, that in the month of March last year, there was a small anticipation of revenue in the matter of excise, but it is very unlikely indeed that when the first of July comes—looking at the very large amount of the hon. gentleman's estimates and looking to the fact that these estimates do not include any supplementary estimates for the service of the current year, with which we will doubtless be presented in good time—it is very unlikely indeed that the additional expenditure which we will have to incur, will not fully equal any trifling gain which may be made in the Department of Excise. I have observed that a very disingenuous use has been made of these "Gazette" returns, whether by the connivance or under the instructions of the Minister of Finance, I do not say. I hope not, although I am bound to tell him, that the appearance of such a line as I have pointed out in the "Official Gazette,"—a paragraph which never appeared before, at any rate until after the close of the financial year, and until the Finance Department knew whether it had a surplus or a deficit—I say, Sir, that the appearance of such a paragraph at such a time requires explanation at his hands unless he chooses to allow us to draw the inference that this paragraph was put in either under his orders or with his knowledge for the purpose of misleading the public as to the real state of the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend puts it that way I will give him my answer now. There is not the least grain of reason for the suspicion which he has thrown out. These are returns which are simlpy made up by the Dominion book-keeper and initialled and signed by the Deputy. I see them when they are in the "Official Gazette" or just before they are put in sometimes, and oftener not. I have had nothing to do with it at all. If it is the word "surplus" that my hon. friend quarrels with he may have that quarrel. The statement is simply a monthly statement of the cash collected in that month, and of the cash paid out, and under it they appear to have drawn a line and stated as for that month, taking cash that is paid out and cash that comes in, there is surplus of so much, which is undeniably true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No that is not the case. This is for the period of the nine months, and my hon. friend will see that if he looks.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend read, and I have the paper from which he read in which he referred to the month of March, 1894, and comparatively to the month of March, 1895, and in each of these cases it is a monthly statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did not refer to that. I referred to the nine months terminating on the 31st of March, and I expressly stated so.

Mr. FOSTER. At the first did you?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the first.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman referred to the nine months he has taken good care not to send me the paper in which the nine months comparison is. He has sent me simply the monthly comparison.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman would have looked at the paper I have sent him, he would have seen it is no such thing. I will read from it: "Total to the 31st of March, 1895, revenue received, $24,533,009. Total expenditure to the 31st March, 1895, $23,844,991. Surplus, $708,107."

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, my hon. friend is right and so am I. The month of March, 1894, gives here the receipts and expenditures and the surplus for that month. The same is given for the nine months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Exactly, and to which I referred.

Mr. FOSTER. The surplus is given there. In each case they are simply as they purport to be, the cash record of the month or the cash record, receipts and payments of the nine months. They correctly represent what they purport to represent. Whether you call it surplus or anything else, that is the actual statement of the case. In the nine months so much was received in cash, so much was checked out of cash, and so much remains over—a surplus undoubtedly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the fact of the hon. gentleman's department making a return of the audited expenditure. What I think is very objectionable is that the line "surplus" should be introduced now for the first time. We have had these returns published every month ever since confederation, a period of eight and twenty years, and I do not think that in all that time the hon. gentleman will find any such reference to a surplus until after the end of the financial year. The reason we do not find it is that the heads of the department were perfectly well aware that any statement of a surplus made at any other time would be misleading in the highest degree; and I object to its being put in the "Official Gazette," because any ordinary business man in Canada, looking at that, and knowing no better, would naturally say to himself, "Well, after all, things are not so very bad when there is a surplus for nine months of $708,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will excuse me if I say a word or two further. My statement is true, and my hon. friend will take it as such; but I want to supplement that by stating that the only time I have interfered with the way in which these statements have been made was last year. Previous to that time, if I mistake not, at the end of the fiscal year, when all the accounts were not in, but when overdue claims and accounts that had to be adjusted, amounting to some millions of dollars, had yet to come in, I said to the book-keeper, "That will be a misleading statement if you send it out at the end of the fiscal year or in the July statement, because there are accounts yet to come in; after this, when you make up that statement to the end of the year, I want you to add a note stating that this does not include accounts overdue and accounts to be adjusted which are yet to come in, and which will make this statement very different."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I accept frankly the statement of the hon. gentleman, and I am glad to hear it. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman was not responsible for what looks on the face of it to be rather an unworthy artifice, and I recommend him to strike out that line for the future, or to add a note to the effect that this is merely audited expenditure and has nothing to do with any other expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly; any one would see that who looked into it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, anybody would not see that. On the contrary, all over the country, in all the organs of the hon. gentleman from the "Mail-Empire" downwards, these statements have been accepted as representing the true state of the case, and long articles have been indited holding me up as a slanderer of the credit of Canada, because I alleged that the real deficit for the nine months was over $5,000,000, when it was only $500,000. Now, Sir, I call the attention of the House to the extent to which this absurdity in the way of book-keeping may go. We all know that 1894 terminated with a deficit of one million and a quarter; as to that there is no dispute. For the nine months ending the 31st of March, 1894, the revenue was given as $27,845,000, and the expenditure as $23,331,000, showing a nominal surplus on the operations of the nine months of $4,514,000, with an actual resulting deficit of $1,210,000. On the 30th of April the revenue was given as $30,288,000 and the expenditure as $25,515,000, showing a nominal surplus of $4,773,000, with a resulting deficit, as before, of $1,210,000. On the 31st of May the revenue is given as $32,911,000, and the expenditure as $28,840,000, showing a nominal surplus of $4,071,000, with a resulting deficit of $1,210,000, as before. On the 30th of June, under the date of the 4th of July, the revenue is given as $35,382,000 and the expenditure as $30,755,000, showing a nominal surplus of $4,627,000, while the actual deficit was only $1,210,232. However, Sir, can the hon. gentleman gainsay the accuracy of any one of my statements? Can he gainsay the fact that we closed last year with a deficit of $1,210,000? Can he gainsay the fact that on the last day of this month our revenue had fallen to the extent of three and a quarter millions and our expenditure had increased to the extent of half a million? These statements are taken from his own official returns; they are the statements which he has himself submitted; they are the statements which, at any rate, have issued from his department, whether he saw them or not, and I suppose, according to the rule he laid down some time ago that the Minister is bound to accept the statements of his subordinates, these are statements which he must accept in full faith or get rid of the subordinate who made them. Now, as to whether we are likely to lose another million by extra expenditure or diminished revenues during the next three months, I do not desire to offer an opinion other than this, that if, on the 1st of April, 1895, you have an ascertained deficit of $5,016,000, it is not very likely that you are going to make much improvement in the remaining three months. However, that is a matter on which I shall

probably have an opportunity of cross-questioning the hon. gentleman shortly, because I propose at the earliest moment to find out from him what the receipts and expenditures of the first half of the month of April may be. Perhaps he has them now.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not carry them in my pocket, but I can bring them over on Monday. I do not sleep with them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nor carry them in your head, I presume; and I can understand why—because they might murder sleep under the present circumstances. Apart from that, here is a significant fact, which I also find in the statement of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, be it remembered, was very strong some time ago in telling us that he was going to put a stop to the increase of the net debt; yet the total net debt on the 31st March, 1894, amounted to $240,189,000, while on the 31st March, 1895, it amounted to $248,150,000, being as nearly as possible an increase of $8,000,000 in one year. The House will remember, Sir, as I said, that I am quite open to correction. If I have, in any shape or way overstated the facts, if I have in any shape or way misunderstood the hon. gentleman's statement, I will be ready at once to make amendment. The Speech informed us that His Excellency regrets that although the depression has not resulted in any considerable decrease in our foreign trade—

> yet owing to low prices and recent reductions in and removal of taxation, it has been followed by a serious decrease in revenue derived from Customs and Excise. In order to produce equilibrium between revenue and expenditure for the coming year, it will be necessary to observe the greatest possible economy in the appropriations for the various branches of the public service.

Well, Sir, I listened attentively to the Speech, I listended attentively to the speeches of the mover and seconder of this Address, and I listened attentively to the speech of the hon. Minister himself. Sir, the inference which I drew from these various speeches—and it is open to the Finance Minister to correct me if I am wrong—is this, that whether the deficit be five millions or whether the deficit be six millions, the hon. gentleman's recipe is to do nothing, the hon. gentleman proposes to fold his hands, the hon. gentleman hopes that by and by things will improve. The hon. gentleman reminds one of the peasant in Aesop's fable who sat down by the brink of a river waiting until all the water should flow away, when he expected to walk across. The hon. gentleman is without resource. All that the hon. gentleman can tell us is that he proposes to exercise economy. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that it is one thing to propose economy and another thing to practice it. The hon. gentleman has colleagues, some very close to him who do not propose to practice economy; colleagues who, during the recent electioneering tour, stated to the public—and I think stated quite correctly—that the difference between them and those miserly Grits was that they were not afraid to spend the public money for the benefit of their friends. How does that comport with "the greatest possible economy in the appropriations for the various branches of the public service." And I think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) will have to be heard from. The hon. gentleman who, by the way, I am sorry to say I do not see in his place at the moment, has generally a tolerably extensive budget, and he has also various expensive relations who contribute to swell the expenditure from time to time. Now, Sir, I do not ask much from the hon. gentleman; but I think, under the circumstances, I have the right to ask for some information. If the statements that I have made be true, if it be the fact that there is to-day at the close of nine months an ascertained deficit of over five million dollars, I think, Sir, that although we are not entitled to ask the hon. gentleman for details, we are entitled to ask him whether he seriously proposes to allow this monstrous deficit to exist without taking any steps to reduce it or to equalize expenditure and revenue by imposing additional taxation. Judging from what he stated, I should imagine the hon. gentleman intends to do nothing. Judging from the tone of his speech, the hon. gentleman lives in hope and desires us to live also. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman can surely tell us—his policy must have been settled on this head long ago—whether it is part of his intention to meet that deficit by the imposition of an additional amount of taxation or not. He can likewise tell us whether he intends to add to the burden of the people by making any new and additional grants; and that is a thing that the House ought to be seized of at the earliest possible moment, under existing circumstances. The hon. gentleman might likewise tell us, does he propose to effect any new loans? Sir, I have taken the opportunity of analysing the statements of the amounts at the hon. gentleman's disposal; and, so far as I can see—and again I am open to correction—the hon. gentleman's recent loan, amounting to about $10,700,000—I think that is about the amount it realized—appears to have entirely disappeared. Sir, I find that up to the 1st of April, 1895, we had incurred a capital expenditure of $3,273,000; we had temporarily borrowed £500,000 sterling in England, which we have repaid; we had the deficit of 1894 to provide for, $1,210,000; we have a deficit for the current year to date of $5,016,000. So that against $10,700,000, the hon. gentleman either has spent or will be called upon to provide for sums amounting to $11,932,000, without counting any additional expenditure which may be incurred upon capital account within the next three months. Now, Sir, as to

the amount of cash in hand—and here again the hon. gentleman can correct me if I am wrong—I find that in the various Canadian banks the hon. gentleman is credited with $5,300,000. I want to ask the hon. gentleman, has he any considerable amount to his credit in London, or does that $5,300,000 represent his total available cash assets?

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to enter into a discussion of finances in the debate on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne? If the hon. gentleman proposes to do that he goes against what he said five minutes ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said I did not propose to discuss the trade question.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman does propose to discuss finances, I do not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman, I may assume, has no money in London?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will keep his patience until about the middle of next week——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will keep it until I have time to put two questions on the paper, when he will have the opportunity of giving me the information. I will assume that this sum of $5,300,000 represents the hon. gentleman's total cash assets. That sum of $5,300,000 is all anticipated already. If the sums due to date were paid, the whole amount would disappear. That is the position in which we stand to-day. We have very considerable commitments as the hon. gentleman knows. We are bound to provide several millions of dollars to be paid to the various railway companies we have subsidized, nor are these all the capital commitments. And,moreover, Sir, as everybody knows, we borrow at call from the people of Canada about $40,000,000, so that we ought, in all conscience, and reason to keep a considerable sum in ready cash at our bankers so as to be ready for all emergencies. Sir, I will not now discuss a matter which may require a little attention, with reference to the relations of the Bank of Montreal with the Government. I told the hon. gentleman at the time he made the present arrangement that I thought he was making a mistake, and for this reason, which he has found or will find, I suspect—when he confided all our financial affairs to the Bank of Montreal, a bank doing a large business in Canada, he exposed himself to the danger that if he requires money from that source it will have to be drawn from the current accommodation granted to the business of the country, and may prove a serious inconvenience to the people. However, I will leave the discussion of that subject for a further opportunity. As I have said, I purposely forbore discussing the trade question, but before I leave the question of these ugly and ill-visaged deficits, I will take the opportunity of saying a word or two on the deficits of 1876-77-78. The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that there was one difference between that of to-day and those of 1876-77-78. Sir, the hon. gentleman is mistaken; there is more than one difference between the deficits of 1876-77-78 and the deficit, as at present ascertained, of 1895. I will point out one difference—the deficit of 1895 is like Aaron's rod, it is big enough to swallow the other three deficits put together. The hon. gentleman may say with truth that he has "seen" us and gone several "better."

Mr. FOSTER. We always do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, it is a twenty-knot government in the way of going to leeward, and particularly in the way of deficits. My hon. friend who spoke first was mistaken in one thing. He was mistaken in saying that this was the largest deficit known in Canadian history. That is true literally, yet it is not quite true comparatively, because under the late Sir John A. Macdonald, whom the hon. gentlemen revere so much, deficits were of everlasting occurrence until confederation; and those deficits—I will give the hon. gentleman that crumb of comfort—were much greater in proportion to the revenue than his, although he is in a fair way to overtake his master and teacher if he goes on much longer.

Mr. FOSTER. Give me time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I intend, if I can help it, that you shall not have time to scuttle the ship before you leave it, though I have no doubt you will try. The hon. gentleman says there is another difference in that we put on taxes, a very grievous crime to commit in face of a deficit. The inference is that he proposes to meet his deficit by putting none. That is the inference, if he disputes it, let him deny it. The hon. gentleman goes on to tell us that the revenue has fallen off because last year he took off such a lot of taxes. Well, Sir, with my customary generosity, I made an estimate of what he had taken off, and I gave him credit for 200 per cent more than he deserved; I credited him, after carefully examining the result of his tariff for two months, with a reduction of 3-10ths of one per cent. I observe now that the six months have been added together, that I committed the grievous error— for which I apoligise—of crediting him with 200 per cent too much, the actual reduction being 1-10th of one per cent. Sir, the French treaty and Newfoundland must stand over; and I think I will do the same with the Manitoba question. But I want to ask the hon. gentleman seriously, does he pretend to deny the computation I have

made as to the amount of the deficit? Does he, in cold blood, pretend to tell this House that there is any reasonable prospect that within the next ten weeks he will have any chance of materially reducing that deficit? Does he not know on the other hand, that there is only too great a probability that it will be considerably augmented, largely by reason of the expenditures he has already asked for? Now the hon. gentleman has brought us to the very verge of the financial year. Neither last year did he make any provision for the deficit now existing. Apparently the hon. gentleman is all at sea as to what is to be done with this deficit. Now, I really think that paragraph of the speech which I have quoted in plain English, ought to read thus: "Gentlemen of the legislature, there is a huge deficit, I do not know what to do with it. Perhaps if we wait long enough, things will right themselves; anyway I can't." As I have said, the hon. gentleman's mode of delivering us from a deficit was to agree to give up $200,000 of revenue to the brewers, $200,000 and more for the French Treaty, $750,000 a year for the Atlantic subsidy, $4,000,000 to be granted to railway subsidies. But how much more to the Trent Valley Canal? How much more to the Hudson Bay Railway? How much more to other railways gently hinted at, but not quite clearly indicated by the hon. gentleman? The hon. gentleman talks of his economy. He is prepared to cut down the services to starvation point if his colleagues will let him; but at the same time he is prepared without shrinking to add tens and tens of millions to the general expenditure. Now, Sir, I will give the hon. gentleman one bit of advice. I know the difficulties that beset a Minister of Finance who tries to keep his colleagues within bounds. I have had to do it myself, and a very difficult job I have found it, I admit. I know perfectly well that however much the Minister of Finance may desire to keep down expenditure, he is but one among 13 or 12 or 17—what is it? What is the number of those who have no portfolios? I have really forgotten. However, he is only one among a number, and they have all expenditures to be provided for. Let the hon. gentleman make a clean breast of it, let him throw himself on the House, and let him throw himself on the country. I dare say his intentions are good, although his power of giving effect to them seems to be almost nil. Sir, he has been frightfully overborne in the past; and I now solemnly promise him publicly—and I think my friends will help me to implement the promise—I promise him my best assistance in struggling against the efforts which will be made by his colleagues to overcome his good intentions and prevent him from carrying out his scheme of economy. I am abundantly willing to forward his alleged desires, but it is on one condition. I want there should be no misunderstanding. I desire to say, before the hon. gentleman makes his budget statement, that when he does make the statement, I think he should give us fairly and honestly to understand all the expenditures that he proposes to bring down to the House. Sir, for years back the Government and the Parliament of Canada have been, in my judgment, very derelict in their duty, in that they have allowed the Government, owing no doubt to the enormous majority at their back, to make their financial statement only in part and to conceal from the House and the country at the time an enormous number of grants which they have made up their minds to give, making large additional charges on the public chests. Sir, that is all wrong, that should never have been permitted. The House, had they made the Government do their duty, would have insisted on all occasions that when the Government made their annual financial statement they should make a full and complete statement of all proposals they were about to make entailing any additional charges on the public treasury. I call on the hon. gentleman on this occasion more than on any other, in view of the enormous admitted deficit between our revenue and expenditure, in view of the situation of the country, in view of the fact that, as the mover said, this is the last session of this Parliament. I call upon him to turn over a new leaf in that respect, and if he will do that, and make a clean, candid, honest statement, I repeat my pledge on my own behalf, and on behalf of my friends, that we will do our best to protect him against his colleagues, and to enable him at long last to give effect to the pledges of economy and retention to which we have listened so often and by which so far we have profited so very little.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Several playful allusions have been made to my name in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I shall therefore claim the attention of the House for a few moments while I contribute, to some extent, to the discussion. I have been puzzled for some time to find the reson for what seems to be the most extraordinary debate on the Address that has taken place—certainly since 1883, the beginning of my parliamentary experience. The leader of the Opposition, of course, was very happy, and used his eloquence with great effect; but it seemed to me that he was struggling to-day to avoid discussing or referring to those subjects which are uppermost in the minds of the people at the present moment, and forcing, if possible, the debate upon subjects which have been discussed 'ad nauseum' for many years past. We had the old arguments brought out one by one, the old references to trade, and the arguments which may be used with some effect in a

discussion upon the Budget or a debate on Ways and Means, but certainly an undue importance has been given to them on an occasion of this kind. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to my surprise, in what I may term, not offensively, I hope, a most peculiar speech, has not only run over these subjects, but openly given to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, the points for his Budget speech, and pressed upon him most earnestly the necessity of referring to them. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the solution of this extraordinary tactical movement on the part of the Opposition, is they are not in a position to speak as a party to-day any more than they have been for the past month on very important and very burning questions ; and that, therefore, if they can carry the minds of this House, and the minds of the people of this country, away from these subjects for some time, it will be better for them. The leader of the Opposition was good enough, and he did it in a very happy manner, to refer to some liberties that have been taken with my name, and he stated that I had observed that no dependence could be placed on the ministerial press. I think it unusual for the leader of the Opposition and for a prominent member of the Opposition at the opening of Parliament to give this extraordinary importance to press rumors or to invite a debate as to the accuracy of references of a personal nature. I can say this, however, that I have never charged the ministerial press with being inaccurate ; but I do not hesitate to say that I have seen many inaccurate statements both in the ministerial press, so called, and in the Opposition press, and I think the experience of the leader of the Opposition is similar to mine. But I deny there was authority to make many of the statements respecting my action that have been made during the last two weeks. I, perhaps, can illustrate that by referring to a story told by a traveller of an extraordinary monkey he had seen. Sitting at his dinner with his fellow voyager and servant standing behind him, he began to relate that he had seen a monkey with a tail 50 yards long. The waiter whispered that the tail was entirely too long. Correcting himself he said that the tail was certainly forty yards. "Still too long," came a whisper. Then the traveller said, I certainly shall not be wrong if I say the monkey's tail was thirty yards. The waiter said the tail was still too long The traveller then turned round and said, "confound this man, we must allow the monkey to have a tail of some length." Of course we must allow gentlemen Opposite to amuse themselves with the extraordinary stories regarding their opponents. But I can say this, that whatever truth there may be in those rumours, I have not been obliged to go to my constituents or appear before the people in any part of the country with a certificate of character from my leader, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was obliged to do. The hon. member for South Oxford, for instance, said—and I am certain he spoke from his heart—that he had no objection to a session "per se." Now, we know that that hon. gentleman has no objection to a session "per se." But the hon. gentleman has had a very hard struggle. I was with him in heart in the struggle because I wished to see him survive the effort to retain his hold upon the constituency of South Oxford, and the hon. gentleman was obliged, and it must have been a very hard task for him to perform, to read to his own constituents on an important occasion when they were discussing the nomination for the next candidate a certificate of character and the endorsement of his leader, the leader of the Opposition. I think that report in the Opposition and ministerial press was accurate. The hon. gentleman also referred to the subject of the session in another respect, namely, as to whether it was called too late ; and with considerable delight he referred to the fact that in his time, when the Reformers were in office, they had four early sessions, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878. I think I can meet that argument, if there be any force in it, by saying that since 1878 the proportion of early sessions will compare very favourably with the proportion of early sessions held during Mr. Mackenzies' regime, because the hon. gentleman carefully avoided any reference to 1874, and the date of the session that year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was an election.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly ; and reforming and reorganization of the Government occurred in 1895. There had been an election previous to the session of 1874, and for that reason, and it was a valid one, the session was not held until pretty late in March. If hon. gentlemen opposite had been sufficiently long in power they would have found other reasons no better than our own, for not assembling Parliament this year at an earlier date. I have referred to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and it was an extraordinary one in a debate of this kind. It was evident to the House that the hon. gentleman felt as if he were in office as Finance Minister ; he revelled and made fun and apparently enjoyed himself to his heart's content in a discussion of the deficit, and with that word and topic his name will be for ever connected and remembered in this country. But I think the hon. gentleman was particularly happy to-night—he broke out, so-to-speak, in a new part. He as a rule uses pretty hard language, he strikes very severe blows, and on no occasion has been guilty of such an amount of good humour and jollity as on this occasion. If the newspaper reports can be relied upon, he has had an experience

that has been for his good. The last occasion on which I read his utterances was at his appearance in a theatre at Brantford, perhaps a comic opera, and it was said he contributed to the amusement of the evening. Certainly the hon gentleman has gained much by that experience, and I congratulate him on his new role. But the hon. gentleman made some serious statements in that extraordinary speech, and from one of them it appeared to me that we have called this House together too soon. This day is the 19th of April. The hon. member for South Oxford said the Government would not get a vote until the 1st of July. If he had kindly intimated that fact to us, we would have taken the responsibility of delaying the summoning of Parliament at as early a date as 19th April. I believe, however, the hon. gentleman was no more serious when he made that assertion than he was in regard to many other statements he made. I feel sure he cannot be sericus in constantly sneering at the French Treaty ; I feel sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to make it uncomfortable for his leader ; I fain would believe that he did not inspire the article in the Toronto "Globe," published in last July, where not only the leader of the Opposition but the whole of the French Liberals were hauled over the coals for lending their support to a treaty which involves chiefly, as the hon. member for South Oxford says, the Tupper interest. If it does involve their interest I am glad to welcome as allies all the hon. gentleman's friends and coadjutors from the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman spoke for a long time on the subject of deficits, and I fear that he has forgotten some of the advice which he and his old leader used to give the country when dealing with the subject of that kind. I have before me the opinion of the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, given in the year 1880, and I think it will meet most of the points the hon. member endeavoured to make with the object, perhaps, of inspiring a certain fear or dread among the business people of this country. Speaking in this House in 1880, Mr. Mackenzie said :

> Under these circumstances it was but right that we should not look upon a deficit as an insurmountable evil, or its existence, or in all cases a political mistake, because money has to be provided in some way at any rate, and the only question that can possibly arise under these circumstances, is this. It is better for the Government to impose additional taxation where it can possibly be able to do so, or to leave the amount of the deficit as an additional charge against the country in another shape ? The country has to pay in either case ; by imposing additional taxation, it pays at once ; by avoiding it, payment is postponed. * * *

I refer to the opinion of Mr. Mackenzie because it will, no doubt, form a subject for contemplation to members on both sides of the House, when considering how best to deal with our financial standing. At any rate, it gives some support to the view I ventured to express, that the mere existence of a deficit is not in itself an evil which should instil fear or alarm. It is a peculiarly happy thing that Canada alone of all the important countries of the world, has not felt the great commercial crisis through which the world is now passing. There have come from responsible mouths in the various legislatures of Canada, words of good cheer and words of thankfulness for our condition, whether the governments of the provinces happened to be in the hands of Liberals or Conservatives. I am not without authority for saying that the responsible business men of Canada, regardless of politics, are expressing words of congratulation that our country is in such a good position as it is to-day, considering the unfortunate condition of other countries. What do you see, for instance, in Great Britain ? You have there in evidence leading men of both parties, Lord Salisbury, the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Balfour, all speaking with dread of the present condition of affairs. You have Lord Salisbury saying that the great industry of agriculture is actually ruined in England, and the Duke of Devonshire goes further, and says that not only was Lord Salisbury right in that particular, but that the condition of business generally in England, the manufacturing industries, was deplorable. You have the representatives of the great manufacturing county of Lancashire stating that thousands are walking the streets in the manufacturing towns without work and without money. You have the representative of labour in England, Mr. Keir Hardie testifying before a committee of the House of Commons that one million skilled workmen are out of employment, without any means of subsistence, and that they represent five millions of people who are in actual distress. outside of those entitled to parochial relief. You see a committee of the British House of Commons appointed to inquire into this terrible distress. We know of the crisis through which they are passing in the United States, and it is comforting that even though the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has evidently watched affairs most carefully, and is as thoroughly posted upon the fact as any one, that on this occasion he dealt purely with the condition of our finances which could not be controlled, and, as he said, intentionally avoided any reference to trade. Is it possible that if the condition of Canada were as bad as the condition of England has been pictured in the British House of Commons, and as the condition of the United States has been pictured in Congress, that he would have neglected his duty in not calling the immediate attention of this Chamber to such a state of affairs if they existed in Canada. It may, therefore, be said that the condition of Canada is, comparatively, not bad, but that it is com-

paratively good. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit down without saying a word or two on a question which the leader of the Opposition avoided saying much about. The present is an occasion when he, perhaps, is exercising a wise discretion, but if he will allow me to say so, I do not think that his discretion to which he referred was anything to his credit with reference to the four elections which have just taken place. I believe there was never an occasion in any of the old provinces of Canada, I am sure there never was an occasion in the mother country, when a great constitutional question, on a question that had any analogy to the Manitoba School question, the leaders of both parties were not heard from, or that the leader of a constitutional Opposition remained dumb and kept silence. I have no knowledge of any similar case, although some may be mentioned, but certainly in Canada it has not been the custom for leaders of the Opposition to take that course. The leader of the Opposition cannot avoid the responsibility which the people will insist in fastening upon him, by lightly talking of an invitation to advise His Excellency's advisers. We cannot forget that he branded the members of this Government as cowards because they did not declare their policy on this subject, before the courts had dealt with the question of the powers of this Government. We cannot forget his pledge on more than one occasion, notably at the convention of his own friends in June, 1893, and subsequently, this very year in Toronto, that so soon as the courts had spoken he would speak. It is quite clear that when the leader of the Opposition made these observations, he did not think that discretion should command silence on his part, but he believed then that when the time for action had come, and this Government was bound to take a step in one direction or the other, that it would be his duty to speak out his mind upon this question, though, perhaps, not to advise His Excellency's advisers; they sought on no occasion his advice, neither did they seek his assistance. They neither sought it nor spurned it, but, steadily pursuing their course, committed themselves, and assumed the responsibility which up to that time it had been expressly stated they were afraid to assume. These elections took place. I took part in one county, and as for the statement which was made on the floor of the House to-day, that in Haldimand my colleague, who won the magnificent victory upon which his friends are congratulating him, was speaking in one sense, while I was speaking in another constituency in an entirely different sense. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know that in the campaign in Antigonish the sentiment of the speech of the hon. Secretary of State was quoted in my presence by my opponents, and I subscribed before the electors to every word of it; and I myself sent a message to him as to what I had been saying, and correcting erroneous reports as to my utterances early in the fight in Antigonish, and the Secretary of State took the earliest opportunity to read that message to the electors of Haldimand. But I do not think the hon. leader of the Opposition can claim much consolation from those fights. He purposely abstained to-day from committing himself on this question or dealing with it, and those men who defeated the candidates supporting the Government, won their victories by expressing opinions which their leader dare not express at this juncture, but purposely abstained from expressing. They practically won their victories chiefly because, among other reasons, they were fighting the first fights in Canada in which the Liberal candidates were allowed to fight without being trammelled by the utterances of their leaders—the first fights which those leaders took care to keep out of, and which were won by their supporters alone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And they threshed you.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, in the county of Antigonish the opponent of the Government threshed the Government, as the hon. member says, by pledging himself to support the Government on this policy, and because he was entirely out of harmony with the views of the leader of the Opposition, who sneered at the remedial order to-day, and found fault with the language in which it was couched. The hon. gentleman's candidate there subscribed to every line of the remedial order and promised to support the Government in carrying it to its logical conclusion. The hon. leader of the Opposition said to-day that the remedial order was couched in unfortunate language—that it was dictatorial. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if other language had been used, or if it had proceeded in what the hon. gentleman conceives to be more polite form, the danger of a fatal defect would have existed. Not only was every effort made to prevent the Manitoba Legislature thinking for a moment that we desired to dictate to them or to insult them in the slightest respect, but every pains was taken in the drafting of the order that no flaw should be found to give rise to further litigation and further embarrassment. Following strictly the lines of the statute, the order had to be in a sense dictatorial, but in no offensive sense. It had to make a direction. It had to state clearly and precisely what was required to be done, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor General in Council; and any one having experience with the orders of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England will find that, so far as that dictatorial spirit is concerned, all of those orders possess it. It is the language of judgment; it is the technical spirit and nothing more. I have, therefore, referred to the subject particularly, and I trust that

no member of the Manitoba Legislature will be for a moment misled by the views thrown out to-day by the leader of the Opposition, that there was on the part of the Government any desire to assume the role of dictators, or to use language that could be considered in the slightest degree disrespectful. Now, Mr. Speaker, we stand in this position, that the Government have before the country, and in those very constituencies, taken a clear and well-defined position on this question. We do not shrink in the slightest degree from any responsibility which that position involves; but notwithstanding that, I subscribe to what has been said by hon. gentlemen to-day, that, considering that the Manitoba Legislature has yet to deal finally with the remedial order, it would be certainly unwise, if not irregular, for this Parliament to thresh out the subject formally on the floor of this House until we know the mind of the legislature which we had approached.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear," perhaps not seriously. Surely, if he sympathizes with his leader's resentment of that spirit of dictation, he will subscribe to the opinion which I have now expressed, that we should take the greatest care on all sides of this House that nothing should be said that could in any way give affront to the Legisture of Manitoba. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a reference to public works which have been promised, and, looking across the House, connected me, I think, with a statement as to the difference between the policies of the two parties in reference thereto. I remember the day when a colleague of that hon. gentleman used to come to the province of Nova Scotia and present what seemed to him his best argument in counting how much he had been able to obtain from the economical Finance Minister of the Reform Administration for wharfs, breakwaters and other public works, in comparison with the expenditure of the former government. At Moncton I made a statement as to the difference between the policies of the two parties with regard to the construction of public works. I said that no person in Canada could expect that federal money would be taken for local improvements or useful public works if the Reformers kept their promises and made a bona fide effort to carry out their policy of free trade, because that policy was wholly dissociated from affording assistance for works of the character under consideration. Their policy, if there was anything in it, meant to leave individual localities to their own resources, to drive them away from the Federal treasury, and I pointed out that our policy was the direct opposite—that we did make the acknowledgment that out of the revenues we could obtain we would promote useful public works both for the advantage of localities and for the general advantage. But curiously enough, Mr. Speaker, that meeting had no sooner taken place than the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) hurried to Moncton, and in the selfsame hall went one better than myself, according to the common expression, taking complete issue with my statement that the policy of the Liberal party was not to make these expenditures; and I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would do well to take his colleague immediately in hand if he has the slightest idea, as he hinted to-night, that he expected in a short time to be called upon to deal with his old friend the deficit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 22nd April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That Notices of Motion be postponed until after the consideration of the Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session.

He said: I do this because I suppose we all agree that it is better that the debate should go on until it is finished.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest to the hon. leader of the House that in case the House complies with his proposal, any notices of motion called in the absence of the mover be allowed the courtesy of standing over for one occasion. The debate may close at a time when some members may not be here to attend to their motions.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be a long way ahead.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps it would answer the hon. gentleman's purpose to go on with all notices of motion on which there is to be no discussion.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 3) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 6) to amend the Superannuation Act.—(Mr. McMullen.)

SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to reduce the salary of the Governor General.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MULOCK. The title of the Bill is sufficiently explanatory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How much reduction ?

Mr. MULOCK. That is a matter of detail.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MULOCK. This is an Act to facilitate hon. gentleman attending to their duties free from other than public considerations. It is to provide that members shall not draw mileage which they do not pay.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEDITIOUS AND UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS AND OATHS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) further to amend the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What seditious association is this expected to deal with ? Does it include, for example, seditious associations for the purpose of promoting rebellion in Ulster ?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The Bill is identical with that introduced last session and the previous session. It has for its object the extension to the Masonic Lodges in the province of Quebec, acting under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the province, the same rights and privileges enjoyed by Masonic Lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. WILSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Act respecting weights and measures. He said : This is the same Bill as was before the House last session. The weights are not at all accurate in the case of certain articles, and it is desirable either that the actual weights be put down or that the system be abolished.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LETTING OF CONTRACTS TO ALIENS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to prevent the letting of contracts to aliens. He said : Contracts are let to aliens in this country while we are deprived of the same privilege on the other side of the line. There are contractors in this country who have taken their men, machinery and plant from the other side, and any money saved by them or by the men in their employ is taken out of the country. We think that we should protect our own labour. They are men who subscribe to our revenues, and it is but right that we should protect them in the letting of contracts when they are ostracised on the other side. There is nothing in this Bill to prevent aliens or emigrants coming into Canada. Its sole object is to protect our contractors against people who refuse us employment on the other side.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY RETURN-FARE TICKETS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) respecting the sale of railway return-fare tickets. He said : The object of this Bill is to prevent discrimination against men who wish to take advantage of second-class fares. A man who asks for a return second-class ticket is refused at many stations, and we wish to give him the right to get a second-class return ticket at a proportionate reduction to that allowed on first-class return tickets, on trains carrying first and second-class passengers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PAYMENT OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) respecting the liability of the Government and public companies for labour used in the construction of public

works. He said: This Bill is intended to protect men working on Government works and on works constructed by companies. Contracts are let by the Government and by companies to contractors, who sub-let them to other contractors, who again sub-let, and perhaps the one contract will be re-let three or four times. Then it falls into the hands of men who are not competent to carry on the work, whose price is not sufficient to enable them to carry it through. They find out, after they have worked a month or two, that they have not enough money to complete their work, and they put what money they have drawn into their pockets and clear out, leaving the labourers unpaid. This Bill will provide that the men employed on public works shall be paid and that somebody must pay them. The failure to pay men on public works has happened, I may say, in almost every county in Canada, and I think it is time that this should be put a stop to. There is no reason why the Government should not protect itself. In the first place they call upon the contractor to put up a 5 per cent deposit, and they only pay 90 per cent, on the estimates as the work progresses, retaining 10 per cent. Then under the specifications they have a lien and claim on all plant, machinery and horses, and everything that is put upon the works; and there is no reason why they cannot protect the labouring man who is doing the work.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what method it is proposed under the Bill to adopt to protect the labourers as suggested?

Mr. McLENNAN. The Bill to a large extent will explain itself, and it will not be necessary to go into details until it is printed. I shall then hope to be in a position to explain fully my views in regard to the Bill in all its details. I think it can be easily worked out. Practically, the Government have now full power to protect the workingman.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DETECTIVE CORPORATIONS AND MERCANTILE AGENCIES.

Mr. SPROULE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies. He said: The object of this Bill is to bring the parties referred to under the surveillance of the law and to have them act as corporations; first, by compelling them to deposit with the Secretary of State a bond for a certain amount as surety in the event of their doing injustice to individuals or committing any illegal acts, and, second, by providing that none shall carry on the work of a detective agency or mercantile agency without being incorporated.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COPYRIGHT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Has Her Majesty's Government yet denounced the Berne Copyright Convention on behalf of Canada, as requested? 2. Has Her Majesty's Government yet given its assent to the issuing of the proclamation by the Canadian Government to bring into force the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889? 3. Does the Government propose to withhold the proclaiming of the Act of 1889 indefinitely, to await the assent of the Colonial Office?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply I beg to say: 1. Her Majesty's Government has not yet denounced the Berne Copyright Convention on behalf of Canada, as requested. 2. Her Majesty's Government has not yet given its assent to the issuing of the proclamation by the Canadian Government to bring into force the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889. 3. I desire to say that after personal communications had with the late lamented Sir John Thompson and the Colonial Office, a request has been received within the last few days to the Canadian Government from the British Government to send some person to talk the matter over, so that instead of correspondence with long intervals between, the matter may be discussed by personal interview with the Government for the purpose of arriving at an understanding. The Government proposes to act upon this request, and the proclaiming of the Act will be delayed, not indefinitely perhaps, but certainly until after that conference shall have been had. And it is the purpose of the Government to have that conference take place as soon as it can possibly be done.

QUEBEC CITADEL GROCERIES CONTRACT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, In whose name has the contract for the supply of groceries to the Citadel at Quebec been standing in each of the months of the year 1894? To whom have cheques been issued in payment for such supplies delivered during the year 1894: giving dates and amounts and name or names of endorsers in each case? In whose name has the contract for the supply of groceries for the Citadel at Quebec been standing for the expired portion of the year 1895? To whom have cheques been issued in payment for such supplies; the dates and amounts and name or names of endorsers in each case?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to that question, I may say that some of the information has not yet been received at the

office. It has been sent for, and if my hon. friend will allow the question to stand until to-morrow it will probably be ready.

PROHIBITION COMMISSION—EXPENSES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What is the amount of the whole expenses in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not able to give the information at present. The accounts are being made up, but some details are still incomplete. The statement will probably be ready in a few days.

Mr. EDGAR. Let the question stand, then.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; or, if he prefers, the hon. gentleman might renew notice of the question.

Mr. EDGAR. Let it stand.

VOTERS' LISTS—COST.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What is the entire cost of the recent revision of the Dominion Voters' Lists? If the cost is not yet fully ascertained, how much of it is ascertained, and what is the estimate of the Government of the amount of the unascertained expenses?

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask my hon. friend to allow that question to stand. I will make the same request of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who has given notice of the next question, which relates to the same subject. The Secretary of State is not here at present, and I have not the information at hand. I will look after the matter personally, however.

SEAL FISHERIES—COMPENSATION.

Mr. PRIOR asked, 1. Whether the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has seen a statement in the press to the effect that Sir Edward Grey had stated in the English House of Commons that no request had been received from the Government of the Dominion of Canada by the Imperial Government asking them to advance the sum of $425,000 to the sealers of British Columbia, that being the amount agreed upon as proper compensation under the Behring Sea award; and which amount the United States Government declines to hand over at once, thereby causing great inconvenience and loss to the Canadian sealers? 2. If the statement credited to Sir Edward Grey is true, what reason has the Government for refusing to make the request in accordance with the expressed wishes of those interested in the sealing industry?

Mr. COSTIGAN. With regard to the first question I would answer in the affirmative—the Minister has seen such a statement as that referred to. But I would like to go a little further and state that the Government of Canada did not understand the "lump sum" of $425,000 as "the amount agreed upon as proper compensation under the Behring Sea award," but as an amount conditionally offered and accepted by Her Majesty's Government, with the concurrence of the claimants, to satisfy their claims, if paid immediately. With regard to the second question, I may say that the Government had no reason for refusing to make the request, and did not refuse, inasmuch as the desire of the sealers was duly forwarded through the proper channel, 6th March, and commended to favourable consideration.

WORLD'S FAIR—MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the Government have any definite information when the medals and diplomas of honour awarded to Canadian exhibitors at the Chicago World's Fair of 1892, will be distributed? What has been the cause of the delay in distribution?

Mr. FOSTER. The obtaining of medals and diplomas awarded to Canadian exhibitors at the Columbian Exposition, Chicago, has been a subject of correspondence. The latest information received from the World's Columbian Commission at Washington, dated January 8th last, is to the effect that the Act of Congress of August, 1892, made the appropriation for the preparation of medals and diplomas to the hon. Secretary of the Treasury direct, and, therefore, the Committee on Awards is without responsibility until they are delivered to it for distribution. The diplomas are being prepared by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the medals are being struck off under the supervision of the Director of the Mint. The Director of the Mint has unofficially advised the Committee on Awards that the medals will be completed about May or June next.

EXPORTS TO AUSTRALIA.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What were the kinds and values of the articles embraced under the classification "Other articles," on page of Trade and Navigation Returns 448, for fiscal year ending 30th June, 1894; exported to Australia, amounting to $646, and constituting the total of the exports of animals and their produce from Canada to Australia for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1894.

Mr. WALLACE. The kinds and values of articles embraced under this classification of "Other articles" on page 448 of the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1894, cannot be separately given without getting the information direct from the point of export, as

these values are returned to this department under the item "Other articles." Vancouver exported $506, and Victoria $140 of the value mentioned. I have written to these ports for the detailed information.

PROHIBITION COMMISSION—REPORT.

Mr. CASEY asked, Whether the final report of the Royal Commission on Prohibition has been presented to the Governor in Council? Has it been printed? When will it be laid before the House? Has the evidence taken by the commission been printed? If so, when will it be laid before the House?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to the hon. member, I beg to say that the final report of the Royal Commission on Prohibition has been presented to the Governor in Council. It has not been printed. It will be laid before the House as soon as the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne is passed. I am not quite sure whether the whole of the evidence has been printed, but I think it is nearly all printed; and that also will be laid before the House in due time.

BIRTH OF AN HEIR APPARENT.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch dated 16th August, 1894, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, requesting by command of Her Majesty the Queen, that His Excellency will convey to the Senate and House of Commons of Canada an expression of Her Majesty's most cordial thanks for their loyal congratulations on the occasion of the birth of a son to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York.

Government House,
Ottawa, 22nd April, 1895.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to lay on the Table of the House, in accordance with the Act, a statement of the Governor General's Warrants on account of the fiscal year 1894-95, made as directed by the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act; also, a return of the Treasury Board's over-rulings on appeals from the decisions of the Auditor General, between the sessions of 1894 and 1895.

JUDGMENT OF THE IMPERIAL PRIVY COUNCIL—MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, the Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Council in the Manitoba Schools Case and the Imperial Order in Council founded thereon, together with the proceedings had before the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, and the Remedial Order of the Governor General in Council.

Government House,
Ottawa, 22nd April, 1895.

REPORT.

Trade and Navigation Returns for the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Wallace.)

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. McMULLEN. Might I inquire of the leader of the House when we may expect to have the Auditor General's Report laid before the House? It is now nine and a half months since the close of the fiscal year, 1894, and we have not yet before us this important blue-book, which is unquestionably one of the most important that is presented to Parliament. It will be impossible for members to give their attention to the items of expenditure until that valuable book is laid on the Table of the House. The Minister of Finance appears to be anxious to expedite business, and he can certainly do so by giving members an opportunity of looking through that large volume before proceeding with other business.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that the report, or such portions of it as are necessary, will be ready for the House when the business to which it particularly appertains, comes before the House. My hon. friend has had all the more anticipatory pleasure by the delay, he will have added to that the actual pleasure of being able to peruse it before many days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought in all conscience to have it laid before us as soon as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it will be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is specially the duty of the Auditor General, and he is usually very punctual in performing it. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says. We cannot discuss these estimates properly without having had an opportunity of looking through the blue-books, particularly that one. May I ask the hon. Minister if he has got the statement of the 20th April, of the receipts and expenditures which he has undertaken to bring down?

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, it had slipped my mind. But they are ready, and I will send for them.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bennett for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech from the Throne.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I listened, Sir, with a great deal of attention to the observations addressed to the House by the Minister of Finance, who is now the leader of the House, and the Minister of Justice, in reference to the period at which Parliament have been convened. They have stated to the House the various excuses for calling Parliament at this late period, and I am quite sure that none of them were entirely satisfactory to their friends, as they certainly were not satisfactory to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The Minister told us of the delays arising from the decease of the late Premier; he told us of the delays that were occasioned by the receipt and consideration of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Manitoba school case, but I do not think that any of the reasons which the hon. gentleman assigned, some of which occurred before the period at which Parliament is usually convened, and others of which transpired at a period later than that at which Parliament usually meets, were satisfactory to the House. I cannot understand how it could be important that the hon. gentlemen should engage in a political tour through the country, holding meetings in various provinces of this Dominion looking to an election, if it was their intention to meet Parliament at the usual season of the year. Then, Sir, we were informed of the special efforts that were being made to print the voters' lists; how it was found that sufficient expedition could not be secured by printing them at the Government office; that some of them had been sent in manuscript to Montreal, and others to certain newspapers supporting the Administration in Toronto, for the purpose of being printed with expedition, so that they might be available at an earlier period of time. All these things pointed rather to an election than to a meeting of Parliament, and I am quite sure if we were to bring the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the bar of the House and ask him whether some instruction had not been given for the preparation of the writs, we would find that instruction had been given. And so we find in this matter that the Government have been considering their own safety and their own convenience rather than the public interest in deciding whether they would go to the country or whether they would meet Parliament in session. Now, Sir, while the Crown has a discretion with regard to the period at which Parliament may meet and with regard to whether Parliament shall be convened at all or not, that discretion is not an arbitrary discretion, it is a constitutional discretion, and I do not understand how, if a constitutional duty had arisen which made it necessary and proper that the Government should have dissolved Parliament and should have gone to the country, how they could constitutionally and properly reconsider that proposition and hold a session instead of holding an election. The hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House from the Treasury benches have not given us information on that subject. They have certainly laid down rules with respect to the rights of the Crown and the constitutional rights of Ministers in the matter, which are not sustained by any writer upon this subject. Then, Sir, we have had laid down by the Minister of Finance a new doctrine of ministerial responsibility. My hon. friend called attention to a letter which had been read by Sir Charles Tupper, a Minister of the Crown in this House, written by the Deputy Minister of the Interior, in which he predicted that a very large amount of money would be realized from the sale of the public domain in the North-west Territories before 1891, and after 1883, and stating that not less than $58,000,000 would be available from the sale of public land. When my hon. friend read that letter and reminded the Minister of the illusory character of the prediction, the Minister denied the responsibility of the former Minister who read that letter to the House, and maintained that the responsibility rested solely on the author of the letter, Mr. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior. I deny that doctrine altogether. I remember very well in this House when Mr. Mackenzie referred to the reports made by his engineers with respect to the Pacific Railway survey, upon which he relied, that he was charged with attempting to shift the responsibility from his own shoulders to those of the officers of his department. He denied any intention of doing that; if it had simply been a question of fact with respect to matters which had already transpired, and if the Deputy Minister had made an inaccurate statement, and the Minister might have very well said that he made the statement in good faith, and he relied on the representations made by his department. But a Deputy Minister when called upon by his chief to engage in the work of prophesying, and when called on to predict what would be the state of things eight or ten years after the period at which he was writing; the Minister who read that letter to the House assumed the responsibility for the declaration that the state of things there foreshadowed were such as he was justified in relying upon and presenting to the country, and the Minister assumed entire responsibility for a statement of that kind. So that the Government can-

not escape the reponsibility for the glowing pictures they have drawn with respect to the North-west Territories, and with respect to the state of the country, by stating that they are not responsible, that they have no responsibility in the matter, that it rests entirely upon their Deputies. I could not help noticing, Mr. Speaker, how much both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice worried over the position of the leader of the Opposition. They demanded that he should discuss a question which they refused to discuss. They said: We are very anxious to know what the views of the leader of the Opposition are upon the Manitoba School question ; but, at the same time, they informed the House that the question, for the present, was relegated to the Government of Manitoba, and that it would be an imprudent, an improper act on their part to enter upon the discussion of any feature of that question until the Manitoba Government had pronounced its deliverance on it. Yet those hon. gentlemen who have the responsibility of the Government resting on their shoulders, come to this House and demand from my hon. friend beside me a declaration of opinion which they themselves decline to offer. They have placed themselves in rather an uncomfortable position. They seem to think that it is a patriotic duty for the leader of the Opposition to assist them out of the embarrassment in which they are placed. They have put the chestnuts in very hot ashes, and while they insist they are there properly and they shall have the privilege of eating them after they are cooked, they ask the leader of the Opposition to be good enough to pull those chestnuts out of the fire. Well, Sir, I think he has very properly declined that task ; I think he would have been going far afield if, while having none of the responsibility of the administration of public affairs resting upon his shoulders, he should have come to the rescue of the Government who are confessedly, by their own proposition, incapable of dealing successfully with the question. The Minister of Justice informed us that we have a new Premier, and also that we have a new leader in this House,—and we knew before we came here that the choice of leader was not a choice very acceptable to him. The Minister of Justice also informed us that the National Policy had become a real Ishmael, that the Government have a new baby, that is to be the heir of promise on this occasion, that the subject of the National Policy and other issues had been discussed ad nauseam, that he wished to hear nothing more about them, that there are other questions, live questions before the country, and that he had the courage to discuss them at Antigonish, although he said it was improper for a Minister of the Crown to discuss them here, but a highly proper act for the leader of the Opposition to engage in such a discussion. When the hon. gentleman made his statement, I thought this new child of promise to the Conservative party in this House was not altogether unlike Ginks' baby. The whole Government were not quite united in describing it. Some regard it as a very proper infant, and one entitled to the utmost attention and care. Rumour has it that the real parent is the Minister of Public Works. He has taken a very great deal of interest in this youngster, and its appearance among the Cabinet has led to a good deal of difference of opinion, and much angry discussion. There is a dispute as regards its character, some wishing to cast a doubt on it, and others wishing to give it the greatest possible attention. There is, in fact, so far as one can judge, a dispute as to the sex of the infant, and they wish to bring it to my hon. friend here for him to decide the differences between them. They have sent it abroad ; they have asked Manitoba to take charge of it, and until they know what Manitoba will do they are not in a position to say anything further in regard to it. It is remarked that the Controller of Customs was greatly scandalized by the appearance of this youngster, and that in fact he threatened to desert the family if the family did not desert the baby. We hardly know the position of the hon. member at the present time upon this subject. We do not know whether he is reconciled to the adoption of the interesting infant into the Government family or not, and I suppose we shall not know until the Government hear from Manitoba. The Minister of Justice said that my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), was struggling to avoid a discussion upon this burning subject. Burning what ? Burning whom ? The Minister did not tell us. He says that other questions have been discussed 'ad nauseam' and that the public are weary hearing anything with regard to them. Well, Sir, the Ministers made peregrinations through the country not very many months ago, and they discussed what they thought were the interesting public questions. Did they say anything about this question ? Did they tell the public what they intended to do or how they intended to deal with it ? I fancy that the hon. the Minister of Railways had something to say with regard to the tariff, and I think he had something to say with regard to the Tay Canal. He had something to say also with regard to many other questions connected with the public service, but he did not think then that he was discussing dead issues or questions in which the public had no longer any interest. I also find, according to the reports of the ministerial papers, that his colleagues followed in very much the same line. In my opinion, Sir, the conduct of the Government and the conduct of the electors in the constituencies which have recently had an opportunity of expressing an opinion, show that these mat-

ters are not dead issues. The public are tired of the present tariff, I believe, but they are not tired of the discussion of the subject and they are not disposed to treat with indifference the question as to whether they will get rid of the tariff, or whether they will longer submit to its burthens. The public are not tired of the discussion of the Tay Canal; they are not tired of hearing something with regard to the disinterested and patriotic services of the Government candidate in West Quebec, and they are not tired hearing something of the sterling integrity of St. Louis of Montreal. The public are still interested in public blunders and in public plunders that have taken place. I am charging nothing against the Government, I am speaking of the facts which have been disclosed in this House and admitted. All these matters are matters of public interest. The public are not disposed to say that there is nothing of interest to them in the five millions dollars of deficit for the nine months of the current year, which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out. These things of course are not of interest to the Minister of Justice, and neither is the condition of the North-west, the absence of population there, the desertion of the country by some of those who were there and the straightened circumstances and the distress that exists amongst that people. All these matters the public care to hear about, although the Minister himself may have become thoroughly tired of their consideration. The observations of the two Ministers who have addressed the House,—and who directed their addresses to my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier)—remind me something of the story of Tom Sawyer's experience in painting the fence. He had great skill in white-washing. He interested the boys who were about him and some of them were willing to pay him something to try whether or not they could do it as well as he could. The Ministers have addressed my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) much as Tom Sawyer addressed the boys who watched him carrying on his white-washing operations. The Ministers said to my hon. friend: Show us what you think of this subject, explain to us your view, let us see what skill you possess, if the responsibility rested with you let us learn from you how you would solve the difficulty. But my hon. friend cannot be drawn into the service of the Government just as the boys around Tom Sawyer were drawn in by that knowing young man. Tom was a little more skilful in his business than the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice have been on this occasion. Sir, I adopt,—and I think it is generally adopted on this side of the House—the opinion of Sir Robert Peel, who said: It would be time enough for him to prescribe when his Sovereign called him in. We admit that there is disease existing. We admit that there are grievances requiring redress and abuses requiring reformation, and we are of opinion that they are not likely to be redressed, nor is the reformation to be brought about so long as the Government continues in the present unskilful hands. But, we think that that is no reason why we should undertake to assist the Ministry in the discharge of those duties for which they claim eminent fitness and superior ability. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen evidently are disturbed by this new infant that is substituted for the National Policy in the coming contest. The Minister of Finance informs the House that he escaped with a whole skin and without a scratch. He was as fortunate as Daniel in getting out of the den of lions. The Hon. Minister spoke with great earnestness and it was not a facetious matter with him at all. It was perfectly clear that the Minister of Finance thought that some of his colleagues were not so fortunate as he, and you have but to look at the Minister of Public Works with his serious face, with that haggard look, and you will see that the matters which appal the Minister of Finance were matters of serious difficulty to him. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman did not care to go to the country after this subject was discussed. The hon. gentleman of course knowing what terrible difficulties were amongst twelve men, thought and thought seriously: if this happens amongst twelve men, what will be the condition of the country if five millions of people are called into a 'melee' such as that existing among Ministers of the Crown. Now, Sir, this may have had, and I have no doubt it has had, an important influence upon the Controller of Customs. I think it goes a long way to excuse, and perhaps to fully explain, the position of that hon. gentleman. The hon. Controller of Customs was ready to stand with one party in preventing home rule on the other side of the Atlantic, law or no law; he was prepared to stand by his friends in Ulster in opposition to the law. It is declared that on this side of the Atlantic the hon. gentleman is ready, law or no law, to stand with his friends in the province of Manitoba. No doubt, when the question comes to be discussed, the hon. gentleman will be able to explain to us how it is that he takes one view of the question when he looks across the Atlantic, and takes another and different view when he looks towards the west. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will shoulder his musket and strap on his bayonet in the one case as well as in the other. An impression has gone abroad that he has modified his opinions, and is reconciled to the views of the mother of this interesting infant, the hon. Minister of Public Works. The hon. Minister of Justice said that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) found it

necessary to appeal to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition for a certificate, in order that he might become the Reform candidate in Oxford. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what kind of a certificate was required; it would not have suited his purpose to do that. The hon. Minister of Justice, it is rumoured, sulked in his tent. He is a younger man than my hon. friend, and he has a parent, a father, living; and it is rumoured that he threatened his colleague with the wrath of the mighty father. I do not know whether that is so or not. It is also rumoured that the Prime Minister addressed to the Minister of Justice on that occasion an interesting letter, which called him out of his tent, and put him back again in the public department of which he has charge. It would be interesting to know what were the contents of that letter. Then we were told that the Minister of Finance was also interested in the matter. Now, I do not think the Minister of Finance was helping anybody to obtain a nomination. His case, it is said, is a case of the head being helped by the tail. The Minister of Finance has adopted the scriptural rule of not putting his trust in Kings; he has retired from Kings. The hon. gentleman has gone to the "Temple" to worship. There is where he is now said to pay his devotions; and there is an impression abroad—I do not know how well it is founded—that he will require to sacrifice something more than a turtle dove and two young pigeons to be successful—that nothing less than an unblemished male sheep will serve his purpose. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Ministers have spoken of their success in the four elections which have recently taken place. Three of those constituencies, prior to the elections, were represented in this House by supporters of the Administration; now, three of them are represented by gentlemen who were opposed by the Administration. In Quebec West, the Government supported the candidature of Mr. McGreevy. Mr. McGreevy was entitled to their support. He has endured a good deal on their account. That hon. gentleman was expelled from this House; he endured that rather than give evidence. He was prosecuted civilly, and judgment was obtained against him; he was prosecuted criminally, and was sent to jail. Having been purified by these processes, he was qualified again to become a candidate, and was entitled to receive support from that side of the House. The Ministry, in the Address, and in the Speech which they have put in the mouth of His Excellency, have, for the first time since 1878 admitted that the country is not in a highly prosperous condition; but they console themselves by declaring that matters are not as bad here as they are elsewhere. The hon. Minister of Justice pointed out that Lord Salisbury had made a regular blue ruin speech with regard to the state of agriculture in England; and the hon. gentleman himself, while admitting that the country was far from prosperous, maintained that the farming population of England were in even a more disastrous condition than the farming population of Canada. This is the first time we have had a statement from hon. gentlemen opposite of the relative condition of this country. For the last fifteen years, the hon. gentlemen have carefully ignored the fact that there was a general depression throughout the world from 1875 to 1880; they have carefully ignored the fact during that period Canada suffered less than almost any other country in Christendom. They have carefully ignored the fact that real property did not shrink in value at all, and that personal property and manufactured goods, such as textile fabrics, shrunk in value less in Canada than in the United Kingdom, the United States, or Germany. But the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, but you had a deficit then, and your deficit happened notwithstanding the fact that you did not reduce the taxes." Well, Mr. Speaker, our rate of taxation was a little more than half the present rate of taxation. If we had been disposed, in a period of distress, to increase taxation on the people of Canada, we might very easily have made up the amount of the deficit that then existed. The hon. gentleman said: "But I reduced the rate of taxation." How did the hon. gentleman reduce it? He took the taxes off sugar. He says he made a large concession to the people there. Well, Sir Leonard Tilley argued in this House for three sessions that the tax on sugar did not increase the price, and he compared the prices of sugar in the New York market with the prices of sugar in Montreal and Halifax to show that no increase took place as the result of the tariff. The hon. gentleman no doubt has obtained light since that period, and so no doubt have his colleagues and his friends who sit behind him, and we are glad that he is now ready to make this concession; but the reduction of the duty on sugar is indeed a very small matter when compared with the actual rates of taxation on almost everything else throughout the country. The hon. gentleman has not told us when or how the very large deficit now existing is to be met. He talks of economy; he says that when we go into Committee of Ways and Means he will ask the House to make the necessary appropriations. What is the object of going into Committee of Ways and Means except to provide an adequate sum for the expenditures that are to take place? Will the hon. gentleman be prepared, when he asks this House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, to make adequate provision for the expenditures which he expects the Government to incur during the next twelve months? The hon. gentleman referred us to a number of matters.

He called our attention to the public lands of the North-west, and he feebly hinted that some matter or transaction between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government is to be brought under the attention of Parliament this session. The hon. gentleman knows that the condition of things in the North-west, which has seriously affected the revenues of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is in a large degree due to the change of route. The line which was surveyed by Mr. Sandford Fleming, and which ran through a fertile belt from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains was abandoned, and a line was adopted which carried the road through the American desert. People have been invited into that country and have found it, two or three seasons to one, almost uninhabitable and unproductive, and that has had the effect of giving to the country a bad name and seriously interfering with its settlement. Now, I think the statements made by the hon. gentleman go to show that the condition of the country is very grave, that its financial condition is imperilled. You have great public works and enterprises existing in the country, none of which are remunerative at this moment and the largest of which are not paying current expenses. This is a serious condition of things, which requires to be carefully considered by this House during this session, or the House will be derelict in its duty. The time has come when it will no longer serve the purpose of the Government to give charters for railway lines to penniless adventurers in order that they may sell the land grants attached and make private fortunes at the public expense. There was a period in the history of the mother country when the Crown domain was given away to favourites of the Crown, and the Crown domain in Canada has for some years been in the same way bestowed on the favourites, not of the Crown, but of the Administration. During last session we had a railway charter given to a company composed of men without means or capital, for the construction of a road through a section where no settlers had yet gone and where none are required—where none ought to be for the next twenty years. And for what purpose? To promote the public interest? Not at all. For the purpose of enabling some men to make a fortune by offering the charter to capitalists in New York, England, or the continent of Europe. But the time has gone by when that system can longer be practiced, and it is in the interests of the people of this country to see that that system is no longer continued. The Minister of Finance has preached to us economy. But the Minister of Justice has everywhere throughout the country taunted us with being a party of economists, with undertaking to economise too much, with wishing to starve public works, by not making the necessary liberal appropriations. Whose view is to prevail—that of the Minister of Finance or that of the Minister of Justice? It is perfectly obvious that if the views of the Minister of Justice are to prevail—and they have prevailed in the past—the hopes of the Minister of Finance are not likely to secure to him anything like an equality between the expenditure of the Government and the revenue of the country. This country has been for the past ten years travelling over precisely the same road taken by the Argentine Republic. We know where the expenditures of that republic have landed it. We know what its financial position is at present. And unless this Parliament is prepared vigorously to take hold of the subject of public expenditures, unless it is prepared to inquire into our management of public works and undertakings and to see that no appropriation is made for any works that is not meritorious in its character and deserving of public aid, this country will, in an incredibly short period, be in precisely the same position as that to which the South American republic has been reduced. The hon. gentleman referred to the question of preferential trade with the colonies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to quarrel with his proposition. I do not think it amounts to much. I think that two months' trade with the neighbouring republic would amount to more than two years' trade with the colonies with which the hon. gentleman has undertaken to make these arrangements. The past experience of this country, the condition of those colonies, the products of those colonies, for export, show that that is the case. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the case of Newfoundland. I am not going to discuss that subject to-day. We shall have that up when the terms agreed upon are submitted to us. But I will say this, that if it had not been for the active interference of the Canadian Government, the Blaine-Bond Treaty would have been in operation. That treaty would have been of great advantage to the colony of Newfoundland. And had it been in force, the colony would have escaped the financial depression that has occurred, while it could have done us no possible mischief. Newfoundland would have been infinitely better off if our Government had minded its own business and let that colony alone than it can possible be by any arrangement which would make it a part and parcel of the Canadian Confederation. Newfoundland no doubt will become a part of this confederation some time or other, but if the hon. gentleman thinks that he can carry out any arrangement in the existing state of Newfoundland, with the unsettled French shore question in the position in which it is to-day, he will find himself mistaken. My impression is that the people of Canada will not agree to any arrangement by which France will be made for all time to come a substantial factor in the government of this country. So that, unless the hon. gentleman is

prepared to show that the question has been satisfactorily settled, before the scheme of union is submitted to this House, I think it will not be acceptable to the people of this country. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to trespass further upon the attention of the House in discussing the Address. I think, Sir, that the policy shadowed forth means a very great deal to this country; that it points to additional burdens, additional burdens that at this time we can ill bear, and the proposals of the Government, when they are submitted to us will call for careful consideration by this House.

Sir JAMES GRANT. The Address of His Excellency as presented to this House on this occasion is one that embraces more facts for discussion than any speech from the Throne that I have read for many a year. For that reason I ask the indulgence of this House while I offer a very few observations. The session is significant in many respects. In the first place, on our entering here we found two floral wreaths, one upon the desk of a departed member of the Conservative side of the House and the other a tribute to the memory of an hon. member on the other side. These members have passed away during the short interval that has elapsed since we had the pleasure of meeting here before. In their departure both have left a noble record in the history of this country. The able, I might say the admirable address delivered by the leader of the Opposition on the death of our late lamented Premier, is characteristic of the ability and genius of that great French patriot, who, by his elegance, by his irresistible eloquence on all occasions of this kind, wins the encomiums of this House and this country. I listened to his observations with much pride and satisfaction, inasmuch as he showed that he bore to the members of this House a nobleness of sentiment that is well deserving of the members of this assembly. Then, the observations which fell from the Minister of Finance were a perfect eulogy, in fact a panygeric of a great man, his associate in this House and in the administration of this country. I was not at all surprised that the sad event should call forth from him the expression of such touching sentiments, which must have gone to the hearts of every one who listened to him. On the death of Sir Robert Peel the London "Times" observed, that "statesmanship is the brightest jewel in the casket of the Empire," and certainly, around no one's life's career has a brighter halo been thrown than around that of our departed Premier, the late Sir John Thompson. I trust that now the wealth of the country will flow in the same channel as its tears, in order that a fitting tribute may be given to those who have been left to mourn the loss of so great a man. We have also parted with a dear old friend in the person of Hon. Félix Geoffrion. I must say I was somewhat surprised that nothing had been said heretofore about that great man. Félix Geoffrion occupied a prominent position in the country for many years. He raised himself from the rank of a humble notary to that of Minister of the Crown by his intelligence and high character, being a shining example of that great French nationality, whose members, by their great perseverance and by their brilliancy of character have assisted the great Anglo-Saxon race, in developing this country from the wilderness which their great progenitor, Jacques Cartier, found as he made his way up the St. Lawrence into the great western country. I have very little more to say upon this subject, but I must say that at no time in the history of Canada has our Chamber experienced greater losses than on the present occasion. It was not my intention to speak at any length upon the trade question, upon the fiscal policy of this country, although there is a reference made in the Address to His Excellency upon the depression of trade. But, after the observations of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other evening in which he afforded us the opportunity of conning over the deficits which he said were about to fall upon this country, I cannot but make a few observations upon this point. It is true there is a great depression in this country, as in every other portion of the known world. Such has been the experience of those concerned in trade during the past two years. But I think that of all the parts of the world there is not one that has escaped that depression better than Canada. As a proof of this, I would ask any sensible man to consider the result of the loan made by the Hon. Minister of Finance last year. That was one of the best financial operations ever effected for this country, and that during a time of depression. And what was the cause of his success? It was that the people of Great Britain have confidence in this country, have confidence in our resources and in our people. They know what we have accomplished, within a short space of time, and they are ready and willing to give us the support which we have shown that we deserve. The trade question is doubtless a very important one, and there are some notable facts in connection with it. The depression is said to be due to the fact that we have a system of protection in this country. But, if we go back to the time when Hon. Edward Blake was leader of the Opposition in this country, we know perfectly well that he issued a circular note to manufacturers of this country, declaring that if his party attained power they were not going to interfere with the policy which had been in force. We very well know that Sir Charles Tupper, when he was Minister of Finance, on the floor of this House complimented Mr. Blake on the expression of those sentiments, as it was proof that he him-

self saw the desirability of continuing the system of protection in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to get over the difficulty, our friends of the Opposition undertook the advocacy of various means of raising the revenue in order to see if by any one of these means they could gain the public confidence. The first was unrestricted reciprocity; second, commercial union; third, continental free trade. Every one of these they advocated as strenuously as they were able to do; and although they brought to bear upon these points all the fire, and eloquence, and erudition of which they were masters, still they were not able to commend them to the country. Why? Because the people had not confidence in them; these gentlemen had not shown that these principles would be advantageous to the country; our financial men and the public generally would not adopt those principles, and as a consequence, the Conservative party is in power to-day, having not only the confidence of this House, but also the confidence of the country. Shortly afterwards we remember that they held a convention here at Ottawa, which drew together a great many good men. I know perfectly well that there are good, and sound, and substantial Reformers in this country; there are men in that party who are doing their utmost to advance the interests of the country as well as of their party. But they fail in their diagnosis, they do not thoroughly understand the position, or, if they do understand it, these words may be applied to them:

> Convince a man against his will,
> He's of the same opinion still.

At that convention what did we see? We heard the hon. leader of the Opposition using these words: "I will go to the mother country and not to the United States for an example." Again, in his Winnipeg speech: "We shall not give in one whit until we succeed in carrying into effect the British system of tariff." And again, in his St. Thomas speech: "We shall not leave a trace of protection; every vestige of protection shall be removed from the soil of Canada." Now, he says he will go to the mother land and not to the United States for an example. Well, Sir, if we look at the history of the mother land, what do we find? Sir, during the last two months, when a general election was in prospect, we found individuals addressing audiences in various portions of Canada, preaching free trade and low prices. That was the motto. What have free trade and low prices brought about? If we look at the history of England, what do we find? That since 1889 they have lost over £60,000,000 in their exports. There are now 3,000,000 acres of land less under cultivation than there were at that time. After fifty years of free trade, the people of England are crying out to-day for protection in almost every part of that country. The Right Hon. Mr. Chaplin, who was Minister of Agriculture in Lord Salisbury's Administration, said last February, when addressing the English House of Commons, that they were passing through one of the most remarkable crises in agriculture ever known in the history of England. Mr. Balfour, the same day, endorsed that opinion, and stated that England to-day was passing through a crisis in agriculture, in commerce and in finance such as they had not known during the present century, and he attributed it entirely to low prices, the result of protection. And why? Because the products of almost every country in the world are flowing in there unchecked by any additional taxation, so that the farming community cannot earn an honest living by the sale of their products in competition with the surplus products of other portions of the world. Now, I ask any sensible man, how is it possible for our farmers to go in for low prices when, owing to the protective tariff of the United States and other countries, they cannot sell their products to those countries, and in the only market that is open to them, Great Britain, they still have to compete with low prices? Now, the Montreal "Witness" says: If free trade is introduced, you will have a greater importation of manufactured products into Canada. It is true that we have manufactured products brought in from the United States; we would have them brought in from Europe, and as a consequence our markets would be drugged, our manufacturers would be obliged to close their establishments, the trade of the country would be paralyzed, and thousands of people would be thrown out of employment. "We shall not give in one whit until we succeed in carrying into effect the British system of tariff," says Mr. Laurier. If they carry into effect the British system of tariff, can the farmers of this country continue their support to a party who opposes protection, who will introduce a policy which so reduces the sale of their goods that their best customers, their best trade, will be cut off, and their resources will be paralyzed, as the resources of English farmers are being paralyzed to-day? "We will not leave one trace of protection, every vestige of protection shall be removed," says Mr. Laurier. Now, if there is going to be no protection, where are the 35 or 36 millions coming from to carry on the affairs of this country? I cannot understand where they are going to get the money; the point is not clear. They say, Oh, if we only get into power, we will introduce such-and-such a policy. I want them to say now what they mean. Let them tell the country what they mean, and where these 36 millions are coming from. The leader of the Opposition at Winnipeg, said: We will place a tax upon raw materials, that is where the revenue is coming from. But what will be our position immediately that tax is placed on raw material? What are raw materials? Sugar, cotton, binder-

twine—I will mention but a few of them. Take sugar, the largest article of importation into this country. We know well that during the Mackenzie Administration our sugar factories had to shut down with a tax of 40 per cent on the manufactured material and a heavy tax on the raw material brought into this country. The Minister of Finance stated the other day in his address, that if the Administration were willing to bring back the ordinary sugar tariff, they could wipe out the present deficit in this country, and show the people in a tangible form where they were cutting off the revenue in order to meet the wants and requirements of the people and give them cheap articles. The Opposition are crying out for cheap articles. They say they will reduce taxation and give the people cheap articles. They say that if free trade was introduced, the farmers would be able to live without any effort. But once you bring in that free trade and those materials are taxed, as they say, in order to raise the revenue, we will see at once where we will be. Then take the article of cotton. Put one or two cents per pound upon cotton produced in the United States, and you would shut up every cotton industry in this country. I state that without fear of contradiction. I assure you, Mr. Speaker and hon. gentlemen, that it is a very serious problem. We cannot afford to have that tax placed on cotton at the present time. As regards binder-twine made from ordinary jute, that is also a farmers' product, it is not produced here. It is one of those materials very largely used to-day by farmers in tying up their grain. Immediately you put a tax upon it, the farmers complain. But that is not done by the Conservative party, it is contemplated by the Reformers, because they wish to raise a revenue, and the only way they can raise a revenue, according to the principles of free trade, is to put a tax on these raw materials which are now, under the policy of the Conservative party, giving such cheap products to the people of our country, which policy we intend to preserve and which we are determined to protect so far as we possibly can. There is one great principle that it is necessary for our people to uphold, and that is to defend and maintain our defensive tariff, and build up our industries and retain our home market. We know perfectly well what protection has done in the past, and what it is doing in the present. Those who visited the World's Exhibition at Chicago, and saw the extraordinary outcome of the protected industries of Germany and France, must have observed at a glance what those countries have accomplished by adopting the principle of protection. Then, again, if you look at Russia we observe similar results attained. That country had free trade for a time; but in 1819 that remarkable statesman, Count Nesseldorf, impressed on the leading authorities that it was desirable to have a change in the tariff system, and since that time that Empire has enjoyed a protective system. Hence, the progress and prosperity of the country, and its satisfactory position, financially, hence the development of its industries and resources, until to-day Russia is looked upon as one of the great powers of the world, and one that is fully and thoroughly determined to maintain that protective system under which its industries have developed and prospered. Let me say a few words with respect to our neighbouring republic. According to Professor Thompson, one of the greatest authorities on political economy within the past century, the tariff of the United States has been changed no less than nine times, and on four separate occasions the whole scaffolding of the tariff system has been broken down and rebuilt. Now, through the Wilson Bill, which gives a higher protective tariff than any introduced into this country, the American people are determined to allow the principles of protection to stand, and that the scaffolding of the tariff shall be retained for at least not less than a quarter of a century. We know well that the people of this country have done everything in their power to promote the principle of reciprocity between Canada and the United States. No less than on fourteen occasions have our public men approached the leaders of the Government at Washington, and only once during that whole period, in 1854, were they successful; and no sooner had that treaty of reciprocity expired in 1866 than it was cut off almost instantaneously, and, notwithstanding the efforts made by British statesmen, notwithstanding the efforts of our Canadian public men, we have not been able, up to the present time, to introduce any principle of trade and commerce that would be acceptable to the American authorities since the abrogation of that reciprocity treaty. Our public men have been found fault with in this connection. The late Sir John Thompson, and the present leader of the House, when they visited Washington during the administration of the late Mr. Blaine, did everything to promote the principles of reciprocity. But they were told: Gentlemen, we cannot grant reciprocity between the United States and Canada unless you discriminate against Great Britain. Those public men, like true patriots, having the welfare of the country at heart, recognizing what Great Britain has done for Canada, and how desirous we are to remain a part of the Empire, said: No, gentlemen, rather than surrender those principles we will return to our domiciles and to the Parliament of Canada, and let the people know that Canada is determined to maintain the power and prestige of Great Britain, and will not surrender any right or interest to any power that will seek to

interfere with the trade relations as they now exist between Canada and the mother country. Sir Richard Temple, in one of the admirable addresses which he delivered in Winnipeg only a year ago on the subject of raising a revenue, put the matter so tersely and laconically that I will read an observation from that address, as follows :—

When Mr. Laurier talks about "Free Trade" as understood in England, as possible in the near future, he is "talking through his hat." Both political parties must have resort to customs duties, and the issue between them is not one of "free trade" and "protection," but one of mere detail as to the mode of levying the tariff. The money must be raised somehow, whether Conservaties or Liberals are in power ; and the only difference between them will relate not to the system itself, but to the method of its application.

The Conservative Government, if you boil down the issue, are getting a revenue out of the country from taxing the people in the manner which most fully meets the wants and requirements of our population, that of protecting our industries, by fostering our resources, by encouraging our manufactures, by adopting all measures possible to make our people happy and confortable, by giving them cheap sugar and coffee, and the necessaries of life ; but let it be known that the Government intend not to raise the revenue from the raw materials imported into the country, then the labouring classes, our farmers who toil the soil, and those of the people who earn their wages by the sweat of their brow will at once admit that the policy of the Conservative party is to protect and foster their interest by allowing no taxation whatever on those products, for such taxation would tend to paralyze the industries of the people and hamper the advancement of the great interests of Canada generally. Mr. Speaker, I desire, before closing my observations, to say a few words with respect to our colonial conferences. The Conservative party are said to be doing very little for this country, that they are adopting a laisser faire policy, that they are sitting in their seats and are desirous of retaining them, if possible, while doing very little. Are such statements accurate ? They are far from it. We know that within the last twelve months the late Minister of Trade and Commerce proceeded on a mission to Australia, New Zealand and other colonies, and as a result of that visit he was successful in bringing about a conference of delegates from the antipodes, who consulted with each other and with Canadian representatives as to the importance of establishing a system of preferential trade between Canada and the Australian colonies. As a result of that conference we have the admirable and succinct statement presented by Lord Jersey. In that statement he met the whole issue. That conference brought about new relationships. Now the colonies understand more thoroughly the working of their trade and commerce, they know what Canada requires, and what they require, and to-day we are preparing to take into serious consideration many methods which would improve and develop materially the trade with this country and the Australasian colonies. I think, at the present time, Mr. Larke is in Australia, looking into the whole question, and shortly we shall receive a statement of his practical experience on these points. Again, we are now considering the desirability of securing cable communication between Canada and Australia ; also, steam communication, and other questions. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that these efforts put forth by our energetic statesmen, are evidence of untiring energy and zeal, as to our best interests. Then, again, we find that a few days ago another conference was held, one with Newfoundland delegates. True, that a similar conference met here twenty-five years ago. The subject was also discussed at the Quebec conference, where the first principles of confederation were laid down. I recollect perfectly well, in conversing with the late Sir John Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier, who were the Nestors of that period, men who did more to advance the material interests of this country than any other two men in the present century, that I found those statesmen were imbued with the desirability of bringing into confederation the Island of Newfoundland. Doubtless the day is not far distant when Newfoundland will be brought into the confederation. It is said to be a big island surrounded by fog ; but it has a magnificent climate. It has 36,000 seamen constantly employed in their fisheries which produce every year about $6,500,000, and they have a revenue of about $12,000,000 annually. All these will add very materially to the resources of Canada. At the presnt time we trade with Newfoundland to the extent of only about two and a half million dollars as their products chiefly go to the United States, so that by bringing Newfoundland into our confederation we will be adding largely to our trade. In fact Newfoundland is our third best customer to-day, and if she were in the Union, I have no doubt we would derive as much benefit from her trade, or nearly as much, as we do to-day from our trade with Great Britain. Under these circumstances I trust the day is not far distant when the ancient colony will be a province of our confederation. I look upon union with Newfoundland as important also from a strategetical point of view. She is the great protector of the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and she is to the St. Lawrence what Gibralter is to the Mediterranean. Every day she is growing in importance in that respect, because the Canadian route to the Orient is

fast taking precedence over the Suez route. Why are the travellers from the East coming here? It is because we have the shortest route, and the best from a sanitary point of view, because its climatic conditions are ahead of any in the known world. When people find that they can go from Calcutta, India, to London, Great Britain, in a comparatively short space of time by a route which cannot be surpassed at the present day, the shortest route from ocean to ocean, rely upon it that the country which can have the shortest route across a great continent like this will hold in its grasp before many years the commercial supremacy of the North American continent. I have little more to say, Mr. Speaker, further than to advert briefly to the Manitoba school question. It is a question which has disturbed the public mind very considerably within the last few years. It is entirely a matter of law. It is a matter of right. Sir Donald Smith a few days ago, when he addressed a committee of gentlemen who waited upon him in Montreal, put the whole subject in a nutshell, when he said: These people were entitled to certain privileges at the very commencement of confederation, and if we gave them these privileges then, why should they not be continued now. We may legislate upon these points, we may have differences of opinion, but I believe in giving equal rights and privileges to all classes of the community whether they be Protestants or Catholics. In this great country of ours we have two great bodies, the Catholic and the Protestant. Have they not both worked together harmoniously, and have they not both done everything in their power to advance the interest of Canada? Are they not living together side by side and enjoying the company and society of each other? Do we not find Protestants at the head of Catholic institutions, and do we not find Catholics delivering addresses to Protestant assemblies, as Father Dawson did here in Ottawa. Let me tell you to-day, hon. gentlemen, that as a member of this House I feel pleased and gratified beyond expression to be the representative of a Catholic University as I have been for twenty years, besides being the president of a Catholic hospital. I have experienced nothing but kindness from the Catholic people, and I have seen nothing in them but what is worthy of the highest respect. If we extend to them the right hand of fellowship and do what is right and proper, we shall have nothing to fear in this Manitoba school question. It is a question which will be easily settled and which I believe can be settled so as to satisfy the entire people of this country. It is a question that should not be discussed from a political point of view, and those who go on the hustings in this country and attempt to stir up rancour and to disseminate the principles of antagonism should be condemned. This question should be looked at in a broad and comprehensive sense, and I know perfectly well that whether Liberal or Conservative, whether it be English or French, or whether it be Catholic or Protestant, the great aim and object of all will be, and should be, the advancement of the material interest and prosperity of this country. Let us unite together as one people to keep Canada intact from race and religious prejudices, and let us show the world at large that we have a full and thorough determination to make Canada what she should be, a colony of which the British Empire may well feel proud.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman (Sir James Grant) in his discussion of trade matters, because as has been observed, there will be another and perhaps more fitting opportunity to treat on that subject. I wish simply to refer to one statement the hon. gentleman made, a statement which was new to me. He said that in recent years—I forget what year he mentioned—the Hon. Edward Blake, when leading the Opposition, had sent a circular to the manufacturers informing them that if he came into power he did not intend to do anything to disturb existing fiscal regulations. I never heard before of any such circular being issued, and when the hon. gentleman (Sir James Grant) says that it was issued and that it was the subject of discussion in this House, he mentioned something that was entirely new to me. Passing to the earlier observations of the hon. gentleman, I thoroughly agree with him in the fitting tribute he paid to the memory of the late Sir John Thompson and of the late Hon. Mr. Geoffrion. Every member of this House, I am sure, agrees most thoroughly and most feelingly with the second paragraph of the resolution in reply to the Address. With regard to the first paragraph of this resolution, in which His Excellency expresses satisfaction at again having recourse to the advice and assistance of the Commons, I take it that that means that His Excellency's advisers have also satisfaction in that regard, and viewing it in that light, it has occurred to me as rather strange that instead of the member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) embracing the opportunity of addressing the House now, one of His Excellency's advisers did not seek the opportunity of expressing to us in our hearing the unbounded satisfaction they have in seeing us once more assembled and having our advice available to them. I am glad to know that that is the case, because it was thought at one time that the Ministers had not much satisfaction in the prospect of meeting with the Commons of Canada. It was thought by some people, perhaps not rightly, that the Ministers were unable to make up their minds whether to call Parlia-

ment together or whether to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the electors. Since, however, the Ministers have their minds made up for them, I am glad to know that it is a source of satisfaction to them because it would not be pleasant if they met Parliament and felt uneasy under the circumstances. I agree with them in the satisfaction we have in meeting together, but I regret that we were not sooner summoned to meet. I believe that every member of this House will admit that this is an inconvenient season of the year for the calling of Parliament. The good precedent set by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, is one that should be followed by this Government. Not only have we the precedent of the Mackenzie Government in this respect, but it has been insisted upon time and again by members on both sides of the House, that it should form part of the unwritten law of this Parliament that we should be summoned here early in the month of February, if not late in January. But when months are allowed to elapse, and when we find that we are summoned at a time when we should be nearing the end of the session, I repeat that it is a matter of great regret. I know that the Finance Minister, the leader of the House, has given us reasons why we have not been summoned earlier, and as I allude to that hon. gentleman for the first time, I think I can safely congratulate him on the position which he occupies in the House. When it became necessary to reorganize the Government after the lamented death of Sir John Thompson, I may safely say that when the choice was made of him to be leader of the House, it was a choice that was generally expected by, and I think, I may also add will be most cheerfully acquiesced in by the members of the Opposition. The reasons he gave, however, seemed to me to be not the full and precise reasons for the delay in summoning Parliament. I have endeavoured to give all the weight to them that I could. Whether my mind had been warped somewhat by articles which I had seen in the press representing the views of the Government or not, I cannot say; but there certainly was lodged in my mind, and is still there, the impression that the unbounded satisfaction with which we are assured the Ministers greet the assembling of Parliament is a satisfaction of very late origin. If we are to believe current reports, all the Ministers were not in favour of having Parliament summoned at all; and while I know we have been told by one of the Ministers that we are not to believe the full length of the "tail" that Conservative newspapers give to us, yet the same hon. gentleman, in giving the illustration he did, taken from the habits of a lively member of the animal kingdom, did admit that if the animal was there at all, he must have a caudal appendage of some length, greater or less, even if it might not be fifty yards long. I think we have read in the papers also that one at least of the members of the Government threatened to resign if Parliament were summoned—nay, that he did actually resign; and when after a time he was found in his place again, we were told that he had returned—and, sure enough, he is found in his place to-day. Now, that hon. gentleman being a lawyer, and all lawyers, especially constitutional lawyers, being strong in precedents, it was meet and proper that he should have a precedent for his return; and it is alleged that the precedent which he cited was taken, not from English constitutional history, but from the action of a member of the feline race which on one occasion for some cause or other left the family abode, but finally in repentant mood returned, and was received again and forgiven. Whether these things be true or not, the impression has been left on the minds of the people of the country that the reasons given by the Finance Minister are not the full and frank reasons for the delay in summoning Parliament. If they were, and if it was fully determined that there should be a session of Parliament, and the Ministers looked forward to it with such rapturous joy, I would ask the hon. leader of the House, how it was that the usual work in the Government Printing Bureau of preparing the departmental reports was all stopped? How is it that, when Parliament is summoned at this extraordinary late period of the year, and a member has to rise in his place and ask when he may expect one of the most important of the departmental reports necessary for the proper supervision of the acts of this Parliament, he is told that it is not yet ready? How is it that we are told that the Trade and Navigation Returns placed on the Table to-day, have only been issued a few days ago?—nay, that all the public documents which should have been in our possession months ago, are not yet issued? If it was the intention to summon Parliament, what excuse can be given by the Ministers for stopping this necessary work, and hastening the preparation of voters' lists that might not be made use of for many months to come? and why, in addition, should they have gone outside of our own printing bureau and given the printing of many of these lists to other printing offices? These are questions which suggest themselves, and if the reasons the hon. Minister of Finance has given for calling Parliament together are to be accepted, and it was the full intention all along that Parliament should be summoned, how does he account for such strange conduct, amounting to maladministration, on the part of the Government? I also ask how it was necessary that Ministers should leave their departments and wander from one end of the country to the other and appear on public platforms to explain their policy to the people? If Parliament was to be summoned, here was the place where they could speak to the people in the best

manner, and where public questions could be debated. Further, I would ask, if it was the intention to have another session of Parliament before an election, how was it that we saw, what I think we never saw before, Ministers and the supporters of Ministers receiving their party nominations in the various constituencies, and setting the election machinery in motion? Why did all these things take place if the reasons and statements advanced by the Finance Minister are to be accepted? To be personal, I might ask the hon. leader of the House himself, how was it, when he had fully determined that there should be another session of Parliament, that he thought it necessary to receive a party nomination for this House so far in advance of the time? I notice that he actually received nominations for two counties; and, if I remember rightly, the reason he gave for declining the nomination in the county he now represents was that he thought it would be for the good of his health. If the election was not to take place for many months to come, and there was to be in the meantime a session of Parliament, I think it would have been better for him, instead of forsaking his old constituency in that way, and leaving the impression on the minds of the public that the climate of King's was insalubrious, to have waited till after this session, and not to have placed that stigma upon his old constituency. These things have raised in the minds of most people a doubt that the Minister was perfectly frank when he stated that it was always the intention of the Government to have a session of this House. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the impression prevails throughout the country, and it prevails largely because of the reported actions of the Ministers themselves, that they had a feeling that they did not possess the entire confidence of the members of the House, and that they also after a time recognized the fact that they did not possess the entire confidence of the people of the country. There became deeply seated in the minds of the people the idea that this country was now governed by a set of men who were in mortal fear and terror of their positions, afraid to meet Parliament, and equally afraid to meet the electorate, and that it was impossible for them to make up their minds on the question until finally somebody in mercy, or for some other reason, took hold of the matter and made up their minds for them. That is the impression which, rightly or wrongly, exists in the mind of many people in this country. Now, the hon. Ministers may ask, What reason have you for supposing that we were afraid to meet the electorate or to meet Parliament? Well, Sir, I think the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in part explains that. One can readily understand that it would be anything but a pleasant task for a Finance Minister who had pointed to the existence of a deficit in the public revenue as a proof of incapacity, to have to meet Parliament and have the fact pointed out to him, as he knew it would be clearly pointed out, that under his administration one of the largest deficits which has ever occurred in this Dominion is upon the Dominion now. He knew that if Parliament met, most effectively would be shown here the line that appeared in the fiscal returns, where it was stated that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure. He knew that here more effectively than anywhere else that fallacy would be exploded and the facts brought to light. He knew that here it would be shown that not only during the past year there was a deficit of nearly a million and a quarter dollars, but that, comparing the returns of revenue and expenditure for the nine months of this year in comparison with the nine months of last year, there was a deficit already of $3,805,983 to add to that. We can understand the hesitancy of the Finance Minister, who erstwhile was so boastful of his surpluses, to meet Parliament and have pointed out clearly to the people of the country the terrible condition into which its finances have been plunged under his mismanagement. The hon. gentleman made his answer in this House as best he could in the way of attempting to minimize that condition. He replied that there had been deficits under Sir Richard Cartwright when that hon. gentleman was Minister of Finance. True, there were, but the deficits in which occured under the administration of that hon. gentleman did not amount in all to four and a half million dollars, while in this one year alone we are threatened with a deficit of over $5,000,000. The Minister of Finance drew this further distinction, that the present deficit happened under the pressure of decreased taxation, while under the Mackenzie Administration the deficit occurred in spite of increased taxation. There the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Owing to engagements made by his predecessors in office, Sir Richard Cartwright had to increase the tariff in 1874 on many articles from fifteen to seventeen and a half per cent, but the deficits which happened under his administration were not concurrent with that increase of taxation. If the hon. gentleman would turn up the public accounts, he will see that there was a surplus in that year, and a surplus the year following, and it was only after those two years that the deficits appeared; and during the three years in which they did appear, there was great depression in trade without any extra taxation being put on the people. But in addition to the deficit of $5,000,000 of this year now staring hon. gentleman in the face, and which must be met by increased taxation or borrowing, the Government have added $8,000,000 more to the public debt. We find that we have now a public debt of $250,000,000,

or $50 per head for every man, woman and child in the country. We can readily understand that these hon. gentlemen, knowing that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would be able to point out from official figures the position in which the country stood, and knowing that they could not ignore here, as they did before the session on the public platform, the discussion of questions relative to the well-being of the country, relative to the condition of our finances, should hesitate calling Parliament together. What is the other reason given by the Finance Minister for the decreased revenue, and failure to establish an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure? Carefully avoiding the word "deficit," he used the word "equilibrium" on which to balance himself. He said absolutely what is found in the Speech from the Throne. Really it would be pleasant to find a little humour even in a Speech from the Throne, if we could be expected to make merry in such grave circumstances. What is one of the reasons alleged for this failure to produce an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure? It is the recent reduction and removal of taxation. Now, the hon. Minister himself must have smiled as he dictated that excuse to Her Majesty's representative. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out on the public platform, not long ago, how he had ascertained by comparison that this reduction and removal of taxation amounted to just three-tenths of one per cent; and after Parliament met and he had obtained access to further information, he found by further comparison that he had made a mistake in his calculation, and been unjust to the Minister of Finance by giving him credit for more than he deserved. Instead of three-tenths of one per cent reduction in taxation, the reduction has been only one-tenth of one per cent. That is the showing which has been made of the finances of the country. It will be for the Finance Minister to make any further explanations that he may devise to account for this state of affairs. I have noticed, as far as I can recollect, all the reasons which he has given so far, and I fail to perceive that he has in view any scheme of improvement or of remedy save his delusive dream of increased economy. On that point you can place no reliance whatever on the hon. gentleman's promises, for last year he made a similar plea, and yet, comparing the nine months of the previous year, we find that not only has the revenue decreased, but the expenditure has increased over half a million dollars. The hon. gentleman cannot shirk this question. On the public platform he has done so, but he cannot do so in this House. The Finance Minister visited Ontario some time ago, but very carefully, in discussing public matters, steered clear of the question of finance. Although this was a subject of all-absorbing interest to the people, concerning which it was his peculiar duty to enlighten them, he preferred to leave this question of the addition to the national debt, this question of increased taxation, this question of the deficit or want of equilibrium, as he euphemistically puts it, between revenue and expenditure aside altogether, and devoted his attention to a subject in which there was something swelling and augmenting, something which could revive a semblance of the old spirit of bye-gone days when the National Policy was in its glory and hon. gentlemen opposite were dazzling the people, with its seductive promises. So, Sir, instead of discussing the finances, we find him dilating at great length upon the enormous increase in our export cheese trade. Well, now, I wonder what that had to do with the question or what credit the Minister was desirous of claiming from the increase of export of our cheese. What impression would he seek to make upon the minds of the people of this country? True, the exports did increase. But the Minister himself will hardly care in this matter, to follow the example of one of his supporters who declared—and I think he fully believed it when he said it—that the hens were laying larger eggs than they did before the National Policy was introduced. The Finance Minister, I know, has too much regard for his own reputation to claim that owing to the beneficial influence of the National Policy there is a larger flow of milk or an improvement in the quality of the milk yielded by the cows. He cannot claim credit, so far as the cheese industry is concerned, for the National Policy, the duty being the same as it was under the administration of Sir Richard Cartwright as Finance Minister. So while the hon. gentleman talked upon questions of that kind it was because he wished to find something he could point to in which the country was advancing, but in all these other matters, in which, instead of making advance we have retrograded, the Minister was found silent and with nothing to say. But Parliament has met, the people's representatives are here; the public documents must soon be laid before us and then the questions must be discussed, as discussed it certainly will be. And, Sir, I think that when it is fully discussed the feeling of alarm at the present condition of affairs which is now in the minds of the people of Canada will be deepened and strengthened, and gentlemen opposite will find that they were wise in their day and generation, if they desired to remain a little longer in office, that they decided upon the alternative, unpleasant though it was to them, of meeting Parliament rather than submit themselves to the verdict of the electors at the time they thought of doing so. I have a word to say with reference to a remark of

the Minister of Justice concerning the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Sir, you will remember that the hon. Minister said that the hon. member for South Oxford found it necessary to arm himself with a certificate of character from the leader of the Opposition when he entered the county of South Oxford again in order to be present at the nomination of a candidate of his party in that county. This is a free country, no man has the right to say that he has the right to a certain seat in this House to the exclusion of other aspirants. More than that, it is an honour to which any man may well aspire to be nominated by one of the great parties in any of our ridings to represent the people in Parliament. And it is not a strange thing that new aspirants might be found seeking the nomination. But my hon. friend did not arm himself with a testimonial from the leader of the Opposition, in order to secure the nomination. But, Sir, reports had been circulated that his leader was not anxious to have him here as——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, hear, hear, He did not ask that for he knew his leader's feelings in the matter. But when that report was circulated, there were men in that county who wrote to see what opinion was held of the presence of the hon. member for South Oxford in this House by his leader and by others. And these gentlemen had a letter from the leader of the Opposition. That letter was not received by the hon. member for South Oxford, who did not need it and never asked for it. And, Sir, I have this to say—that that letter expressed the sentiments of the members on this side of the House, I think I can say universally. And I want to add, moreover, that the hon. gentlemen received the nomination in that county in which the nomination of his party means election, and that he will not have to leave South Oxford and go to some other riding more salubrious in its climate for him than his old riding. And I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice this question, having given him light upon that other point: Suppose a report were circulated in his riding by any one desirous of suceeding him and getting the nomination of his party; and suppose that one of his constituents should write a letter to the leader of this Government stating that it was reported that the feeling of the leader was not exactly friendly to the Minister, and that his colleagues were not anxious to have him back, I wonder what answer would be sent by the leader of this Government to the hon. Minister's constituents under that condtion of affairs. It would be as well to have that inquired into. I should not be surprised—if we may believe the tale that is told in the Conservative newspapers—that there would not be the same implicit confidence expressed in the letter to that constituent as gentlemen opposite are forced to admit was expressd in the letter to the constituent of Sir Richard Cartwright who asked the leader of the Opposition for similar information.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an unthinkable case.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know that it is quite unthinkable. I do trust, however, if such a letter is written that in his large-hearted forgiveness, if there should have been—which the Minister would naturally wish to deny—any unpleasantness or loss of confidence among them, they will draw themselves together in the face of such a letter, and that they may be able, without too great a wrench to the economy of truth, to give a fair and pleasant answer to the question. Let me say that if the Government are pleased to meet Parliament, the Opposition for their part are equally pleased to meet the hon. gentlemen opposite. We should have been pleased, as I said before, if the meeting had taken place earlier in the year. But even coming as it does we are prepared to come and discuss the questions at issue between us. It seems that we have met under happy circumstances—the Ministers happy to meet Parliament and the Parliament happy to meet the Ministers. I hope this harmony will not be disturbed. But the Minister will understand that while we are anxious to preserve the harmony of the occasion, it would be impossible for us, with a due sense of truth and justice, to refrain from pointing out—in the most delicate manner possible consistent with the facts—some of the iniquities of which they have been guilty. We will do it in the mildest manner possible. That this is our desire is shown by the fact that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech, in referring to these matters, used no words stronger than "villainous." And I think it must be admitted that he could not have modified that while doing justice to himself and to the facts of the case. If we should have occasion to speak of the gerrymander as cowardly, I think the hon. Minister will agree that a proper regard for truth would not warrant us in using any milder terms; for such an act could not be proposed by any British statesman, such a thing could hardly by any possibility enter the mind of a man with a true sense of fair play. And when we have to allude to acts or meditated acts in the same direction, if they should attempt to perpetrate them, the hon. gentlemen will understand that if similar expressions are used on this side, it will not be for the purpose of disturbing harmony, but for the true and proper discussion of the question and a proper labelling of the article they are offering. In the same way, of the Franchise Act, when we speak of it as a most wasteful expenditure of money and a curtailment of the rights of the people, he will understand that we are actu-

ated only by a sense of duty and that we desire only to speak of the thing in such a way that the people may understand its true character. When we speak of their extravagance being gross they will recognize the fitness of the word when they think of the present state of the finances, of the expenditures they have made and the purposes for which they have made them. When we hint that their conduct of public affairs is not wholly without corruption, they will recognize that that is as mild a way as it can be put when we see public buildings erected in constituencies sending to this House supporters of the Government though other grounds for their construction are lacking, and public buildings refused where they are wanted, for no other reason than the fact that the people declare that they cannot conscientiously send here a representative to support the present Government. When we allude to the damage to business that is created through their vascillation, through their lack of nerve, through their lack of decision, the whole country disquieted, not knowing what to expect, Sir, when we have to discuss this, and have to characterize the present Government, viewed in all these aspects as being incapable of filling the position in which they are placed, and when we say that it is time for them to give way to other and more capable men, they will understand that we speak from no selfish motive, but that we earnestly desire it simply in the interest of the people of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. I intend to occupy the House for a very brief period. Sir, I congratulate the leading members of the Opposition on having broken out in a new vein. This evening we have had a speech from my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and if we extract the jokes from that speech—which, no doubt, he thought the plums thereof—very little in the way of argument remains. Indeed, he dwelt so long on the new baby, and discussed its probable fatherhood, and dwelt so fondly on its sex, that I could no help thinking that he dilated on that baby with all the garrulity of a mid-wife. Sir, the other evening the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was, I will say, exceptionally happy. During fifteen or sixteen years of prosperity that hon. gentleman has stood up in this House, and the scowl with which he looked upon the fair prospect was something like that which Milton tells us the leader of the spiritual opposition looked on Eden, when in all its unsullied loveliness, it first met his eye. But Sir, on Friday evening the hon. member for South Oxford appeared in a light and character that were to me a revelation, and which, I can say with the utmost sincerity, was extremely gratifying. Sir, he proved that evening that he was not born under a wholly gloomy star, and, contrary to the universal impression, especially amongst his own party, he made it evident that a genial emotion could play over the sullen surface of that dark and brooding mind. Sir, if one had regard only to the hon. gentleman for South Oxford, one could wish that we had perpetual deficits in order that we might have the hon. gentleman in perennial good humour. Sir, it may be accountable on the theory of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who introduced this debate in a speech so eloquent and so effective that we are witnessing joy at the meeting of an old friend. It may be that we are face to face with a psychological phenomenon of great interest, and that while prosperous and happy conditions can only excite emotions of ruin and dismay, the prospect of what is sad and unhappy provokes sentiments of gratulation and delight and gives birth to smiles. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Paterson) who has just sat down, he, too, was witty; he, too, was sarcastic. But the gem of the sarcasm of that hon. gentleman was the way he rang the changes on the unhappy phrase used by the Minister of Finance, "restore the equilibrium." Why, Sir, he little thought that with his powers of sarcasm he was actually impaling his own leaders, he was actually striking at his own leaders. I have before me here the Queen's Speech for 1877, of which I will read you a paragraph. Now, I cannot do full justice to this Speech, as my hon. friend does to that phrase, because the range of my voice does not quite go up the whole diapason of eloquence like his. This is what I read in the Queen's Speech in 1877:

> Notwithstanding the loss of revenue consequent chiefly upon the diminution of our importations, the reductions effected during the current year have gone far to restore equilibrium between economy and expenditure.

Now, Sir, where is all the scorn which the hon. gentleman heaps on the Treasury benches? Why, Sir, it is your own phrase, or, to adopt the figure of one of the leaders of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman apparently does not know one of his own chickens when it comes home to roost. Now, Sir, it is, so far as I know, an unprecedented thing in my own parliamentary experience that we should have a lengthened debate on the Address, and is quite unusual, unless an amendment is to be proposed; so, very rapidly I want to refer to the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell. He defended my hon. and learned friend the leader of the Opposition for his silence on an important question, and he quoted Sir Robert Peel, who said it was quite time enough for him to prescribe when he was called in. I believe that in going through the country the hon. and learned gentleman who leads Her Majesty's Opposition with so much dis-

tinction, also said it would be time enough for him to prescribe when he was called in. I grant you, Sir, that there are times when it is a perfectly proper thing for a leader of an Opposition to say, in regard to a given state of things, that it would be quite time enough for him to prescribe when he was called in. But in regard to this school question, the hon. and learned gentleman is not in the position to-day, he has not been in that position for months back, and if he had been in that position before the remedial order was issued by this Government, he has never been in that position since it was issued. Now, Sir, the hon. and learned gentleman has gone all over the country and he has referred to this school question. He referred to it one time as a legal question, and another time as a question of fact, and at other times he has said, If Protestant schools existed up there, it was an outrage, and he would do away with it. But, Sir, the humblest man that listened to him when he came west, the humblest man that has listened to him all over the country, knows well that the whole time he has crept around this question, looking askance at it, not, as the hon. member for Bothwell said, like the animal that was asked to take the chestnuts out of the fire, but regarding it as a subject that he himself was afraid to touch with a pitchfork. This is the more extraordinary on the part of the hon. and learned gentleman, although he is one of the most accomplished men in Canada, a master of expression, born of French-Canadian parents, I believe, and educated in his mother tongue, yet, I can safely say, if I may dare pronounce an opinion, that in my own native tongue, English, he is a master of expression ; but standing in the very first rank in Canada as a master of expression and an accomplished rhetorician, he is also a man ready, at nearly all times, to give lavish and even reckless opinions. We know an occasion when he gave a lavish and reckless opinion in regard to the rebellion in the North-west ; we know an occasion when in, 1891, in Boston he gave, what I think, was a reckless opinion, and if this were the place to do it I would say an opinion that one could impugn and arraign. But the question of the Manitoba schools which has now been before this country so long, the hon. gentleman avoided and still avoids giving an opinion. He is not in the position that members of the Government occupy. I am not now discussing whether the Government did right or wrong.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. If there is any comfort in that statement, the hon. gentleman can have it stated again. I will express my opinion, I have already given it ; but that is not the point with which I am dealing with at the present moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. All the laughter and interruptions in the world cannot divert me from what I am going to accomplish.

An hon. MEMBER. You can divert us.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall dissect the position of the leader of the Opposition ; I shall do it calmly and with the utmost respect to the subject. The hon. gentleman, as I have said, is not in the position occupied by the Government. The Government, acting rightly or wrongly, decided that they would ascertain what was their legal position. The matter went into the courts. After the Government had decided to obtain a legal decision as to their position on the question there was no man, no private member of this House, as the leader of the Opposition is, although he occupies a most important position, who was not perfectly free to express his opinion, and a number of his friends throughout the country, as well as a number of the friends of the Government, have given their opinions on the question. But if there could be found a proper excuse for the leader of the Opposition withholding his opinion while the question was before the courts, if he could have argued that as the question was before the courts he was not to be called upon to advise the advisers of His Excellency and so forth, after the decision of the Privy Council had been given, there was not, I may tell the hon. and learned gentleman, among his friends and followers in the west a shadow of doubt as to what his duty was, namely, to declare forthwith his opinion as to what should be done with this question. The hon. gentleman, if I rightly gather his real sentiment by inference from a remark made on Friday, has through his reticence or indecision, even missed his opportunity, in my opinion. If he had then declared that the time had come for remedial legislation he would have gained supporters. I am not saying he should have done it.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Let the hon. member laugh as he pleases, I shall show from the speech delivered on Friday night by the leader of the Opposition what his ideas are apparrently on this question. Sir, if he had then and there decided—I am now speaking how it would have operated politically, and of course we could not suppose he would have so acted if he had not entertained that opinion—and I am speaking now as a critic, looking at his action from a political standpoint—he would have obtained the credit of forcing the Government's hand, and it would have assisted him in Quebec while the Government could have taken no other course than that they adopted. What would have been the result ? The hon. gentleman would have

stood just as well as the Government stands to-day with Ontario and the west. Where is the hon. gentleman? Still pursuing my role as a critic. He must do one of three things. The hon. gentleman either must endorse what the Government have done, or go one better, entailing disaster to him in Manitoba, Ontario and the West; or the hon. gentleman must declare, and that would destroy him in Quebec, for provincial rights. Apparently the hon. gentleman shrinks from giving an opinion now, although prominent followers have expressed opinions, and although at this moment an opinion from him on the floor of Parliament, an authoritative opinion from him, might go far to induce, what we all desire to see done, Mr. Greenway and his colleagues and the legislature of Manitoba to come forward and deal with this question. I do not believe—and I gather from the expressions made use of by the leader of the Opposition, that such is not his desire—there is any man within my hearing so unpatriotic as to wish that the legislature of Manitoba shall be so wanting in respect to itself as not to approach this question with the solemnity that it demands, considering its character, the number of persons affected, the opinion influenced by it and the authority of the tribunal that launched that question on its lap; that any man is so unpatriotic as to desire to see it sent back to this House with all the unfortunate and irritating issues that might follow its return, and if the hon. and learned gentleman who leads the Opposition were to speak now he would redeem himself from being in the position of a leader who will not lead but allows a follower here and there to instruct him as to what should be done. Yet the hon. gentleman may be for aught I know, quietly and patriotically trying to influence his friends in the Manitoba Assembly to deal with this question, because I gather from his speech that he desires to have this question removed from the arena of political discussion and thus be allowed freely to harp on the trade question in the way he has been doing for some time past and again has done in this House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAVIN. When the House rose at Six o'clock, I was about to call attention to a circumstance that probably indicates that, whether under the influence of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition or not, the Manitoba Government intends to deal with this question. I say here, repeating what I said before, that it would from every standpoint be most unfortunate if the legislature and government of Manitoba should so far forget what was due to the dignity of the province, what was due to itself, and what was due to the Dominion at large, as not to treat with becoming respect and examine with statesmanlike care the message that was sent to them by the representative of Her August Majesty in the Dominion of Canada. Sir, when that message reached the Government of Manitoba, the leader in the Assembly—I think it was Mr. Sifton, Mr. Greenway being ill—moved an adjournment to the 9th of May next. Many persons thought that adjournment too long, but I take no such view. The reason given by the mover for that adjournment was a most proper and constitutional reason, namely: that for a question of this magnitude and importance, and novelty, it was most important that they should have ample time to consider it. But, Sir, what was the spectacle that shortly before the 17th day of this month astonished all Canada and scandalized, not merely the Conservatives of Manitoba and the North-west, but I can say advisedly, because I heard their expressions, scandalized the best men in the Reform party in Manitoba and the Territories. What was it we saw? We saw the Attorney General of Manitoba, the next in command to the Premier, he who is not only one of the jury to consider this important question, not only a Minister, but the legal adviser of the Government and the legal guide of the Assembly; the question one which the House adjourned for time to consider, and on which he would have to pronounce on the 9th of next month—what was our astonishment, and the astonishment of the whole West, to see that gentleman leave his office and leave his province and go down to Haldimand to engage in an election contest in which the school question was before the people, and to there express apparently the strongest opinions that could be uttered on an issue in regard to which he was one of the judges and one of the jury. Here he is, the Attorney General, the law officer of the Government, a man that, therefore, we should expect to be peculiarly circumspect in a case of this kind, here he is in Haldimand behaving like a reckless juryman, who, obtaining leave to go out and get a drink of water or something else, blabs abroad what he intends to do, and what his brother jurymen intend to do when they come to deliver their verdict, although even if their minds are made up there is ample time for them to come to another conclusion. That was the humiliating position that Mr. Sifton placed himself in. The "Globe" newspaper, in its edition of the 15th of April, the leading organ of the Reform party in Ontario, published the speech of Mr. Sifton in extenso, and, presumably endorsing it as expressing the opinion of the great mass of the Reform party. Now, the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) said again and again on platform after platform: "I am told that the schools in Manitoba

are Proestant schools : and if they are Protestant schools, and if I come into power, I would certainly feel bound to interfere, and I would see that this great scandal was removed." My hon. and learned friend (Mr. Laurier), amongst the many fine mental gifts he possesses, has this remarkable mental peculiarity, or excellence, probably some might regard it, that it is the inveterate habit of his mind to express a proposition by implication. I doubt, however, if the hon. gentleman always sees the proposition to which by implication he commits himself. When the hon. gentleman said : If these schools are Protestant, and if I get into power, I should feel bound to interfere with them, what was the proposition which by implication he committed himself to ? Sir, he committed himself to this proposition, and, in my opinion, it is a logical sequence ; he committed himself to the proposition : that if these schools were secular, if no religion whatever was taught in them, that he would not feel himself bound to interfere at all. However, the hon. gentleman never said that in so many words, and in the speech which he made in this House on Friday last he said :

> Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and also my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley), who seconded the Address, dilated at some length on a question which my hon. friend from Simcoe called a question of sentiment : the Manitoba school question. The language of the speech is in that respect very discreet. The elections are over. * * * *

The hon. gentleman goes on to condemn the remedial order because its language was too peremptory and likely to irritate Manitoba. Here again there is an implied proposition behind that, and the implied proposition is : that it would be desirable that Manitoba should approach this question in a spirit of sympathy and with the view of dealing with it finally, and that their so approaching it was imperilled in consequence of the peremptory language of the order. The speeches of the hon. gentleman on the platform would lead us sometimes to think that in his heart he is in favour of provincial rights and secular schools, while his speech of Friday last indicated that he is really in favour of Manitoba dealing with this question, in the spirit at least, if not the letter, of the suggestions of the Privy Council of the Empire. The hon. leader of the Opposition is a statesman, and he is a statesman of experience, and he is a statesman of whom this House and all Canada is proud, and, being a statesman, in his heart of hearts he must desire that the government and legislature of Manitoba shall deal with this question—if dealt with it is to be—and not this House and not this Government, whatever party may be in power. Now, Sir, Mr. Sifton went to Haldimand, and he declared in a speech there, that the condition of things in Manitoba before the year 1890 was something deplorable. He indicated, in fact, in a polite way, that the Roman Catholics there were accustomed, by some sleight of hand, to get a great deal more money than they were entitled to, and to pay less taxes than they ought to pay. (The statement will be found in the second column of Mr. Sifton's speech. I will not read it, as I do not wish to weary the House with extracts.) Mr. Sifton goes on to describe that a sum of $10,000 was paid for management, whereas $60,000 was the appropriation for schools, and he tells us that the Roman Catholic population were in a state of the greatest possible illiteracy. Well, Sir, he fails apparently to see that before 1890 the legislature of Manitoba might have dealt with that ; and, in fact, his speech, even though it was intended to appeal strongly to the people with the view of exciting them, would seem, if looked carefully through, to be a speech made by a man not necessarily in favour of the legislation of 1890, but in favour of such legislation, for instance, as took place in the North-west Territories. What occurred the other day in the North-west Territories ? We had a meeting there of a Protestant bishop, a Roman Catholic priest, a leading Roman Catholic layman, a leading Protestant layman, and the four members of the executive. What was the system they had before them ? What did they arrange for ? They arranged for a programme of instruction from half-past nine in the morning until three in the afternoon, which should be exactly the same in every school in the Territories ; but after three o'clock there should be religious teaching in accordance with the suggestions of the trustees. I was assured by more than one man, and men differing in religion, that at that meeting there was the greatest harmony and the most perfect contentment with the system. In the North-west Territories at the present time, from half-past nine until three, the children in the schools, whether they are taught by Sisters or Brothers, or by young men or young women not in orders, are taught precisely the same things ; and a great deal of what Mr. Sifton says might apply to such a system as that. But what I want to point out is this. Mr. Sifton is very hard on the Dominion Government. In speaking to the people of Haldimand, he tries to make out that the Dominion Government has handed over the legislature of Manitoba a hard and fast system which the people of that province must swallow, and that if they do not swallow it it will come back and will have to be proposed here by this Government. Sir, I know Mr. Sifton by repute, and I think I have the honour of slightly knowing him personally. He is an able lawyer, and probably the ablest, certainly one of the two ablest of the prominent Liberals of that province ; and the speech I am referring to is not one that I would have expected from him. I might

have expected the speech of a statesman, but this is a speech of a personality half demagogue and half technical lawyer. Of the Dominion Government, he says:

They are making an order which will consign one-third of our population to ignorance and illiteracy, and it is as plain as the nose on any man's face that the reason why that order has been made is simply for the purpose of buying the votes of the province of Quebec.

Further he says:

These religious exercises, the Act says, shall be held at the public school entirely at the option of the trustees for the district, so that if the trustees do not want to have religious exercises, they need not have any. There is no ground for the idea that these schools are Protestant schools, and that the Roman Catholic people are obliged to send their children to schools where they will be required to attend at Protestant exercises.

Therefore, if the hon. and learned leader of the Opposition can rely upon a distinguished friend and supporter, he would have no reason whatever for interfering. He goes on further to say:

We have been told we must restore a system which will destroy and cripple our educational system, and the Government has sent a member back to Haldimand to ask for re-election. What does this re-eleection mean? * * * * * * * You are asked to approve of that Act, and if Dr. Montague goes back to the House of Commons, it will be said that the people of Haldimand approve of the order that was made; that they approve of the Government imposing the original separate school system, which they are seeking to impose upon Manitoba, and that they declare that the Government and Parliament are bound to act if the legislature of Manitoba refuses to carry out the order, and I have no hesitation in saying that the legislature will refuse to carry out the order.

Of course, the people listening to that would come to the conclusion that what Mr. Sifton meant was that the legislature would refuse absolutely to consider the remedial order. That is what he intended to convey to the audience, but of course it is open to the construction—and a quibbling and pettifogging legal mind might put it forward with the object of conveying that construction "we will not adopt the remedial order in its literalness"—and I intend in a little while to call the attention of the House to this, and make a point in reference thereto. He goes on to say.

When the legislature meets on May 9th, and when the resolution is introduced and passed, as it will be, refusing to carry out that order, the Government of Canada are bound by every consideration of constitutional law and common sense to bring in a bill to carry out that order in toto, in the same terms in which it was passed, to impose on us the system of separate schools which we had prior to 1890. You hear people say that they don't intend to do that. There is no more doubt that the Government of Canada will do that than that I am speaking here.

Mr. DAVIN.

Although the closing paragraph of the decision of the Imperial Privy Council points out that a literal reproduction of the acts bringing separate schools into existence was not at all necessary. Mr. Sifton goes on:

When they passed the Order in Council they committed themselves to the policy which that order contains. They are bound to bring in the necessary legislation. Mr. Ouimet says that the Government will bring in legislation, that it will be passed, and that the old separate school system will be restored in Manitoba. Whether Dr. Montague is elected or not, when the answer comes back from the province of Manitoba that it will not accept the order which has been made, there will be introduced by the Government of Canada a law for the purpose of giving effect to that order, unless something happens in the meantime which will show enough members of the House of Commons that the people of Canada do not intend to stand that sort of thing. What I am here to ask you for is to ask you not to do Dr. Montague any injury, but to say to the members of the House of Commons that the people of Haldimand do not approve of that order being made. I ask you for once to forget whether you are Liberals or Conservatives, and to cast one vote for sound principle and for Canada.

Of course he was not there to do the Secretary of State an injury, but he was there to try to defeat him when he was on the threshold of ministerial ambition. Now, Sir, in view of such a speech as that, I cannot acquit the hon. leader of the Opposition of being wanting in his duty to his party and to Canada in refraining to speak so as to influence the Liberal Government and the Liberal majority in the Manitoba legislature. Demosthenes compared the people of Athens to an unskilled pugilist who always put up a guard where he was last struck. The hon. gentleman, for the last two or three years, has always, in every changing attitude and circumstances, put up the same guard, and we have it now. He cannot speak at this time because it is none of his business to advise His Excellency. But we cannot let him off so easily. The people of Canada, the Liberal party especially, this House, have a right to know what his opinion is on this great question. Instead of that, what do we hear? From such a man, in such a position, and at such a time, on a hundred platforms from Halifax to Vancouver, and here in this House, on this great, this perilous question, we hear nothing but sounding phrases of calculated inanity. But he may be, as I suggested before recess, really secretly influencing hon. gentlemen in the Manitoba Legislature. An hon. gentleman who used to sit in this House, and not far from where I usually sit, is, I am told, in Ottawa. And I am told that the hon. gentleman, the learned and distinguished Attorney General of Manitoba is in Ottawa at present, and it is possible that ere now, it is possible that conferences may very recently have taken place, and that

after all it is dawning on the minds of gentlemen in Manitoba, who thought that this question would be a fine club with which to bludgeon Ministers of the Conservative party, might be just as fearful a weapon to destroy leaders of the Opposition. A lengthy interview with Mr. Sifton appears in the Montreal "Witness." The hon. gentleman reminds me of the tramp—I do not want to be disrespectful—who comes to you with glozing words to try and get you to give him a shilling or a dinner, but who, when you give him neither, goes from the door growling out curses at you. The hon. gentleman went to Haldimand where there is a strong Orange body. I ran there myself once—and know the county, and a finer body of men you could not find in any other part of Canada. The hon. gentleman went there and addressed them in a long and eloquent speech, for eloquent he could not fail to be. He expected to get their votes, but did not, and he gave in consequence his opinion of the Orangemen to the reporter of the "Daily Witness." It is only because the interview shows a completely different attitude from that which he took in Haldimand, and towards the close a much more statesmanlike attitude, that I refer to it at all. I refer to it because it is a great gratification to me to know that a gentleman occupying so high a position is about to take a much more rational view of his duty than he seemed to take at Haldimand. He was asked by his interviewer how it was Mr. Montague was not beaten. He replied :

People like to shout with the crowd and chiefly with the biggest crowd. I did not think McCarthy would win in Haldimand nor had I a great interest in his winning.

Although he made long speeches and told the people of the bad effect which public opinion in Ontario would have on Manitoba, if the Secretary of State were not elected to stay at home, still he did not wish to do the hon. member for Haldimand the least harm. All he wanted was to kill him politically. Then he went on to say :—

There is a general impression that the people of Manitoba are disposed to trample on the rights of the Roman Catholic minority simply because they are strong in number and without regard to reason or justice. I need not say that that is all nonsense. It was to dispel ignorance of our position that I entered the fight at Haldimand. I think I succeeded in doing that, for the speeches at a bye election are more readily read than similar matter would be if put in the form of a letter to the press.

So it was to do something like what could be done in a letter to the press, only more emphatically, that the hon. gentleman went down to Haldimand. He had no interest whatever in the result. He went on to say :—

The results in Antigonish and Verchères, on the other hand, were highly significant, because the remedial order was made the ground of acceptance of the Government candidate and the people rejected this claim.

How historical that is we all know. The reporter asked him :—

How do you account for the attitude of the Orangemen in the Haldimand contest ?

The answer will be interesting reading to those Orangemen who have recently in different parts of the Dominion been appealed to, on various grounds to desert their old friends :

How do you account for the attitude of the Orangemen in the Haldimand election ? The Orangemen have been passing resolutions all over the country, insisting upon the principle of public schools for Manitoba, offering their moral and material support to the Government and condemning all connection between Church and State.

"All not worth that." Mr. Sifton cracked his fingers contemptuously.

These are the men he was, but a few days before, with honied words seeking to win to his case and whom he was urging to keep the Secretary of State at home. Said the reporter :—

Are the Orangemen unreliable as a political factor ?

"On the contrary," said the Attorney-General, a little bitterly, "they are very reliable—to shout for you, and go out and vote for your opponent."

There is the bitterness—I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you have never felt it, I hope that no member of this House has felt it,—but there is the bitterness of misplaced affection. He goes on to say—and mind now that he can only speak of Orangemen of what he knows of Manitoba Orangemen because he knows them best. He said :—

I know where they are. They are quite reliable. The Orangemen came to our meetings and applauded. Apparently they were enthusiastically in favour of Mr. McCarthy—and I must say that some of them really worked and voted for him—but most of the men who shouted the loudest at our meetings went out and voted for Montague.

And then Mr. Sifton dropped a metaphorical tear and said :—

It is pleasanter to go with the big crowd, you know.

"And is it not a little singular," said Mr. Sifton, smilingly, "that many of the Ontario papers that commended the notion of my entering into the campaign, and patted me on the back for the stand I took, have wavered since they saw Dr. Montague's figures.

Again he drops a metaphorical tear and heaves a sigh :

It is always safe to shout with the crowd, you know.

And the reporter does not add that he lifted his handkerchief to his eyes—but we can imagine that. Now, Sir, what follows is important, for in his interview, away from the passions of the hustings, he shows what are the views of Mr. Sifton in regard to this question. And I commend these views to

the people of Haldimand, for they are not the views he expounded upon the platform in that county:

"But the result in Haldimand,"——

Said the reporter——

——"makes no difference in your attitude?"

My attitude was somewhat misrepresented by the press——

I suppose that was not the Ministerial press; I suppose that was his own, the Opposition press.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. DAVIN——

"My attitude was somewhat misrepresented by the press through insufficient care in following my statements. I have been made to say that the Manitoba Government would listen to neither argument nor reason, but took its stand upon the new law, heedless what could be said or urged. Now, my position, and the position of the Government, which I clearly defined in all my speeches, was this: the Federal Government has issued a remedial order. We assume that this is the reasoned decision of the members of the Cabinet, who have given the matter consideration. This order means the restoration of the old school system in its entirety, as it formerly existed. It means the unqualified teachers and an inefficient system. The Manitoba Government will never go back to that. That is what I stated. That is what I now repeat."

Here we have great Reformers showing by implication what are their real opinions; and the fact is, Sir, that a man cannot go speaking from Dan to Beersheba and submitting to interviews everywhere, and always keep locked in his own bosom the profound conclusions he has formed upon the various questions he discusses. So it would seem from the latest utterances—this is from the "Witness" of Saturday, 20th instant; and I suppose that it was on the morning of that day or the evening of the previous day that he was met by the reporter—and I commend it to the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I commend it to all our friends in this House, as showing that the Attorney General in his saner moments is a very different man from the Attorney General when heated with passion and determined by hook or by crook and in defiance of all the decencies of political and ministerial life to strike a blow at the Conservative party of the Dominion. When he is speaking with passion upon a platform in Haldimand, he is a very different man from that we see when he is being interviewed at Montreal. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen who have spoken have all said they would not deal with the trade question. I will follow their example—I also will say that I will not deal with the trade question. But, as I have said that I will follow their example, of course you will naturally expect me to devote the greater part of what I have to say to the trade question. But I will not go deeply into it. And I will tell you why: because one does not need to go deeply into it to expose the propositions of hon. gentlemen and blow them to the winds. Why, Sir, take the speech of my hon. and learned friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am proud to say that I am glad to read what he writes, I like to hear him speak; I can always learn something from him. But, Sir, Homer sometimes nods; and my hon. friend fell into the great error of going away from constitutional lore, from May, from Todd, from what Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell said on various constitutional questions; he made the mistake of quoting a book that, I suppose, since his constitutional and political studies have become so exigent, he does not read so often as he used in his earlier days—he quoted from the Bible, and he quoted wrongly. He said, Sir, that the Finance Minister had adopted the scriptural rule, "Put not your trust in Kings." That is not what the scripture says: it is: "Put not your trust in Princes." But, doubtless, it had dawned on the hon. gentleman's mind: The Finance Minister is not going to run for King's; was there not a quotation somewhere in the Bible about Kings? is not there a pun I can make, cannot I flash my wit upon this dull House and make its slumbering waves quiver? Yes, "Put not your trust in Kings." Now I will try a proverb—I do not see why Solomon should engross all the proverbs to himself. This is my proverb—Let no constitutional lawyer put his trust in his memory, when he quotes Scripture. Well, Sir, my hon. friend in that speech—which I will say was not characterized by that close-knit reasoning that so often distinguishes his utterances in this House; it was somewhat rambling—took exception to the Minister of Justice quoting Lord Salisbury's speech as to what my hon. friend called blue ruin in England. Well, Sir, the hon. the leader of the Opposition came west and told us everywhere throughout that country that he wanted to give us free trade as they had it in England; but he always added that it would take a long time before we could get there. So that all he could do would be to give us a shadow of free trade as it is in England. But it is not merely Lord Salisbury who tells us that the state of England is deplorable; nor is it alone the figures brought forward in that eloquent speech of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Sir James Grant), that show us that England is in a deplorable condition. We have in the paper of "To-day," a picture of England under free trade, showing that, not merely in the farming districts, but in the manufacturing districts as well, England is in a deplorable condition. Sir, we have here the utterances of a great Liberal on this very question, given in one of the strongholds of free trade, Birmingham. Mr. Chamberlain, one——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Chamberlain?

Mr. DAVIN. I beg pardon.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Don't mention him.

Mr. DAVIN. I see my hon. friend perceives that in this matter discretion is the better part of valour. Mr. Chamberlain said:

I am inclined to think that in our staple trades —for instance, the coal trade, in the iron trade, in the cotton trade, and above all in the greatest of all our trades, the trade of agriculture—the margin of profit has entirely disappeared. Up to the present time wages have not fallen at all in proportion, but if the present state of things continues, it is simply inevitable either that wages will have to be considerably reduced or that works will be closed, land will be idle, and the numbers of the unemployed will be largely increased. Under these circumstances, which we are bound as courageous men to look in the face, it is not wonderful that people are seeking everywhere for remedies, and it appears to me not to be wonderful either that some people are ready almost to take any remedy which is offered without considering whether the prescription may not be worse than the disease.

I find that there are a number of people, and I think an increasing number, who, under the present condition of trade, are coming to the conclusion that our free trade policy has been a failure—(cheers).

Cheers in Birmingham. I say it is most significant that that sentence should be cheered in Birmingham; and I say here that if the hon. member means to give us a cheap country to live in and free trade, I fancy we shall find ourselves not living in a cheaper country, because at the present time, as has been admitted to me by farmer after farmer in the west, the great staples are cheaper than ever they were; and leading Patrons have said to me that the necessaries of life and the great staples are cheaper than ever they were. So that what I said of the position taken by the leader of the Opposition on the school question, will apply exactly to this trade question. He tells you that the country is in a deplorable state, that it was never in such a bad state as it is at present, but he does not tell you what he will do. Will he say again that he has no right to advise people, that he will only prescribe when he is called in? Surely if he has a panacea that would cure the desperate state of things that he says exists, and is solely traceable to the tariff, why does he not produce it? Why does he not show and explain what changes he would make, and how these changes would affect the result? Now, what does he say on page 30 of the "Hansard"?:

To-day there is a plaintive admission that Canada is suffering, though in a minor degree, from a universal depression. Depression, says my hon. friend from East Simcoe. But then, Where is the virtue of the National Policy?

Now, there again we have my hon. and learned friend's style of political discussion. He states that there is distress, there is depression. Where, then, he says, is the virtue of the National Policy? Now, what is the value of that question? That question is of no value unless he can establish two propositions—that it was the end and aim of the National Policy to prevent depression; and that it was so stated. Why, Sir, nobody ever held that the National Policy could guard against depression; nobody ever laid down that was the object. On page 31, the hon. gentleman speaks in a way showing that he himself does not believe it—he speaks of "cycles of depression which come periodically." Yes, cycles of depression come periodically, whatever tariff you have, whether you have free trade or whether you have protection, they come periodically, for when you have depression in protected America, you have depression in free-trade England; when you have depression in protected France, you have depression in free-trade England. Take the period between 1875 and 1878, you had depression during most of those years. You had depression in England, you had depression in the States, you had depression the world over, showing clearly that the form of the tariff you have has nothing whatever to do with depression. Depression, Sir, is produced by over-production, and over-trading, and the banks becoming stringent and refusing to give accommodation, and the over-trading is stopped, and the over-production is stopped; and, after a time, we get out of the trough of depression and once more go on, whether we have a protective tariff or not. So when the hon. gentleman asked, what, then is the virtue of the National Policy? he betrays precisely the same kind of mental habit that I alluded to before; he implies propositions which, when examined, are found to have no cogency or relevancy whatever. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Bothwell referred to 1873 and 1878, and so did the hon. member for Oxford; and he talked of taxation at that time. Mr. Speaker, I am not going into that, but we know this, that after having added 7,000 or 8,000 miles to our railway system, after having brought about the greatest possible progress in every form of national activity, according to the returns up to and inclusive of 1893, the interest that falls on each individual in Canada is $1.74; whereas, in 1878, it was $1.58; so that about a cent a year, as has been often pointed out, is all that has been added to the interest that each man pays, notwithstanding that we have spanned this great continent with an iron bridge, that we have deepened our canals, that we have progressed within these fifteen or sixteen years at a rate that neither the United States not England nor hardly any other country I know of, can compare with—all that done, and the interest on the debt increased only a few cents.

Mr. McMULLEN. Bosh.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I will answer that monosyllable with another monosyllable, and I will say: "bray." Now, Sir, I rose mainly to call attention to what I deemed to be the position taken up up by a great man, which, looked at from whatever point of view, I could not understand. I will only say this now, that I rejoice to see that thus far the discussion in this House has been approached in a spirit that cannot be too highly commended. I may differ from the positions taken up; I may think there is not enough candour or enough frankness; but the spirit of moderation in which this question has been approached, a question which is calculated, I think, if approached in an improper spirit, to do great harm—the spirit in which it has been approached is, I think, a statesmanlike one, a moderate one. In view of what I read from the interview with Mr. Sifton, I think it exceedingly probable indeed that the legislature and government of Manitoba will justify their claim to statesmanship by approaching the question according to the best of their judgment—I do not care how they do it, but, according to the best of their ability—and that they will say, after deliberation, this is what we intend to do; and then, Sir, I consider they will exhibit to the people of Canada, and to the Empire, an attitude worthy of a great province, and the legislature of a great province, and they will help to solve a question which might prove perilous to the peace and the prosperity of the Dominion.

Mr. CASEY. The debate on the Address, as has been pointed out, has taken an extremely wide range, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask those hon. gentlemen opposite, who began it? Who has compelled us to enter upon matters in the discussion of the Address, which are usually discussed on the stump? Why, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite, the occupants of the Treasury benches, began their stumping excursions through the country so long ago as last November, and continued them, with one sad interruption, up to the beginning of this session. Well, I do not object to this wide range. It has given liveliness and freedom to the debate. I hope it may give more vigour to the debate than has been exhibited by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who has just sat down. His speech is only another proof of the spirit of flatness, of the spirit of futility, that seems to have lighted upon hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, in times past, who was more flowery than the hon. member for Assiniboia? Were his speeches not like the prairie in June, full of flowers, glowing with colour, sweet with the odours of Araby the Blest? His voice dropped gems of eloquence, and milk and honey, and that sort of thing that goes to enliven a debate. I will not say that hon. gentleman's eloquence is bald, because it certainly bristles with some assertions which he had better have left unsaid. But if his eloquence was too pointed in some respects, it was very flat and insipid as a whole. The hon. gentleman told the House a great deal about the deplorable state of England, and also in regard to Mr. Sifton's misdoings in Haldimand. Here is where the bristles came into his eloquence. I cannot pass over the hon. gentleman's remarks without saying that they did not become the dignity of a member of this House, or of one who possessed the reputation of a gentleman, for that hon. gentleman said that Mr. Sifton was a pettifogging lawyer and was a tramp—the hon. gentleman compared Mr. Sifton to a tramp, although I now observe he shakes his head. The position held by Mr. Sifton in Manitoba and the North-west is quite equal to that possessed by the hon. member himself, and, moreover, it should be remembered that the gentleman referred to cannot be here to defend himself. The hon. gentleman failed to make the slightest expression of his own opinion on the question of the Manitoba schools, although at the same time he accused hon. members on this side of the House of cowardice in not expressing an opinion. The hon. gentleman is very polished outwardly, but his remarks have given the House very little insight into his true inwardness. He said we were cowardly in not discussing this question, and yet the House is utterly in the dark at the present time in regard to his own opinion on it, although he occupied upwards of an hour. The hon. gentleman said that the leader of the Opposition was confined to three courses on this question: he had either to go with the Government, or against the Government, or else see the Government and go one better. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will condescend to explain to the members of the House from the east the peculiar language of the prairies as to seeing a man and going one better. I have an idea, however, that it means outbidding in some way or other. I submit that a leader having three courses open to him is not crowded into a very narrow corner, after all. But the hon. member for West Assiniboia sees him and goes one better, for he has four courses open. He may not only see the Government, and go one better, agree with it, or oppose it, but he may do what he has done time and again, speak in one direction and vote in another.

Mr. DAVIN. Never. Give an instance.

Mr. CASEY. That is a course that is not open to the leader of the Opposition, who has not learned that trick.

Mr. DAVIN. There is not a single instance of such action on my part.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for West Assiniboia made an attack on Mr. Sifton and quoted an interview with him in Mon-

treal, and some speeches in Haldimand, the report of which Mr. Sifton does not acknowledge as being perfectly correct. I think the hon. gentleman was rash in assuming that the reports of Mr. Sifton's speeches, and the interview were exactly accurate. Not many years has elapsed since there appeared in the Ottawa "Citizen" a verbatim report of a speech supposed to have been delivered by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the night before at Stratford. It not only contained gems of wit and humour, but interruptions and clever replies, also cheers, satirical and applausive. The only unfortunate circumstance lacking to the completeness of the report was that it unfortunately happened that Providence had prevented the hon. member from getting to Stratford on the evening in question. The hon. gentleman, therefore, should not depend too much on reports of interviews and speeches. He further informed the House that the voice and manner of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) were much more cheerful when he had deficits to discuss, and he almost desired to see a continuance of deficits in order to keep that hon. gentleman in good condition, and happy. But the hon. member need not worry about the cheerfulness of the hon. member for South Oxford, for the deficits seem likely to continue and the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) will have plenty of opportunity to manifest cheerfulness. Then the hon. member for Assiniboia went out of his way to prove that his friends in framing the Speech from the Throne on this occasion had been guilty of what must be called gross and undoubted plagiarism, for he quoted from the Speech of 1877 to show that the very language employed in regard to the falling revenue and loss of equilibrium—which is a grand phrase—in our finances at that time had been inserted in the Speech at the opening of the present session. He said that when hon. members found fault with that expression they were simply attacking their late financial leader. It appears to me the hon. member for Assiniboia, in calling attention to that fact was simply proving that the occupants of the Treasury benches had not sufficient originality to invent a Speech from the Throne, which did not require a great deal of ability after all, but had to plagiarise a very old speech. The hon. gentleman, moreover, was very solicitous respecting the prospects of the leader of the Opposition in connection with the school question. He told the House what my hon. friend should have done in order to take advantage of the great opportunity presented to him; he fussed, cackled, and excited himself over that subject in a manner that compels me to parody what he said of the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and say that he spoke with all the garrulity of an aged grandmother. We are not, perhaps, able to divert the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) as he stated we could not divert him from the course of his remarks, but we probably have obtained sufficient diversion for the present from his speech, and I may pass on to the consideration of questions and personages somewhat more weighty. It is impossible for any of us in this House to pass without notice the paragraph referring to the loss which the House and the country have sustained in the deaths of Sir John Thompson and of our dear old friend the Hon. Félix Geoffrion, the late member for Verchères. Of Mr. Geoffrion, I must say that we of the old guard have known him ever since our entry into politics. He was a sort of political foster father to many of us, he was a man on whose judgment we could always rely, whose good sense never failed and whose honesty was never for a moment doubted by any one. I think I may say that Mr. Geoffrion had not a single acquaintance wherever he was known who was not at the same time a personal friend of his. We looked upon him as an example of the sturdy gentleman of the old school, and as a thoroughly sound politician at the same time. I do not think that higher praise can be given to any man. With regard to Sir John Thompson, the news of his sudden death struck us at first as almost an impossibility. Rumours floated about of his death in Windsor Castle at the foot of the throne, in the presence of the Queen some said, and it all seemed so unreal that for a time we could not possibly appreciate it. But when the sad and pathetic details began to arrive; the details of his appearance at Windsor Castle, of the men who travelled with him in the train from London, of those who were with him in the Council Chamber when he was sworn in of the Privy Council; and when we read of his final remark before he fell in death across the shoulder of his neighbour at the table, when we recognized in that remark the courtesy and thoughtfulness for others which always characterized the man, then we were able to feel that the sad news was the cold telegraphic truth, and I need not refer to the shock which the lamentable death produced on the mind of every man in the country who knew him. We were at last compelled to realize the fact that, surrounded by princes and nobles and dignitaries in the old historic pile at Windsor, death had taken away our friend in the zenith of his greatness. While a great deal has been said, and justly said, about Sir John Thompson himself, enough has already been said with reference to the gracious and royal lady who showed her true ladyhood in nothing so much as the care which she took to show her personal respect for the remains of the dead statesman and for his relatives who were left. It cannot be forgotten that the Queen is an extremely busy woman, far busier than most of us in this country can realize, but in spite of the time she

had to give to affairs of state and to the necessary ceremonials of the court, she devoted personal attention to the smallest details of respect to the remains of the Canadian statesman. Even beyond all that there was a personal feeling of regard and sympathy and motherliness shown by Her Majesty towards the orphan daughter of the great statesman which did the highest credit to the noble hear of this queenly lady. I believe that it is proper that we should pay a tribute to the kindness of Her Majesty in this matter, and I believe that, without being accused of any undue show of gushing loyalty we can very properly and fairly and justly express our high appreciation of the manner in which ladyhood was exemplified by the Queen on that occasion. Sir, the loss of Sir John Thompson is beginning to be deeply felt already. This session of Parliament is practically only two days old in debate, and I say (without any disrespect to the gentleman who is now leading the House, or to the gentleman who is at the head of the Government and sits in the Senate) that the difference is so unmistakable that nobody can avoid noticing it. The spirit is gone out of the party and the spirit has gone out of its leaders. The speeches from the ministerial side of the House, which used to be so triumphant and even boastful, have been apologetic so far. The speeches from this side of the House, on the contrary, however right or wrong in the opinions they may have advanced, have been confident and hopeful, and I may say aggressive. I will go further, and say that the leader of the House and his first lieutenant, who spoke on Friday last, were supported, or I should say not supported, by their followers in a manner which I never saw paralleled on the occasion of the opening of Parliament. It is within the memory of all of us here how in the old days, when the leader of the House made his first speech of the session, the enthusiasm used to boil over on the back benches and on all the benches between them and the front ones, and how the House used to be crowded to hear what he said. Was it so on Friday last? No, Sir. I will not say that the gentlemen on this side of the House did not give the Finance Minister a good hearing, because they did, and there was a large attendance of Opposition members, but it was sad to any friend of the Government to see the array of empty benches that were behind the Finance Minister and the Minister of Justice when they addressed the House. I can attribute it to nothing but to a sense of the fact that the party has lost its head, that there is disunion on the ministerial benches, that trouble is cropping up in the near future, and that there is an uncertainty among the supporters of the Government and the Cabinet Ministers themselves as to what should be done in the crisis and as to what is going to happen them. I cannot profess to lament that from a party point of view, but I do lament that in such a crisis as this—for it is a crisis in more ways than one—a crisis in regard to our tariff policy and a crisis to a smaller extent in regard to the Manitoba school question, that party should have lost the only man who seemed capable of uniting it together as a solid body for legislative purposes. It is bad for the country when the party that has the majority in the House has not a head able to lead it in straight paths of legislation, and I fear that it cannot be said that the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite has such a head at the present time. Now, I have alluded to the fact that the Ministers began their stumping career long before the House opened. I do not intend to go over a series of stump speeches, but I want to call attention to one fact in regard to these speeches, taking one of the Minister of Finance's more especially for a text. Years ago speeches intended to boom the National Policy were made with the view of proving that something great was being done for the manufacturers, while in this last campaign our friends opposite appeared to think that they must talk to the farmers, and the Minister of Finance seemed to fancy himself specially qualified to address the farmers on tariff questions, and to convince them of the soundness of his policy. He was the farmer's friend, the man who kept out the ravenous wolves in the United States from preying upon our market—the man who kept up the price of wheat, cattle, hogs and every other kind of farm product in this country. But, Sir, his taste had been vitiated to such an extent by practice before protectionist audiences, his mind had been pumped so full of flapdoodle by the agents of the combines that he found himself totally incapacitated for making an impression on an audience of farmers. I will trouble you with only one specimen of the way he attempted to make the farmers believe that they were prosperous and happy. In one of his earlier speeches, at Galt, he said:

> In 1891, there are 500,000 more people living in the cities than in 1881. Have you not a market of 500,000 mouths more than you had in 1881? The more the city population is in comparison to the rural population, the better is the home market for the farmer.

There is an argument to be addressed to an audience of intelligent farmers. If that argument means anything, it means that the depopulation of the country parts and the building up of the cities is a direct boon to the farmers. It means that every man whose farm is sold out by the loan company, and who goes to the city to drive a horse or to become a porter in a store or to work in a factory, has become a more valuable citizen to the farmer than he was when living beside him in the country. It means that every farmer's son who deserts the farm and seeks to make a living in the city is

doing more good to this country than the one who stays at home and helps to increase the productiveness of the farm. It means that this country would be better off if nine-tenths of the farms were depopulated and lying waste. If his argument means anything, it means that. But the farming community were not to be caught by such chaff as that. It has been ridiculed, and justly ridiculed, all over the country, and I have only alluded to it to show how a bad habit of trying to make believe that everything that has happened under the National Policy has been of benefit to the country, could lead an intelligent man like the Finance Minister to address such stuff to an audience of farmers. The mouth policy, the policy of getting rich by the number of mouths in the towns, is not going to take with the farming community. The hon. gentleman's policy of farmers' protection reminds me very much of the farmers' protection that we used to operate on a small scale about the time of corn planting when I was a boy. We went for protection then, not against the United States farmer, but against the crows, and the protection scheme which we instituted consisted of a lot of posts put up around the corn patch, with a ribbon of basswood bark tied from post to post, and a tall dark figure in the centre, wearing last year's Sunday hat and a seedy long-tailed coat. This was the farmers' protection in the days of my boyhood, and was about as effective, though it but dimly resembled the farmers' protection scheme now. But it is hardly worth while asking what is good policy for the farmers, for the Minister of Finance has abdicated his functions as the controller of our tariff. I used to assert this during the discussions on the tariff legislation of last session. I used to say as item after item came up that it must have been prepared by the special trade which it was intended to benefit. My assertion was poohpoohed at the time; I was told that the items were framed by the Finance Minister himself. But I hold in my hand positive proof that the assertion was well founded —that the Minister of Finance neither made nor revised our tariffs, that he was only the mouthpiece of an oligarchy, a Venetian Council of Ten who dictated the terms on which the tariff must be framed. I have in my hand the organ of the combines, called "The Canadian Manufacturer," bearing date March 1st, which contains a report of the annual meeting of the Manufacturers' Association on the 27th of February, from which I shall read a few extracts to show that the combines framed the tariff, and not the Minister of Finance or any other member of the Government. The president, in his address, began by referring to the history of the Manufacturers' Association which is co-eval with the existence of the National Policy. He said it had gone on:

> With but one single object in view, and that to exert all its influence to maintain and uphold that financial policy of the Government that would in all Canadian industrial enterprises give the home market to the home producer, that would encourage the investment of capital in workshops and factories, and that would give diversified employment to Canadian labour;

And so forth. The Manufacturers' Association is, then, distinctly for the purpose of maintaining a protective policy, according to the statement of the president of that association. Now, as to the method in which the Manufacturers' Association think that the tariff should be framed, I will give you a quotation to prove that they do not think anybody else should interfere with them in what they consider ought to be done in that regard:

> It may be that our present system is not perfect—perfection is not attained in this life—and no doubt many manufacturers feel that it would be to their advantage if certain changes were made in the tariff; but we do not usually call in quacks as medical advisers when we are ill, neither do we consult with our enemies on important business matters; and it would not be wise to ask the enemies of protection to correct any incongruities that may exist in the tariff.

In other words, the president of the Manufacturers' Association maintains that nobody but the manufacturers themselves should have a voice in correcting, as he calls it, the incongruities of that tariff. He goes on to refer to the dangers that were passed during the year—the outbreaks of free trade feeling here and there, the death of Sir John Thompson, &c., and then says:

> It is comforting to know, however, that in this country there are always those who are able to assume any duties that may devolve upon them; and although we will long deplore the loss of Sir John Thompson, we congratulate ourselves that in Sir Mackenzie Bowell we have a Premier who is in close touch and sympathy with us, and in whose hands our interests will be safe. We are assured by him and by his colleagues in the Government, that in the future, as in the past, protection to Canadian industries will be the inscription upon the banner under which they will fight the political battles of the country.

Here is something new to the country at large. Here is a fact that the Premier and the Government, who are supposed to represent, and act for, the whole people, have been giving, on the sly, special assurances to the Manufacturers' Association as to their conduct regarding protection. I claim that this is unconstitutional servility on the part of the Minister and his Cabinet. Then the secretary made his report and gave a history of the association's efforts for the last year. He takes care to say a good word for the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said:

> Some anxiety may be felt that Sir Mackenzie being no longer Minister of Trade and Commerce, efforts to promote the export trade of Canada may not be as active and efficient as under his regime. But there is no cause for

such anxiety. As Premier, he will be none the less interested in the matter, and we are assured that the new Minister in that department, Hon. Mr. Ives, will push it, and do as much for it as the most enthusiastic could desire.

They are satisfied with their new Minister. They say he is a pretty good boy, and, at all events, Sir Mackenzie Bowell will look after him and see that he does his duty. Then the secretary tells us how this revision of the tariff came about last year, and to this I would call special attention :

At the time of the last annual meeting of this association, the Finance Minister and the House of Commons were struggling in the revision of the tariff. There had been a fierce and unreasoning demand for such a revision as would, if carried out, have amounted to a revolution ; and it required the best generalship on the part of Mr. Foster and his protectionist colleagues and supporters to withstand the onsets of the free trade enemy. On March 27, the House, sitting in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Foster introduced his Tariff Bill, which instantly became operative.

Now, we are coming to the point. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, how much that first draft of the Tariff Bill was changed :

Quite a number of amendments were, from time to time, made to this bill, and before its final passage on July 26, it became modified to an extent that gives much satisfaction to the country—certainly to the friends of the Government.

By friends of the Government he naturally wishes us to understand the combines. He goes on to show how these modifications took place :

The Tariff Committee of the association, in the discharge of their duty, and in accord with the usage of this association, entered upon a close and careful examination of all matters brought before it by members of the association relating to the tariff. The situation at that time was critical. An excitement, amounting to a furore, had been worked up by the enemies of protection, and some who had previously declared themselves staunch adherents of the National Policy weakened. It was evident, however, that some changes in the tariff were imperative, and that if they were not inaugurated by the friends of protection, the Government could not survive, and that the enemies of protection would accede to power.

The secretary confesses that if the Government had not made some prudent changes in the tariff it would have been beaten, and this free trade party, which hon. gentlemen opposite say has no power or influence in the country, would have come in and controlled the tariff. The combines saw the case more clearly, than hon. gentlemen opposite. The secretary continues :

It was under these circumstances that the Tariff Committee entered upon their labours, having the counsel and assistance of many of the most experienced members of the association, the result of which was the embodiment of their views in a communication to the Finance Minister, which elicited from him a kindly letter, in which he alluded to it as a well-prepared brief in which all the matters therein discussed had been done full justice.

A well-prepared brief, Mr. Speaker. Who gets the brief ? The counsel for one side or the other in a case. What does the counsel get along with the brief ? A fee, and a counsel never touches a brief unless there is a fee mentioned in it. It is not possible for me to say what form the fee took in this case—whether it was a promise of money or subscription towards the approaching elections or general support and influence during the elections. But you may be sure, Sir, that when the Minister of Finance took a brief from the combines, he took a fee of some kind or the promise of a fee. The secretary continues :

Perhaps it might be going too far to even surmise the effect these recommendations of your Tariff Committee to the Minister may have had in the final arrangement of the tariff ; but it is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes that were made in the tariff along the lines suggested in the recommendations, and that in many instances the language used in both are substantially identical. This is particularly noticeable as regards the iron schedule, the duties upon textiles, the duties upon drugs, chemicals, alcoholic preparations, &c., as well as upon an extended list of miscellaneous articles.

There we have a complete charge. It was not a tariff committee of the Government which drew up these revisions of the tariff, but the tariff committee of the Manufactrers' Association. They made a brief for the Minister of Finance, and they sent it to him by letter. They did more. They sent a deputation after it, to which I will call your attention in a moment. The Minister of Finance not only accepted their suggestions, but accepted their statements of their views verbatim, and put on the statutes exactly what this committee of combines directed him to put on. Then the secretary proceeds :

On February 14, 1894, a largely attended joint meeting of the Tariff and Executive Committees of this association, and of other members, was held in this office, Mr. R. W. Elliot presiding. The meeting was called to take final action on all such tariff matters as had been previously submitted to the association, the business having been previously arranged and prepared for consideration. The brief, as prepared by the secretary, was accepted and adopted as expressing the views of the association, and the secretary was instructed to present the same to the Minister of Finance.

The brief was presented to the Hon. Mr. Foster, at Ottawa, on February 26, 1894. You will remember, Sir, that immediately after 26th February, 1894, the Finance Minister began to eat up his first propositions and to substitute the ones forced upon him by his masters. In view of the state of things, in view of the complete abdication

of their functions by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, the words used by the leader of the Opposition in a speech at Montreal, in which he said that emancipation was the first issue before the people were not a bit too strong. Here we have a class of combines against whom one member of the Government directed a bill a few years ago, but which bill seems to have utterly failed in its object. The Finance Minister takes their brief ; he does what they tell him to do, and their will becomes law. I say, Sir, that he is the slave of the combines ; I say that the combines who, by means of what is called the National Policy collect taxation for their own pockets instead of for the public treasury, are in the position of the publicans of old in the Roman Empire, who paid large sums yearly into the treasury for the privilege of collecting as much taxes as they could from the people of the different provinces. And these publicans when mentioned in the scriptures, were classed with the sinners. They were not our friends who sold strong drink, but those who paid for the right of taxing the people of the provinces. They were classed with the sinners and properly so, and I class this same sort of people with the sinners to-day. The alliance between the combines and the high tariff Government is an alliance between the publicans and sinners, an alliance as much to be reprehended to-day as it was in the time of our Saviour. I cannot read through all the interesting matter in this report without occupying too much time ; but there is one delicious sentence which I think I must read to you, in which the association speaks in the true tone of royalty encouraging deserving subjects, where they are speaking of the new Premier. The association passed a resolution including these words in the way of congratulation, and I ask hon. members to note the royal tone in which they express their pleasure with and their approval of a good and faithful servant. They say :

> It is due to him, as head of the Dominion Government, as it is our pleasure that this association should declare and make known to him our entire confidence in his ability to manage the affairs of this country, and that management will be along the lines that he has so closely followed for so many years. And we hereby assure him that in the administration of the great trust that is reposed in him he will have the most cordial support of this association.

I do not think that anything more impudent was ever sown broadcast throughout this country than the language I have read out of this report, in its calm assumption of authority over the Government, and its lofty approval of well behaved members of the administration whom it can trust to carry out its behests. I am sure, Sir, that the publication of this, which is evidently intended to act as an advertisement in the interest of the combines, is really the first gun of the great salvo of artillery that shall blow them out of existence. The reading of these extracts from the report has taken more time than I intended to occupy, and I beg the pardon of the House for detaining hon. members so long. But the extracts I have read indicate, I believe, a condition of affairs of serious, grave, and I might almost say vital importance to the people of this country. I think it is absolutely essential that they should be placed on record in the debates of this House, so that the people may see to what degree of impudence and arrogance our new rulers have attained, how fully they control the Government of the day and how servilely the latter act in regard to them. I thank hon. members for the indulgence with which they have listened to me.

ADJOURNMENT—EXPORT OF CATTLE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the motion is carried, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter of some urgency. I refer to certain changes in connection with the cattle trade. Two or three years ago, if I remember correctly, a departmental regulation was issued with regard to the space to be allowed on steamers carrying cattle. The space then ordered was a minimum of 2 feet 8 inches for each animal. That has been the regulation in force from that time up to the present. I am informed to-day by the cattle breeders that this regulation has been altered by the Government, and that the space has been reduced to 2 feet 6 inches, which, as I am informed by men in the trade, is altogether insufficient. I call the attention of the Government at once to this matter. I do not know that the Government is prepared at this moment to give an answer on this point, the Minister of Agriculture not being a member of this House. But I call attention to the change which, as I am informed, is injurious to the trade and ought to be remedied at once, and, if the old order is not restored I will call attention to the matter to-morrow after the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity to consult his colleague the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can give my hon. friend the information he wishes with regard to this matter. It is true as he has said that last year the space was fixed at 2 feet 8 inches, and that this year, on representation, it is proposed to fix the space at 2 feet 6 inches on the upper deck, the space below being the same as last year. I understand that it is the same space as is allowed on vessels which go from American ports, and the object was to enable steamboat owners to carry as large and consequently as paying a freight as possible, but

at the same time under the impression that the cattle upon the upper deck would not be at all injured, so that both interests would be conserved. The cattle men have made and are making their representations. They are here to-day and are being heard by the members of the Government who have this matter in charge, and I have no doubt at all that satisfactory arrangements will be come to in a very short time.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 23rd April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House, that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return

Of the Hon. Walter Humphries Montague, for the Electoral District of Haldimand.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MACLEAN (York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) to promote the safety of railway employees. He said: The object of this Bill is, in the first place, to protect railway employees, by making a law that after the year 1900, every train shall be provided with automatic brakes and with couplers which shall not necessitate the men passing between the cars. It also provides for the protection of the general public, to this extent—that every conductor must have had five years' experience as a brakeman and every engine-driver five years' experience as a fireman. I might add that similar legislation has been introduced in many of the States of the Union and almost universally adopted, and that this Bill is presented by me at the request of the railway employees of the country as represented by the various brotherhoods.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Walter Humphries Montague, member for the Electoral District of Haldimand, introduced by Mr. Patterson (Huron) and Mr. Marshall.

Mr. FOSTER.

THE CATTLE REGULATIONS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would claim all the attention of the leader of the House to the subject I brought up yesterday—the regulations with regard to the cattle trade. I understood from the hon. gentleman yesterday that negotiations were now going on between the Government and the representatives of the cattle trade. If my information is correct, nothing has been concluded so far. Now, this is a question upon which there cannot be any delay. The time has come for the shipping of cattle and it is important that the trade should know at once what the regulations are to be. As I understood, the regulations which have been in force for some years have not caused any complaint, but have been quite satisfactory to the shippers of cattle. But now, without notice, so far as I know, the change which I referred to yesterday has been made. It is most important that any action to be taken by the Government should be taken at once, so that shippers may know whether the present regulations are to be maintained or not. As this matter is important to other members than myself, I will move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. When this question was before the House last night, I understood the leader of the House to say that the same space had been adopted as was allowed in shipping from American ports. The American cattle are shipped in a space of 2 feet 6 inches on deck, I believe, as compared with a space of 2 feet 8 inches allowed on vessels from Canadian ports. The reason the Americans can afford to ship their cattle in a space of 2 feet 6 inches is that their cattle are more hardy and stronger on their legs than ours are, because they are fed outside the stable and in the fields and have daily exercise, which enables them to grow more muscle than cattle fed in stable. The American cattle are, therefore, stronger for the sea voyage than our cattle, which are left in the stable for six months in the winter season. I think that in justice to the trade the shippers should be allowed the space allowed to us a few years ago. Since the embargo was placed upon cattle in Great Britain, we have not been able to ship small cattle as formerly. We are, therefore, shipping larger cattle, and that is an additional reason why we require larger space for our cattle going from Montreal and Quebec. The season will commence in a few days, and there are a great number of good cattle this year. If these should be crowded in a small space, it will be very injurious to the trade. The reduction of 2 inches in space which has been asked for, means an increase of about 6⅔ per cent in shipping capacity. That, taken on a basis of say 40 shillings, with 6⅔ per cent added, would be about 42 shillings and

4¾d., or let us say for practical purposes, 42s. 6d. I think business men would rather pay the additional 2 shillings and 6 pence for the larger space than ship in the smaller space at existing rates. The additional cost is nothing as compared with the safety of the cattle and the advantage they would have in the larger space. Therefore, I hope the Government will see fit to retain the regulation instead of reducing the space, as proposed. At at any rate, I trust the Government will allow 2 feet 8 inches for the earlier shipping months of the season. No doubt, there will be some heavier cattle coming forward in the fall season, but we shall really require a larger space for the spring season. It is impossible to do without the larger space even on deck, to which, I understand, the proposed new regulation is confined.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is rather an unusual way to get information asked for across the floor of the House. The leader of the Opposition drew the attention of the House to this matter yesterday, and he was promised that the matter should receive immediate attention and that he would be informed. It was hardly necessary, I think—though, of course, it was the right of the hon. gentleman—to move the adjournment of the House and open a debate on a subject which requires no debate at all. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me in this, when I state that I met a large deputation of the cattlemen of the country and discussed the matter with them, and when I tell the hon. gentleman that the whole matter is settled——

Mr. LAURIER. Settled in what way ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Settled so that the old regulations remain. In view of the strong representations made by these gentlemen that no changes should be made, the old regulations will stand. I think this should be quite satisfactory to the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Mr. LAURIER. If the old regulations remain and the new ones are cancelled, I am quite satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the anxiety of the Opposition is hardly warranted by the facts. When the deputation was here yesterday, I had the pleasure of introducing it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who agreed to take up the matter immediately. I understood that the leader of the Opposition was informed that it would be dealt with immediately, and that information would be given at the earliest possible moment of what the Government would do. There was no delay nor desire for delay on the part of the Minister or the Government, and the fact that the matter was dealt with within twenty-four hours from the time the deputation interviewed the Minister is sufficient proof that there was no undue delay shown by the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. There is also another view of the case. A deputation of the cattlemen some years ago waited upon a committee of the Government and presented arguments which resulted in the passing of an Order in Council allowing enlarged space. The subject was brought up after due notice to the vesselmen and the cattlemen, and after arguments were made by all the parties interested a decision was arrived at. Now we learn that the Government, on an ex parté case made by the vessel owners, decided to revoke the decision which was come to after the hearing of arguments on both sides ; and if I am rightly informed, the Government passed an Order in Council or gave a decision revoking their judgment of four years ago. Now, I protest against such hasty action interfering with one of the most important interests of the country, an action instigated by one of the parties alone to the question. The duty of the Government, when the vesselmen made a complaint, was to have summoned the other interests before them, before proceeding to disturb trade and thus produce want of confidence in the stability of the arrangement, and force a deputation to come down here in order to protect their interests. While I commend the Government for retracing its steps, I hope the Government will not again forget what is due to both interests before arriving at a judgment. I commend it for its repentance but condemn it for its rashness in the first instance.

Motion withdrawn.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bennett for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech from the Throne.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of occupying at all the time of the House in this debate, and were it not for some remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite on matters contained in the Address, I should not now, Mr. Speaker, ask your indulgence. I shall not detain the House by any lengthy reference to the first part of the Address dealing with the loss this country has sustained by the death of two very able men who formerly had seats in our midst. After all that has been said, I need only express my regret at the great loss we have sustained and my sympathy with those to whom death has caused a loss that is indeed irreparable. With regard to the condition of the country at present as shown by the great depression that exists—a depression which is

admitted in the Address—we are in the very unpleasant position of having to meet a very large deficit. We have been accustomed to seeing hon. gentlemen opposite coming forward at the opening of each Parliament and exulting with mock bravado over our country's financial condition. But to-day they have to sing a different tune. The Minister of Finance has been forced to admit that a very serious deficit is now staring us in the face. But, he says, that while from 1874 to 1878 a deficit followed increased taxation, from 1894 to 1895, the deficit follows a reduction in taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, the very small reduction which has been made in the taxes of the country is no excuse whatever for the enormous deficit we have to meet. As the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has shown, all the reduction that has been made amounts to one-tenth of 1 per cent. That is the insignificant result which follows the many days and weeks we spent in the revision of the tariff. That is the miserable outcome of the expressed determination of the Minister to make very considerable reductions. We all know how, by the time the tariff was finally got through committee, the anticipated and promised reductions vanished into very thin air, and our taxation stood at almost the original amount at which it stood before we touched the tariff at all. It was a repetition of the mountain in labour producing a mouse. When therefore the Minister of Finance attributes the deficit of this year to the reduction in taxation, he is simply repeating his old game of trying to impose on the credulity of the people. The deficit is unquestionably the result of the general depression, and for that depression the Government is to a large extent responsible. We have had in this country a saturnalia of about fifteen years of political profligacy. Year after year we have gone on enormously increasing the public expenditure and swelling the annual drain upon the resources of our Dominion, until we have reached that point when, with an expenditure of between $36,000,000 and $37,000,000 a year on a population of not yet five millions, even the Finance Minister finds himself compelled to call a halt. Last year the hon. gentleman promised to apply the pruning-knife. He said it would be his duty, as it would be the duty of any wise and prudent housekeeper, when he found that income was being reduced, to reduce proportionally the annual export. Well, we looked, and looked very patiently and wistfully, for the reductions he had promised, but they never made their appearance. Now, I want to remind the hon. Minister of Finance, and I think this is the proper time to do it, that in face of the very considerable deficit we have got to deal with this year, we shall expect considerable reductions when the estimates come down. We want him distinctly to understand that if he is going to ask Her Majesty's loyal Opposition—and we are here, Mr. Speaker, to discharge the duties devolving upon us—if he is going to ask us to consent to the passage of items of a very objectionable and extravagant character such as we have had to discuss and pass in this House in past sessions, he is going to have many weary nights in getting them through this Chamber. We have got a deficit that we are just as anxious to provide for as the Minister of Finance, and now before he issues his estimates is the time to apply the pruning-knife, and if he will apply it vigorously, and cut off all these items of expenditure that the country can well do without, he will realize the advantage of doing so in getting these estimates through the House. My hon. friend, I dare say, is not too robust at any time, his physical strength and bodily appearance are not of that character that would enable him to bear, day in and day out, and week in and week out, the torture and annoyance of fighting estimates in committee. Well, Sir, if he will take my advice and now apply the pruning-knife, and cut off unnecessary items, he will realize the advantage of doing it, and if he does not do it, he may expect that his bodily appearance will hardly be able to cast a shadow by the time he has got them all through this House, if he intends to ask us to consent to such estimates as he has presented to us in the past. Now, Sir, I am one of those who take an active part in the criticism of the public expenditure, and I give him this notice in advance, so that he may be prepared. We want no more grants to Caraquette railways and Tay canals, we want no more grants of $2,000 a year to High Commissioners in London to feed and wine the lords of London at the cost of this country. We want these items all taken off, and I warn the Minister of Finance that now is the time to do it, and if he wants to escape long and tedious sittings night after night, he had better eliminate from the estimates, when he brings them down, all these objectionable items——

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the nature of a threat.

Mr. McMULLEN—and then we will try and assist him, and in this way we will help him to provide for the enormous deficit. I know very well, that economy is something that hon. gentlemen opposite know very little about. I know that they have not been accustomed to practice that peculiar feature in conducting our public affairs. I have heard the man who now stands at the head of the Government say that on any occasion he would rather justify an increase of $100 than to defend a reduction of $5. I know they have practiced that principle for a great many years. The Minister of Finance says that he expects they have bridged the last deficit we shall see, he hopes we will

not have any more. We are so accustomed to such utterances from hon. gentlemen opposite, that we are unwilling to accept almost any of their forecasts. We know perfectly well what they promised us as a result of the National Policy, at its inception. We know very well that we were promised that there would be no more business depression, we were to stop the exodus, we were to turn the balance of trade in our favour, we were to tax British goods less than foreign goods, we were to give to the farmers a home market, to develop our mineral wealth, to attain reciprocity with the United States, to reduce the debt $100,000,000 by the year 1890, and to place 1,000,000 of people in the North-west. Now these are some of the things we were promised in the inception of the National Policy. We have not realized one of them, not a single one have the people of this country realized. Now, Sir, we contend that in view of the failure of all these promises, it is time we should turn over a new leaf and to commence a system of economy, economy in every department. The people of this country are paying about $3,500,000 per year to the inside and outside Civil Service. I think that if the Minister of Finance will go over that list he will find a great many men whose principal work is to draw their monthly salary and endorse their cheques. Now we can dispense with the services of all these men. I think that he can, if he is so disposed, apply the pruning-knife in a great many directions, and cut off many expenses that are now burdensome and unnecessary. You can abolish a large amount of the expenses connected with the Mounted Police, with the feeding of the Indians, with the host of officials in the North-west, with the Land Board at Winnipeg, and with many other things east and west, north and south ; there is plenty of room. But I know that it will be a hard matter for the Minister of Finance to get his friends to consent to the necessary reductions, for the simple reason that a great many of them are directly or indirectly related to a number of officials that are now drawing salaries. It is not a pleasant thing to ask his followers to assist him in cutting off the heads of these people, and stopping their drain upon the Dominion treasury ; but, Sir, it has got to be done, and if the hon. gentlemen opposite do not do it, they will find that this country will demand that it should be done by some other Government. Now, Sir, I notice in the Speech from the Throne something with regard to Australian trade. The Government have been making efforts in the direction of working up an Australian trade ; they have subsidized a steamship company to carry on trade between those colonies and Canada. I would like to know in what line, or in what way, the financial condition of the most depressed portion of the people of this Dominion is to be improved by an Australian trade. I have no doubt that the manufacturers of this country might possibly reap some advantage, but what advantage will the farmers of this country reap by the Australian trade ? Why, Sir, I believe that at the present time such supplies as frozen mutton, and beef, and many other things that will come into keen competition with the products of the farmers of this country, have been imported from Australia and entered for consumption in Victoria, B.C. I do not see how these things are going to benefit the farmers of this country. I do not think that it is at all possible for the Government to benefit the farming community of this country by an Australian trade. I cannot understand how it it to be done. There are some matters to which the Address should have made reference but which it does not contain. A Royal Commission has been sitting on the question of temperance and the use and the abuse of alcoholic drink, and although it has cost a great deal of money to the country, the Speech from the Throne does not contain a single word with regard to the intention of the Government respecting the report, or even an intimation as to the date when it is likely to be laid before Parliament. That Commission was issued for the purpose of deferring the consideration of the subject, in order that the Government might not be called upon to deal with it. The Minister of Finance during the early period of his life and when he entered Parliament delivered very strong speeches in behalf of temperance, but from the time he became installed in office until the present he has stabled that particular horse with which he made such a successful entry in public life, which he used in securing a constituency and a seat in Parliament, and that horse has not been saddled by him since that time. Although the Commission has sat on the temperance question, that important matter has been deferred, year after year, and probably it will be again deferred, and, indeed, it is not likely that we shall hear very much about it during the present session of Parliament. An hon. friend reminds me of the adoption of the French Treaty. That appears to have been a step in the wrong direction, and certainly the people did not expect that by the passage of any treaty with a foreign country facilities would be provided for increased consumption of light wines such as are produced and exported by France. Thus it appears we have been retrograding rather than progressing in this respect. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), in the course of his remarks yesterday, appeared to be very anxious to obtain an expression of opinion from the leader of the Opposition regarding the Manitoba school question. He said he was willing to sit at his feet and learn ; he evidently wanted to go to the school of the leader of the Opposition. Not only so,

but he desired all the members of the Government to go and sit at the feet of the leader of the Opposition and learn from him. I quite admit that the hon. member for Assiniboia would do well to sit at the feet of somebody and learn, for he certainly requires to be schooled, and no doubt he would like to see members of the Government schooled. I desire to say to members of the Government, by way of encouragement, that when the leader of the Opposition opens his school on the Manitoba school question he will admit all the members of the Government as his pupils; but I am afraid that, instead of being fed with taffy, he will punish them with scorpions. The hon. member for Assiniboia also drew attention to what he considered was apparent gratification on the part of the Opposition over the present deficit. I assure the hon. gentleman that we regret very sincerely that the country has to meet an enormous deficit this year, and our regret is as sincere as that felt by hon. gentlemen opposite. We feel as much interest in the general well-being and prosperity of the Dominion as do hon. gentlemen who happen to occupy the Treasury benches, and we earnestly hope that this will be the last year of the deficits, although we are very much afraid it will not prove the case, judging by the reduction in values, falling off in exports, and absence of public works, the construction of which, during the past ten or fifteen years have given considerable employment. The Minister of Finance stated that the time for borrowing had virtually come to an end, and that our debt had reached the highest point. That does not appear to have been the case. Our debt to-day stands higher than at any previous period of the country's history, and the interest which the people are called upon to pay is also a greater amount. Yesterday the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) offered to the House a statement in reference to the per capita interest. That hon. gentleman, however, is not a very skilful actuary, and, judging from past experience, I never can accept financial statements submitted by him, and, on the present occasion, I desire to point out that he has made a very serious mistake. The hon. gentleman stated that the increase in interest was only 18 cents per head. If he will take up the Year-Book, the figures in which must be accepted as accurate, he will find that the statistics do not support his view of the question. During the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, the per capita rate was $1.58. Let the hon. gentleman turn to the Public Accounts for last year and he will find that the amount of interest paid was a little over $9,000,000. He is well aware that, according to the last census, our population was not quite five millions. Making the division, he will obtain a result of about $1.80 per head. If you make the deduction there is a balance of 22 cents in place of 18 cents; and that does not even make up the balance of interest. So the hon. gentleman was quite inaccurate in the statement he presented in regard to the per capita interest. With regard to the references made by the hon. gentleman to Mr. Sifton, I desire to say that I do not wish to justify the action taken by all members of Provincial Cabinets. Those public men, as a rule, are capable of defending themselves, and, no doubt, Mr. Sifton will take an early opportunity to measure political swords with the hon. member for Assiniboia, and give him a castigation such as the Attorney General for Manitoba doubtless considers he deserves. While the hon. member was finding fault with Mr. Sifton for giving away the secrets of his Government, or, at all events, stating what the Government were going to do with respect to the Manitoba school question, he should also have pointed out how the Minister of Public Works of this Dominion went down into his own province and declared before the electors of Verchères that if the Government did not give remedial legislation, he would resign his seat and leave the Government. The public press so stated; if that report is not true, I am willing to allow the hon. Minister to deny it. Thus the Minister virtually threatened the Government of which he is a member, that if they did not adopt a certain course he would resign. Was not that as important action as that taken by Mr. Sifton with respect to the action which the Manitoba Government would take on the school question? I consider that this country never in its history more needed a master-hand to guide it than it does to-day. Where are the men to take the place of the master-hands who have guided the ship of state of Canada in the past? Where are the men to take the places of the Macdonalds, the Tilleys, the Howes, the Camerons, and the Abbotts? We have none. We have before us to-day virtually a Cabinet of political infants, men but of yesterday, men who have not had any extended experience in banking or commercial life to prepare them for the onerous duties they are called upon to perform. I admit that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) promised to be a funnel to some of them, and to try and infuse brains and wisdom into them, but I am much afraid that the source is so exhausted that the funnel is no longer of any use. I do not think that the hon. gentleman can possibly hope to perform that duty any longer. I ask, in all earnestness, if ever there was a period in the history of this country when a master-hand is required to handle the affairs of Canada, is it not at the present time? We have not in the Cabinet a man of such business training as would enable him to grapple with the national difficulties that our people find

staring them in the face. The Minister of Finance himself was never brought up to a commercial life. He performed the important duty of teaching the young the rule of three for a number of years, and he also took an active part in delivering temperance lectures, but that is his only qualification to enable him to discharge the duties of a Finance Minister. Let us look at the Minister of Justice. If there is any office in this country that should be filled by a man to whom the Bar and Judiciary of his country would look to as able to uphold that position, it should be that of the Minister of Justice. He should not be surpassed by any man at the Bar of this country. I would like to ask if the Bar of this country is prepared to look up to the present Minister of Justice as a man whose standing at the Bar, and whose extended experience and training has fitted him to occupy his position? I say that there are dozens and dozens of men in this country who are better fitted for the position, and who ought to be asked to assume its responsibilities, rather than to have it occupied by such a young man, almost a beardless boy, I might say. Then, if you go along and consider the other members of the Cabinet. There are a few of them that I shall not refer to. I do not wish to be personal, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit that I have had to deal personally with some of the Ministers, but I am not going to follow up that line. It is out of respect that I refrain, because if I dealt with the rest of them it would be considerably worse than in the cases of those I have mentioned. In my humble opinion, the country at the present time is not served by men of experience outside of the political arena. I am sorry, for the sake of Canada, that this is the fact, because I believe that it would be better for us if we had men of ability filling those positions.

An hon. MEMBER. And honesty.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, and honesty. We want honesty above everything else. We have had a reign of dishonesty that has blackened the pages of this country for the last fifteen years, and we earnestly hope that we have seen the end of it, but we are not sure. We had the Curran bridge investigated last year, and we may possibly have another. I am very glad to see that the Minister of Public Works is evidently enjoying my remarks; but possibly before the Public Accounts will be got through, he may hear of something that may cause another turn to his pleasantry, and he won't feel so genial. We have already some little hints of what is brewing, and it may possibly come out. We hope it may come out all right, for we do not wish to frighten the Minister of Public Works, but he had better be prepared. We do hope that we have seen the end of these scandals and disgraces. We want no more Curran bridges, and public expenditures by which the people of this country have been robbed and plundered. They cannot stand that thing any longer. Now is the time for the Government to commence in the matter of general reductions of expenditure. I hope the Minister of Finance will see to it that before his Estimates are brought down he will have them in such a shape that we can endorse them, and that we will not have the prolonged fight which usually takes place when he asks us to pass items that are not intended for the public good. I warn the Minister of Finance that if he asks the members of the Opposition in this House to consent to such items of expenditure as he has proposed in years past, we will fight them to the bitter end before we vote for them.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to give an explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) charged me with an inaccuracy, and he referred me to the Year-Book. The Year-Book is here, and it was from the Year-Book I took my information. The net interest paid per year, according to the Year-Book, was $1.58, and the net interest paid per head, according to the Year-Book in 1893, was $1.74. That is what I said. I think that my hon. friend was calculating on the gross debt, and not to the net debt.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to correct my hon. friend, I might tell him that I referred to the Public Accounts of this year, and surely he must have heard me make that statement. If he will turn to the Public Accounts of this year he will see that I am right.

Mr. DAVIN. You referred me to the Year-Book.

Mr. McMULLEN. I referred you to the Year-Book for the amount of interest that was paid when the Mackenzie Government was in power. I referred to the Public Accounts of this year for the interest paid this year, and if my hon. friend will turn up the Public Accounts he will find that the net interest is $9,000,000.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member, addressing me, said: "If you refer to the Year-Book you will find it to be so and so;" and I appeal to my hon. friends who listened to him if that is not the case?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think, Mr. Speaker, there would be sufficient justification for this debate, unusual as it is in our proceedings, from the fact alone of the time at which the House has been summoned. I am not here to dispute in the slightest degree that the Parliament has been summoned

within the year provided by the constitution, and the Minister of Finance in that respect was right when he argued, in answer to the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that there had been no breach of the constitution. But in another sense, and in the more proper sense of the term, I venture to say that there has been a very flagrant disregard of that unwritten law and that unwritten rule which requires the meeting of Parliament at a convenient season. I have looked through the Votes and Proceedings for the purpose of ascertaining at what time and at what period the House has assembled during the last twenty years, and I think it will be found that this is the result. Commencing with the year 1875, the House has met once in the preceding December—that is to say, twice in one year, that was the time of the Pacific Railway contract—five times in the month of January, eleven times in the month of February, once in the month of March, and twice in the month of April; and on these occasions on which the House has been called as late as the month of April there have been elections—once in 1887, and again in 1891. So that in the majority of instances we have met some time in February, and the struggle of late years has been to try to have our meeting in January. This is the first time, without an election, and without any cause or reason so far as we know, that the House has been called as late as the time at which we are now assembled. Now, Sir, this is a matter to which we ought to call the attention of Parliament, and upon which Parliament ought to pronounce, because it is the only means by which the Executive can be checked. It is not a party matter at all. It is not a matter which calls for remonstrance simply from a party point of view, and I should be surprised if there are not members on both sides of the House who will protest against the calling of Parliament at a season so inconvenient, not merely to the great body of the members, but to those of the public at large who have business to attend to at the parliamentary session. The unwritten rule of our constitution, the elasticity which makes it preferable in our judgment to the American system, must be fairly and reasonably worked out, or great and irreparable injury may follow. Now, what justification—because some justification is necessary—has been offered by the leader of the House for the delay in calling Parliament? I have read—for I had not the opportunity of being present—the speech of the hon. Finance Minister and the excuses which he offered to the House for this very extraordinary delay in the convening of this assembly; and what are those excuses? First, the hon. gentleman referred to the unfortunate and lamented death of the late Prime Minister, and the disorganization which necessarily followed that event. Well, Sir, we know that that unfortunate occurrence happened during the early half of December; we know that the present Administration was formed within a few days afterwards; and we know that while technically it was a new Government, it was not new in any other sense. It had the same policy, and the same men with the exception of the leader, were in their places; and I am unable to understand why that change of administration, such as it was, should have delayed the calling of the House together beyond the ordinary time. It appears to me to be a lame excuse, and one which on its face is not entitled to any great weight. The hon. gentleman put forward other causes for delay. The next cause, if I understood the argument, was this—that the Manitoba question was before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that the judgment in that matter was not rendered until the 29th of January, that it did not reach Canada until the 19th of February, that the matter had to be argued and determined before Parliament could be assembled, that that determination was not made until the 19th of March, and that, immediately upon that determination being arrived at, the House was summoned. Well, I am unable to understand on what principle it was absolutely essential or in any way necessary that this Manitoba question should be determined before the meeting of Parliament. I should like to have something more than the mere statement to show why it was so imperative that this question which has been standing for three or four years, should be determined absolutely before Parliament could be assembled. It could have stood for another year, I think, without any inconvenience to anybody. It would have been far better, I think, for the matter to have stood over than that the legislature of Manitoba should have been summoned here on nine days' notice. The notice was telegraphed, I think, on the 19th, and the Government of Manitoba were called upon to appear here before the Bar of the Privy Council on the 26th. The shortness of that notice, together with the fact that the Manitoba legislature was then in session, and the further fact that the leading Minister in that legislature was on a sick bed and that it was therefore impossible for his Government to give the subject the consideration that was desirable, should in all decency have required the matter to stand; and I am unable for my part to accept in the slightest degree as a valid excuse the alleged necessity of settling the Manitoba school question. The third reason was still weaker than the other two: that was, the negotiations with regard to Newfoundland, as they were not terminated or even commenced before the time that Parliament was summoned. Therefore, that should hardly be put forward as a cause of delay. Bearing in mind everything we know—that everything pointed not to a session, but

to an election, and that not merely Opposition but Government candidates were being nominated all over the country—we cannot close our eyes to the fact that this holding of a session was an afterthought—why, we do not yet know. There are various contradictory stories. We are told that the Minister of Justice resigned, or threatened resignation, because of the calling of Parliament. We are told again that that is not so. We are told that the object of a session was to enact the legislation which the remedial order had foreshadowed. Again that is denied. So that we are left completely in the dark as to what is really the reason. But it does appear to me that it is proper for us to call attention to this matter, and to let the Government understand that they cannot postpone the assembling of Parliament to suit their party interests and party exigencies, without remonstrance from the people whose interests we here represent. Now, Sir, we sometimes have to go away from home to get news; there is no doubt about that; and I find in the London "Times" perhaps a more honest and truthful account of what goes on here in Ottawa than is given in the party press which the Minister of Justice has discounted and disclaimed in very strong language, if properly reported. I find in the London "Times" of the 23rd of March this report, cabled from Ottawa by a correspondent who is said to be in very close communication with the First Minister:

> Both political parties are astonished at the decision of the Ministry to summon Parliament on April 18. Preparations for a general election were actually proceeding, conventions were being held, candidates were being nominated, and an extra staff of printers were at work at the Government Printing Bureau setting up the register, the revision of which was completed on March 1. It now appears that there is no necessity for pushing on the preparations. Up to Tuesday everything pointed to a general election, but the growing feeling of Ontario against interference in Manitoba school affairs undoubtedly led the Government to defer its appeal to the country.

I also find the following communication to the "Times" of the 27th of March:

> Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper has resigned. The announcement has caused great excitement in the city, and strong hopes are expressed that he may reconsider his decision, as, with the exception of the Hon. Mr. Foster, Minister of Finance, he is regarded as the ablest member of the Ministry. He considers an appeal to the country to be the proper constitutional course at present.

And on the 30th March, I find the statement in the "Times" that the differences have been reconciled between him and the First Minister, that a cordial understanding has been arrived at between Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and the latter has withdrawn his resignation. Taking all these statements together, either the Ottawa liar must be the correspondent of the London "Times," or there must be some foundation for the statements communicated—and communicated apparently in good faith, for there was no reason to mislead and there is nothing to mislead in these statements—to that great newspaper. Therefore, on the whole, I beg to say, speaking for myself, that it does appear to me that the delay this session has been wholly unjustifiable and unwarranted. Looking back over the last twenty sessions, the average duration of Parliament has been one hundred days and over. We know that the supplies ought to be voted by the 1st of July. Are we expected to rush things through? or are we called here to do anything? Taking the ordinary average session, we will be here until the 1st of August—long into the summer months. Is there any good reason for this? Is there even any pretense of reason at all in the excuse offered for this extraordinary delay? Has it come to this, that everything we do is done, not with a view to the advancement of the country's interest, not out of any consideration for the welfare of the country, but simply to advance party ends? Has it come to this that not merely are our elections delayed, as we know they are, with the warrants lying in the hands of the Clerk in Chancery for months and months, because the Minister will not name a returning officer and will not appoint a day for the elections until every preparation is made in the constituency, but that even the summoning of Parliament is delayed from month to month in order to suit party ends and exigencies? I think this House will be wanting in dignity and in the respect it owes to itself, if it does not let the Administration understand perfectly that there are rights which cannot be disregarded by any Government and that one of them is that Parliament ought to be summoned, in ordinary circumstances, at a convenient season for the members and the public who have business to discharge. Another matter to which I desire to draw attention is one that has occupied a good deal of time in this debate already, and in entering on it I desire the House to understand that I do not propose by any means to consider the question in all its bearings, but I think it important at this stage to let it be understood clearly here, and I hope elsewhere, what the true bearings of the Manitoba school question are. I was not surprised so much, at least in the constituency where I have been recently campaigning, at the misrepresentations that were made there. I was not astonished that upon the one side the people were told that the remedial order which had been passed by the Government was nothing more than an order passed in obedience to the mandate of Her Majesty. In other words, that it was merely handing on to Manitoba the decision and the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy

Council. That was hardly a fair way of putting it before the electors, but after all one was not so much surprised at that as to find in this House the misapprehension which seems to prevail on the part of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed us. It has, I confess, caused me some astonishment, and I hope I will be able to point out that their view is certainly not warranted or justified by anything to be found in the language or terms of the remedial order. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who addressed this House in a very able speech—and I am glad to have that to say of my young friend whom I have known from his boyhood—pointed out in the course of his very able address that all the Government had done and all that perhaps, I suppose, according to that doctrine, it proposed to do, was to hand over the case to the Government of Manitoba; and he went on to utter the fervent hope that the question would disappear from the arena of federal politics and that the province of Manitoba would arrange amicably the rights or privileges of the minority in respect of the matters complained of and which the Privy Council said had been affected. Now that was somewhat the view presented on behalf of my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, in the contest just closed—that the Government were not responsible for the decision; that they were not responsible for their actions; that they had simply handed on to Manitoba the judgment of the Privy Council, and that it was to be hoped that the Legislature of Manitoba would settle that matter amicably, and cause it to disappear from federal politics. Well, I pass from him to the hon. leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in his address seemed to be surprised at the language of the Speech from the Throne in which it was said the Government had come to a decision. My hon. friend went on to say that he had read the order pretty carefully and that he could hardly call it a decision. It was simply an invitation to the Government of Manitoba to deal with the question, leaving it to them to apply a remedy to the evil which had been created by their own legislation. The invitation unfortunately was not couched, my hon. friend went on to say, in very pleasant language. My hon. friend, the leader of the House, then followed, and we have another view from him as to the meaning of it. And the view he put forward was this:

> What is the case to-day, he asks. That subject is manumitted to the Legislature of Manitoba. Call it dictatorial, call it nerveless, look upon it as you please, it is simply this: A decision of the law; and, if there is a request implied, it is a request implied by courtesy to the better powers which Manitoba has, as compared with this Parliament, to settle the question.

That is the interpretation of the hon. gentleman who leads the House. It is a decision of law, and accompanying that decision of law is the request implied that Manitoba, with the better powers which undoubtedly her legislature has than has this Parliament for settling that question, will deal with it. Then further on, the hon. gentleman went on to say:

> Until the ninth of May, when the decision of the Manitoba Government may be come to, and the legislature may be convened to hear it, let Manitoba think over that matter with as little passion and as free from strife and bitterness as possible, let her come to her conclusions, and until that day comes and those conclusions are formulated, I am bound to maintain, as I hope, that she will do her own work as she best can do, and that she will find the way for making smooth these waters, which are now rough and troubled.

Lastly, I will trouble the House with a reference to the statement made by the Minister of Justice, which is more frank, more in accordance with the truth, if I may say so—I am not, of course, implying that the other hon. gentlemen did not say what they thought to be true—but more in accordance with the facts than the views put forward by the other gentlemen to whom I have referred.

> Following strictly the lines of the statute, the order had to be in a sense dictatorial, but in no offensive sense. It had to make a direction. It had to state clearly and precisely what was required to be done, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor General in Council; and any one having experience with the orders of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England will find that, so far as that dictatorial spirit is concerned, all of those orders possess it. It is the language of judgment; it is the technical spirit and nothing more.

Now, which of these definitions is correct? Is it, in the first place, a decision? Is it merely handing over to Manitoba a judgment pronounced by the Judicial Committee? Is it a request courteously conveyed to Manitoba to improve her legislation and to amend her law, or is it a judgment, harsh as judgments must be, because they are technical, and commanding Manitoba to carry out and obey the direction of the Governor General in Council here? Sir, it will be my business, if I can, to make it plain to this House. Now, in the first place, there cannot be any greater misunderstanding than to treat the judgment of the Privy Council as a decree or order to the Governor General, or to this Parliament, or to the Manitoba Legislature. We must not forget, Sir, that the opinion that has been offered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, is an opinion which was sought from the Supreme Court of the Dominion of Canada. The Government were authorized by an Act passed by this Parliament not very long ago, to obtain for the information of the Government—and, if my hon. friends would look at the statute, they will find that that is the language of the Act, as it was

the language of Mr. Blake's resolution, "for the information of the Government,"—the opinion of the Supreme Court upon any question of law or fact. In this case there was no question of fact submitted to the Supreme Court. There were questions of law; and these were submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, with the view of obtaining from that tribunal information as to their meaning and interpretation; but only for the information of the Governor General in Council. It will not be forgotten by hon. gentlemen who heard the first discussion on that subject—I mean when Mr. Blake introduced his resolution—that Sir John Macdonald, in the very clearest language, declared that he would not be any party to handing over to the court any of the powers or responsibilities which rest upon our Government, according to the principles of responsible government; but that, if it was merely for the information of the Executive, who should still be responsible for their acts, who should be perfectly justified in rejecting the opinion of the Supreme Court or of the Judicial Committee, if they saw fit, then, believer as he was in responsible government, he was willing to accept the principle of the resolution which Mr. Blake proposed. I will read Sir John Macdonald's words:

> When I first read the hon. gentleman's resolution hastily it occurred to me, as I daresay it occurred to many hon. gentlemen who hear me now, that it was an advance towards the American system and proposed to transfer the responsibility of the Ministry of the day to a judicial tribunal; but on scanning the resolution in its carefully prepared terms, that impression was dissipated, and I saw that the principal object of the resolution, as I read it, is that the question submitted by the Executive to the judicial tribunal should be enforced, sustained and presented to Parliament, to the public and to the Crown by the fact of this legal decision having been given. * * * * Of course my hon. friend in his resolution has guarded against the supposition that such a decision is binding on the Executive. It is expressly stated that such a decision is only for the information of the Government.

Now, these were the words of Sir John Macdonald with reference to the resolution, and, if my hon. friends will consult the Act of Parliament, they will find that that Act which was passed in the following session, and in which the language of the resolution was closely adhered to, provides that questions may be submitted to the judicial tribunal for the information of the Executive Government. Sir John proceeded:

> The Executive is not relieved from any responsibility because of any answer being given by the tribunal. If the Executive were to be relieved of any responsibility I should consider that a fatal blot in the proposition of my hon. friend. I believe in responsible government; I believe in the responsibility of the Executive. But the answer of the tribunal will be simply for the information of the Government. The Government may dissent from that decision, and it may be their duty to do so, if they differ from the conclusion to which the court has come. * * * I do not think there can be any doubt as to the meaning of the motion of my hon. friend. I think it is so explicit in its terms that no questions can arise as to what its meaning is, and if there were any doubt as to its meaning—there are none in my own mind—those doubts would be removed by the lucid speech of my hon. friend. That speech is of record in the Hansard.

So that, even upon the dry question of law, which the Act of Parliament authorizes the Government to submit to the court, Sir John Macdonald pointed out, and clearly pointed out, that the Government would not be relieved from any responsibility by following the opinion of the court; and that they would be perfectly justified in rejecting, if they thought fit to do so, that opinion even upon the dry question of law which the court might give in answer to questions submitted. Now, Sir, I am not here to make objection at this time—or at any time, for that matter—to the opinion arrived at by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But what I desire to express, and to make as clear as I possibly can, is that the matter arose in this way: The appeal being presented, or the application being made, to the Governor in Council, under the Manitoba Act, that the Government were authorized and empowered, and they availed themselves of that authority, to obtain from the court an answer to this important question of law, whether there was ground for the appeal as a matter of law, and whether the complaint, assuming that to be true which was stated in the petition, would justify interference by the Governor in Council. The answer to this question could, in no sense, be looked upon as an order from the court which this Government or this Parliament was bound to obey. Sir, we have not got to that yet, and I trust we are not likely to get to it, that this great Canadian Parliament is subject to the direction of any court of law, and our system of responsible government has not yet become so effete that the Government of this country can pretend that they are bound to obey the order of any court of law. There is no court of law can order the Government of this country to do anything. There is no court of law which the Government of this country is bound to obey. I am not meaning to say that they are not bound to obey the law—we are bound. But they are not, in any sense, amenable to any court of law; no order can be obtained against them to compel them to perform any functions. What they do, is done as responsible Ministers of the Crown, responsible to this House for all they do; and it is an attempt to shield themselves from that responsibility, as it appears to me, which has induced them to resort to this theory of the judgment of the Privy Council. The question went from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, but the answer that is given is of no more binding

effect or authority than if it had been given by the Supreme Court of Canada, the Privy Council merely determining that the Supreme Court of Canada ought to have decided the questions in the manner in which the Privy Council has answered them. In other words, they gave the judgment or opinion in answer to these questions which they say the Supreme Court of Canada ought to have given; and the direction, therefore, is that the judgment, or the answers to the questions given by the Supreme Court of Canada, should be corrected and amended in accordance with the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Now, Sir, how can that be treated? You ask for an opinion and you get your answer. You are at liberty, according to the very highest authority we had, to accept or reject that opinion, and then you do it under the responsibility which we all know and we all believe in as a part of the responsibility that the Executive owe to this Parliament. How, then, can it be pretended that the answers to any of these questions are a command, in any sense or in any way, which the Government of this country were bound to obey? I am free to say that under that decision on a point of law the Government were justified in entertaining the appeal; I am free to say that, in my judgment, after that full discussion that the case underwent, whether the conclusion is right, or whether the conclusion is wrong, the Government, at all events, ought not to be blamed, and I, for my part, do not hold them responsible or blameworthy because they have exercised the jurisdiction which, under the circumstances, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council thought they possessed. My complaint is, that in exercising that jurisdiction they had just as much right to reject the petition as they had to allow it, just as much right to determine against the prayer of the petition as in favour of it; and that for what they did they are responsible, not judicially responsible, but they are responsible as the Executive of this country to the Parliament of this country, and, ultimately, to the people, whose representatives we are. Now, Sir, what are the terms of the order? The terms are to be found in the blue-book which has been distributed, and we may reject all but the last two pages of that blue-book, pages 26 and 27, the report of the Committee to His Excellency the Governor General, dated 19th March, giving the reasons which induced the Government to make this order. But the order itself is to found on these two pages at the end, pages 26 and 27, and it is so plain, it is so technically plain—it has been drawn with the greatest possible care, it has been drawn and framed upon the pattern of the decisions of the Judicial Committee itself—that there can be no mistake at all as to what it means and what it says. What does it say? It says: "At the Government House, at Ottawa, Thursday, 21st March, 1895. Present: His Excellency the Governor General." Now, if we go back a few pages in this same blue-book, we will find how exact the copy has been, because we find: "Imperial Order in Council. At the Court at Osborne House, Isle of Wight, the 2nd day of February, 1895. Present: The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, Lord President, the Marquis of Ripon," and so on. Here we have present His Excellency the Governor General, the Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, and all his colleagues who were present on the occasion, I think all being present except Sir Frank Smith, and the late Minister of Militia, whose name I do not see amongst the other Privy Councillors in this list. Now, what is stated here? It is stated here in the first place that the petition was presented, setting forth the terms of that petition. That petition complained that by these statutes that were passed in 1890, setting forth what they were, the effect of these Acts was to repeal the previous Acts of the province of Manitoba in relation to education, and to deprive the Roman Catholic minority of the rights and privileges which it had acquired under such previous statutes; and by the said petition the said Roman Catholic minority pray, among other things:

> That it might be declared that the said last-mentioned Acts did affect the rights and privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education; that it might be declared that to His Excellency the Governor General in Council it seems requisite that the provisions of the statutes in force in the province of Manitoba, prior to the passage of said Acts, should be re-enacted, in so far, at least, as may be necessary to secure to the Roman Catholics in the said province the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support their schools in the manner provided for by said statutes.

In other words, that the separate school system, introduced in 1871, should be restored.

> To secure to them their proportionate share of any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education, and to relieve such members of the Roman Catholic Church as contribute to Roman Catholic schools, from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools; or that the said Acts of 1890 should be so modified or amended as to effect such purposes; and that such further or other declaration or order might be made as to His Excellency the Governor General in Council should, under the circumstances, seem proper.

Then it goes on to recite that on the 26th February, the time appointed for hearing, the matter was heard, the petition was read, and the statutes were referred to. Argument was adduced on both sides, and then it goes on:

> His Excellency the Governor General in Council has been pleased to order and adjudge, and it is hereby ordered and adjudged, that the said appeal be, and the same is hereby allowed.

Now, I wonder that my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, doubted that that was a decision. Here we have the recital of the petition, we have the further statement that the matter came on to be heard, that it was heard, and that after the hearing of it:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to order and adjudge, and it is hereby ordered and adjudged, that the said appeal be, and the same is hereby allowed, in so far as it relates to rights acquired by the said Roman Catholic minority under legislation of the province of Manitoba, passed subsequently to the union of that province with the Dominion of Canada, and His Excellency the Governor in Council was pleased to adjudge and declare, and it is hereby adjudged and declared, that by the two Acts passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba on the 1st day of May, 1890—

Setting out the titles—

the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, have been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic minority of the following rights and privileges, which, previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had, viz. :—

(a) The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890, as aforesaid.

Now, I ask the attention of the House to the terms of that order, and then we will, by and by, be able to see with what grace the Minister who leads this House asks us to believe that the Legislature of Manitoba had been invited courteously to settle this matter. The declaration is that the rights of the minority were affected, inasmuch as they were deprived of that which they enjoyed before, the rights to build, maintain, manage, equip, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed :

(b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education.

(c) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools, from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

Now, these were the rights that were interfered with. The order is in these words :

And His Excellency the Governor General was further pleased to declare and decide, and it is hereby declared that it seems requisite——

These are the very words of the statute—

—that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid shall be supplemented by a Provincial Act or Acts which shall restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which will modify the said Acts of 1890, so far and so far only as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), hereinbefore mentioned.

Whereof the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba for the time being, and the legislature of the said province, and all persons whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Is there any possible doubt as to the meaning of that order ? Is there a shadow of doubt resting on the mind of any hon. member that the Government, assuming judicial functions—and that is a matter not of so much importance, the form of the Order makes very little difference—has declared, in substance, which no doubt is perfectly true, that the Roman Catholic minority, by the Act of 1890, were deprived of those rights, and that the legislature is now required to restore those rights by the passage of an Act or Acts to supplement the Act of 1890. Now, what is the meaning of it all ? What does the leader of the House mean, and what does the hon. gentleman who moved the Address mean by hoping that Manitoba will settle the question ? Manitoba has no discretion. Manitoba is commanded to do so and so—you do not leave to the legislature the least discretion. The legislature is ordered and commanded to pass remedial legislation, to restore the school system of 1870, and although it is to be an Act, and although according to the forms it will have to be read a first, second and third time, the legislature has from its introduction until the passage of it to confine itself within the limits of the Order, and there is no discretion allowed. Anything short of that would not obey the Order ; anything beyond that would be ultra vires so far as the Order is concerned. All the difference in the world is there between that and passing it over to the legislature, which, if it is the opinion of the Executive here that separate schools ought to be restored, might well have been done. If the Government of the country arrive at the conclusion that the separate school system was better for Manitoba or better in any case, that might have been passed on, to use the words of the hon. gentleman who moved the Address, as the opinion of this Executive to the legislature of Manitoba, and Manitoba with that warning might have taken such a course as to the province seemed fit. But that has not been the course adopted. The Order reached here, we are told, on the 19th, I think, if the report is correct ; but before it reached here, on the 16th, the celebrated Council was held on Saturday, being that date. Everybody supposed that the sitting was to decide whether there was to be a session or a dissolution ; but when the Council rose Manitoba was summoned by telegraph to appear on the 26th and show cause why a remedial order should not be passed. Formal notice to that effect was sent. So the Government had apparently made up its mind. And is there any doubt, reading what fell from the Minister of Public Works, who has come to be the

leading spirit in the Cabinet, who dominates, governs and controls and issues his manifestos, and appears to have obtained the upper hand, that the Government then determined that this remedial order should be passed, and the only question left in abeyance, and that was not apparent to the outside world, was whether a session was to be held immediately afterwards and remedial legislation passed. So far as the Order goes, I am not dealing now, nor do I propose to deal, with its merits; there will be other opportunities before long for dealing with the question of merits, and I am not going to point out why the Order should not have been made, but I am dealing simply with the question of the position in which the passing of the Order has left the province, and that the object and purpose of the Order was to direct Manitoba, without allowing any power of discretion to the province, to restore the school system as it existed, and on disobedience of this order it will, I dare say, be found that this Parliament has only power to implement the terms of the remedial order. What were the terms of the school system of 1871? What was this system which this Government, going even beyond what Mr. Ewart, who appeared for the Catholic minority, asked, desires to restore? Has any man's voice ever been raised in its defence? Has any argument been uttered in support of that system? Hon. members will read by and by when the papers are brought down, Mr. Ewart's argument on behalf of the Catholic minority, and I venture to say that neither he nor any other man has ventured to utter a single word in favour of the Manitoba school system as it existed between 1871 and 1890. What was it? The system of education in the province was the appointment of a school board, the division of that school board into two sections, Protestant and Catholic, the handing over to each of those sections its proportionate share of public money; and beyond the fact that the salary of the Superintendent of Education was the subject of an Order in Council from the Lieutenant-Governor, absolutely all control over education was handed over to those different sections. There were no regulations, no control over the curriculum, no control of any kind; and when you compare the separate school system of Ontario with that which existed in Manitoba the differences are so great that the systems can hardly be compared. In Ontario it is provided that under the Minister of Education regulations shall be made, that books shall be selected and that more or less throughout the whole system of education the matter is subject to the control of the Minister, and again in the last way subject, of course, to the control of the legislature of the province. Again, it is absolutely forbidden in Manitoba that a Protestant shall contribute to a Catholic school or a Catholic to a Protestant school. What happens in places where there are not enough children to establish two schools? You cannot have either. We in the older provinces have no conception of the schools in that country. It was stated, and I give it as an example, that it was recently proposed by the Government of Manitoba to deprive all schools which had not an average attendance of eight children from a share of the public grant, and that is since the Act of 1890; and upon inquiry being made it was found that out of 750 schools 150 would be deprived of their share of the public grant if that law went into force. Divide up that grant and you render the system impossible. So it is proposed to restore a school system in which the public money was handed over to sections, there being no control over it in the slightest degree, a system under which no taxation could be levied on a Protestant to contribute to a Catholic school, or a Catholic to a Protestant school, and the result was almost appalling, for it was found that in Manitoba large sections of the population were practically growing up in absolute ignorance. But that is the system which is to be restored. It is not the separate school system, it is not merely to re-establish separate schools, but to introduce separate schools which are not to be subject to control. But the legislature of Manitoba are by suitable acts to hand over to the separate school section the power to maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the statutes which were repealed. And then we are told: You have given a discretion to the province of Manitoba as to how she is to adjust and regulate her school affairs so as not to leave this question in federal politics. Now, Sir, I have pointed out—and I do not propose to take up the time of the House at this stage with doing more than pointing out—I have pointed out exactly how this matter stands, and I want to emphasize it if I can, that this Government, sitting here as a quasi-judicial body—assuming or pretending, couching their orders in the language of a judicial body as the Committee of the Privy Council is—have directed the legislature of the province to restore the system which I have only very faintly outlined exactly as it was in the manner provided by these Acts, and that the legislature—if any person will take the statute and look at it,—the legislature has either to obey, in which case of course the school system of 1871 will be restored, or to disobey, and in that event this Parliament will be called upon to pass the legislation required to give effect to the remedial order. I have now, Sir, only to make one observation with regard to my friend Mr. Sifton, whose conduct in coming down here and taking part in the election in Haldimand has been animadverted upon by more than one member. If I read rightly the speech of the hon. gentleman who leads this House, he called it an outrage. I did not hear last night the speech from my hon. friend from Assiniboia

(Mr. Davin), but I believe he criticised it in pretty severe terms also. Well, Sir, I would like to know in what sense or in what respect Mr. Sifton is worthy of these severe condemnations because of his interference in the Haldimand election. Is it because that he is a Minister of a local government? If so, what do we say about the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, who took a most prominent part in the election at Verchères.

An hon. MEMBER. And Casgrain.

Another hon. MEMBER. And Beaubien.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And Sir Leonard Tilley in the local elections in Ontario years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not parallel cases at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I want to know why. Will my hon. friend tell me in what respect they are not parallel?

Mr. FOSTER. In one case the Minister was part of a body which has to give a decision on the question; in the other case he was not.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I understand the distinction and I am glad to know it. Then there is no wrong in it because he was simply a Minister. As a citizen of Canada, I suppose he had a perfect right to appear in any electoral contest?

Mr. FOSTER. A perfect right.

Mr. McCARTHY. A perfect right, yes. As a Minister of a local government he was not disqualified, but my hon. friend says he was disqualified because he is a member of the legislature of Manitoba, which has not yet given its decision.

Mr. COSTIGAN. And which has asked for time to consider its decision.

Mr. McCARTHY. I take the additional statement made by the Minister of Marine; and has asked time to give its decision. On what principle does that disqualify him? He is not pretending, as these hon. gentlemen did here, that they are sitting in Manitoba as a judicial body. While this Cabinet was pretending that, the hon. Minister of Public Works went down to St. Hyacinthe and advanced his argument and announced that if that judgment was not given which has been given he would abandon the Government and retire from the Ministry. Surely that was far more reprehensible than the case of a gentleman who is not pretending to be a judicial officer, who is pretending only to be a member of the Government as he is, and a member of a legislative body which he belongs to.

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) would read what I have said, so as not to mislead, or at all events to give a wrong impression.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will do that with great pleasure. I will read exactly what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ouimet) said, for I think I have it here. I find, on looking through my notes, that unfortunately I have not it here—I am sorry for that, because I think it would bear out all I say. My recollection of it is—not pretending to give the exact words—that the hon. gentleman declared at St. Hyacinthe that the Government were a unit on the subject of carrying out the law and the constitution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait, I am not done. And he declared, that the Government proposed to carry out this matter by its remedial order, and that if that order was not passed, he for one would know what his course was and that he would resign.

Mr. DUPONT. No. I was there, and that is not so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am only speaking from recollection, and I do not pretend to give the very words, but I think I have given in substance what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. OUIMET. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I am glad to hear the denial of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), who was present, and who heard every word I said on that occasion.

Mr. McCARTHY. What were the words the hon. gentleman did say?

Mr. OUIMET. You read them during your argument before the Committee of the Privy Council, and they do not bear out what you are saying now.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think they do. Now, Sir, I do not suppose that that would make very much difference, because if Mr. Sifton was guilty of an impropriety, I would not stand here to justify it because the Minister of Public Works was guilty of another impropriety. I point out further that Mr. Sifton does not pretend to be holding any judicial position, and again I want to know why Mr. Sifton should not take part in that election. Mr. Sifton has made up his mind as a member of the Government, without meeting the legislature, as he had a perfect right to do, and he announces as a member of the Government, with the concurrence of his colleagues, that they do not—so far as they have any power over the legislature—they do not propose to obey the remedial order. Having made up his mind to that, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will withdraw the statement that it was an outrage for Mr. Sifton to come down and take part in the contest. If Mr. Sifton is not able to get the legislative body to go with him his duty will be to resign, but so far as he is concerned his mind is made up. He did not require to cogitate over this subject from the time the order reached Manitoba until the 9th day of May. The adjournment for that

long date, as he tells me, was simply for the convenience of members who are mostly farmers and who desire to attend to their business before the reassembling of the legislature.

Mr. FOSTER. What meant his quest for legal advice.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know that he made any quest for legal advice, nor does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) know that he ever made any quest for legal advice. All I can say is : that he announced publicly —and I think that is since confirmed by Mr. Greenway—that the determination of the Government of Manitoba was as a government, to advise the legislature not to obey that order and, under these circumstances, he was perfectly justified. Now, he would be justified under any circumstances in coming down to Haldimand and asking the electors of Haldimand to take such action as would prevent interference with the affairs of Manitoba by the Federal Parliament. I am glad, therefore, to feel now, after that statement, that any reflection on Mr. Sifton must be withdrawn. He had as much right as any other citizen in the country to take part in the contest, he did it openly and above-board, and I think that if any Minister of the Crown representing a legislative body was ever justified in coming to a constituency, certainly it was a member of the Government of Manitoba on a matter of this kind. His speeches have been very largely quoted, and I think it will be found that in them not a solitary reference was made to the general politics of the country. It is perfectly well known that Mr. Sifton is a Liberal. He has been a Liberal all his life. I dare say that, like other Liberals, he is at variance with the Government here on very many public questions. But he was most careful in everything he said to confine his arguments to the appeal made on behalf of Manitoba to the people of Ontario; and, although not successful in Haldimand, I trust and believe that that appeal will be found to be successful elsewhere. Mr. Sifton's statements have been boldly and openly made, and they are uncontradicted, in regard to the lamentable state of things which existed in Manitoba, and which compelled the legislature of that province to introduce the system of schools now in force there ; and I think it would be an extraordinary thing indeed if any other legislative body should be found to attempt to control or interfere with it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I need not assure the House that I have no intention of answering the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McCarthy) by any constitutional argument on this subject, to meet the arguments put forward by him. In rising at present I simply ask permission of the House, and of you, Mr. Speaker, to deal for a few moments with the subject from another point of view entirely—first, because I do not think that the line which the hon. member has followed was at all a proper line to take ; and, secondly, because I do not think we have reached the stage when we are called upon to discuss the subject at any great length. I may say at the outset that while many of the speakers who have taken part in this debate have alluded to the reference made to this subject in the Speech from the Throne as one calculated to create strife and enmity in this country, there is one consolation to every old member in this House—yes, and a consolation to every Canadian in this country who feels that he is represented in this Parliament—that this Parliament has time and again given proof of its ability to deal with the most delicate questions, and to deal with them in the most intelligent and satisfactory manner. We have had occasion before to discuss subjects which were calculated to create divisions and dissentions in our country that would have had consequences very serious to its peace, and I am sure that every member of this House will agree with me, on looking back at the record of those discussions, that those of us who have taken part in them can congratulate it upon the tone and the dignity that this Parliament has exhibited on all such occasions. Therefore, Sir, I feel confident that the remarks which I offer to-day will be received by my fellow-members in the spirit in which I intend to deliver them. In the first place, I deny the right or the propriety of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) making the appeal which he has made in this House and in the country on the question of separate schools as against common schools, because that question has not arisen. The whole question with which this Parliament has been or may be called to deal, the question with which the courts and the Privy Council have been called to deal, is not whether separate schools are to be established in Manitoba or not. They could not deal with such a question ; they were not clothed with the power to deal with it. The whole question was : Have any rights under the constitution under which we live been taken away from any minority ? And what has been the answer ? The highest tribunal in the Empire has declared that certain rights have been taken away from a minority in one of the provinces. This is the whole subject, and not whether separate schools are better than common schools, or whether they should be forced on the people of Manitoba or not. But I want to take issue with the hon. gentleman on another point, and a more serious one. I want to say in the name of the people for whom to some extent I have the right to speak, that it was a gross act of injustice to the Catholics of this country for the hon. member for North Simcoe, as well as certain newspapers and other prominent gentlemen, all through the time that

the question has been under discussion, to inflame the public mind by trying to create the impression that the Catholics of this country have been the aggressors, and have attempted to force Catholic schools upon the country, and to interfere with provincial rights. While I do not want to discuss the question, because the time has not yet come for discussing anything beyond the remedial order that has been passed, let me say here that I fully agree with the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in expressing the most earnest desire that the legislature of Manitoba will afford the remedy to the evil created in that legislature by its own act, and that the matter may not be brought into this Parliament at all. I will not be so unkind as to suppose for one moment that any hon. gentleman in this House would feel disappointed at such a peaceable solution of the matter. I would not do so cruel a thing to any public man in this country as to charge him with entertaining the hope that Manitoba might not settle this question, and that it might come here to be settled by the Dominion Parliament, with the view of creating dissatisfaction and anxiety in the country. We all trust that the remedial order, having gone to the Manitoba Legislature, will be dealt with effectually by that body. We do not all insist, as did the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, that the remedial order places that legislature in the position that they must pay the last pound of flesh. If the hon. gentleman were in a position to say that the legislature of Manitoba had refused to take action and that this Parliament was called upon to do so—if he were in a position to say that the legislature of Manitoba had offered any fair and reasonable compromise, with the object of restoring peace and harmony, and that the minority in that province had refused such a fair and reasonable compromise, his argument might have some weight. But I say that it is most unfair and most ungenerous to charge the Catholics of this country with the responsibility of this agitation. There must be a beginning of all things, and there must be reasons for the exceptional legislation to which we are obliged to refer, and out of which this question grows. Every hon. member of this House who is familiar with the history of confederation and the circumstances under which confederation was brought about, knows full well that it was not the Catholics of this country who insisted on this exceptional legislation. We know that as a matter of history, as a matter of record, from the discussions which took place when the whole question of the agreement and the treaty between the different parties to the confederation was under consideration. When that was being considered by the old Canadian Parliament, the Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada, what were the real facts? The Catholics did not say: You must give us certain rights and privileges and make them permanent by law or else we will not go into confederation. No; it was quite the other way. It was the Protestants, the leading men in Parliament at that time, men like the Hon. George Brown, the Hon. Mr. Holton, Sir Alexander Galt—all the prominent men at the time—who insisted, as the first condition of confederation, that the educational rights of the Protestant minority in Quebec should be protected and guaranteed. At that time the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec had certain rights, though not so extensive as those they now have. The Catholic minority in Ontario had certain rights under the Bill of 1863, but more limited than those now enjoyed by the Protestant minority in Quebec. It was then declared by all these gentlemen I have named that before confederation could take place at all, the Government must bring in a Bill dealing with the province of Quebec, and amending right there and then the school law as it then existed in that province. The Protestant leaders in Parliament were not content that the rights of the Protestant minority in Quebec as they then existed should be secured by confederation. They said: That is not enough, we want perfect and full control of educational matters for our minority in Quebec, and unless you amend the law now so as to give us that full and complete control, it will not be binding under the Act of Confederation. Therefore, that was done, and let me say to the credit of the people of Quebec, and their representative men, that no voice was raised during that discussion objecting in the slightest degree to the proposal. On the contrary, they said they were willing to give that, and any further guarantee which the minority might desire at the time. Then followed the proposition that if you gave to the minority in Quebec the protection they asked for on the educational question, why not give the same guarantee to the minority in Ontario? That was a fair proposition to make at a time when the prominent men of the country were assembled together to lay the foundations of a new nation by uniting provinces with different interests, speaking different languages, and believing different religions. The fair proposition was then made to give, on the other hand, the Catholic minority in Ontario similar rights. I am not going to find fault, I am not attempting to draw a comparison in an offensive sense between the Protestants and the Catholics at that time, but I simply state the facts as proving the position I have taken from the first—that the condition of things we have now is not chargeable to the Catholics at all, except in part, but is simply due to the movement made by the Protestants themselves to secure protection

to their minority in the province of Quebec. That was agreed to in the first place by the Finance Minister, Sir Alexander Galt, when he pledged himself to it in his speech at Sherbrooke. He was questioned in the House afterwards by the Hon. Mr. Holton, who said :

The Minister of Finance, in a speech at Sherbrooke, had promised that the Government would introduce a Bill to amend the school laws of Lower Canada. The honourable gentleman must be aware that this was a question on which there was a great deal of feeling in this section of the province amongst the English-speaking, or the Protestant class, of the population. He did not like to introduce anything of a religious character into discussions of this House, but in debating the great changes which it was proposed to effect in our system of government, the effect of them upon that class to which he referred must be considered. Among that class there was no phase or feature of these threatened changes which excited so much alarm as this very question of education. Well, the Minister of Finance had said, with great solemnity, as having the authority of his colleagues for it, that this session the Government would bring down amendments to the school laws of Lower Canada, which they proposed enacting into law before a change of Government should take place, and which would become a permanent settlement of the question.

That pledge was carried out. I may quote further what the Hon. Mr. Letellier de Saint Just said, and I do this merely to show the spirit in which this proposition was met by gentlemen representing different nationalities. He said :

I have heard it said that the Protestants of Lower Canada ought to be satisfied with their prospects of the future, because we have always acted with liberality towards them. But that is no guarantee for them, for we would not content ourselves with a mere promise to act liberally, if we considered that our interest or our institutions were threatened by a majority differing in race and religion from ourselves ; and in any case that is not the way to ensure the peace of the country. If we establish this principle, we should say to the Catholics of Upper Canada that they ought to be satisfied with the lot which we provide for them. When we make a constitution, we must, in the first place, settle the political and religious questions which divide the population for whom the constitution is devised ; because it is a well-known fact, that it is religious differences which have caused the greatest troubles and the greatest difficulties which have agitated the people in days gone by.

There were no two opinions on that subject, that, in the best interests of the country these things should be settled at once, so that friction might be avoided in the future. The Quebec representatives, having conceded the Protestant minority the right to so amend the then existing law as to give them full and complete control in the matter of education in the province of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, whom I am glad to see hale and hearty in his place to-day, moved an amendment to the effect that similar privileges should be extended to the Catholic minority in Ontario. That amendment was, however, lost by a very large majority. Mr. D'Arcy McGee said that the Bill of 1863, which had been carried, conveyed to the Catholics of Ontario all that they had asked for in their petition, and he, for his part, had accepted that as a finality, and therefore would not ask to open up that question again, unless special and further privileges were granted to the Protestant minority in Quebec, in which case he thought the minority in Ontario ought to be protected in exactly the same way. Well, the vote was taken, and only a small vote was given in favour of the motion of Mr. Bourassa, showing that the minority in Quebec were exceptionally well treated—not too well treated from a Quebec point of view and from a Catholic point of view, because, as I said, there was not a single dissenting voice representing that province raised against that proposition. Now, much has been said to surround this question with difficulty for the present, but only for the present, for, just as in Haldimand, when the question is understood by the intelligent people of the country, they will finally give the same answer. A great deal has been said with a view to create sympathy for the people of Manitoba, that this would be an interference with their provincial rights, that it is dictation on the part of the Federal Parliament to force separate schools upon an unwilling province, ignoring its provincial autonomy. I will not answer the constitutional argument any further than to say that if this contention were true, you would never have this judgment. The judgment of the Privy Council was surely not in favour of taking away any right from the province of Manitoba or any other province. Then you hear the appeal made that we should leave Manitoba alone to deal with this question. That is what we hope will be done. It is left in Manitoba's own hands. The question is before that province, and we trust the solution will come from there ; that this Parliament may not be forced to take a further step and do the unpleasant duty that may be forced upon it. But why all this sympathy with the province of Manitoba more than with the province of Ontario, with the province of Quebec, of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia ?—for each one of these larger provinces I have named is exactly in the same position as Manitoba, has the same rights and no more. There is no reason why Manitoba should have any more rights than was intended to be given her under the constitution, than was actually given her under the constitution, or than was actually given to the other provinces in the confederation. Just to show how inconsistent it is to carry too far this argument about giving unlimited jurisdiction to the province of Manitoba in educational questions, let us take an analogous case. It might be proper to give Manitoba unlimited power in relation to education, but this is not the time

to discuss it. The constitution under which we live has been framed, and our duty is to live under it and obey it—or amend it; but not to ignore it, not to defy it, not to set it at naught. But with regard to this question of unlimited jurisdiction to each province; that has not been carried out, that is not the principle under which we live; that is not embodied in our constitution, but quite the reverse is embodied in our constitution. Not alone Manitoba has not, under that constitution, full scope in the question of education, but Quebec has not, Ontario has not, nor has New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. But that is not the only case. If there is one question beyond every other that affects a legislative body, it is the regulating of the constituencies for its own elections. No one will say that on general grounds a province should not have full control to construct and reconstruct the boundaries of its electoral division for representation in its own provincial legislature. But there is a case where it was thought wise to depart from that rule. That was not done through conspiracy of the Catholic hierarchy, nor through undue influence from Rome, nor at the bidding of Catholic electors, but as an act of liberality by the Catholics of the great province of Quebec. When this demand was made in old Canada that the rights of the Protestant minority in Quebec should be secured, you will find that it was not only on the question of education; you will find that it was on the question of representation. And Sir John Rose said then, though he was quite sure that the minority would be perfectly safe in the hands of a majority, judging from past experience, still there was an uneasiness among the people, because it would be within the power of the provincial legislature, after confederation, to change these constituencies, so that not one single English Protestant representative would be elected for that province. The knowledge of that caused uneasiness throughout the province, and it was thought a guarantee should be given. Every member from the province of Quebec acceded to that view and said: "Yes, we will agree to any arrangement that will make our fellow-subjects perfectly safe in regard to these matters, so that there may be no feeling of uneasiness whatever. Before this was carried there was nothing in the arrangements to guarantee to the English the continuance of the rights they had, other than, as Sir John Rose said, the veto power. But Mr. Holton pointed out that that was a weak, unreliable guarantee. If the provincial legislature passed an Act so disarranging the constituencies as to deprive the Protestant minority of their representation, that Act might not be disallowed. Mr. Holton asked Sir George E. Cartier, who was then Attorney General East., if he himself would advise disallowance in that case. His answer was: Certainly; I would disallow any Act under which an injustice was done to the Protestant minority. Still that was not thought a sufficiently definite guarantee, because the power of disallowance might not be exercised, it might be found not convenient to exercise it. A more perfect guarantee was given by the arrangement of the electoral divisions under section 80 of the Confederation Act, by which twelve of these constituencies were set apart, and up to this day those twelve constituencies are there with their original boundaries, not one of which boundaries can be altered while seven of the representatives object to it in the legislature. Now, in the face of all that affecting the older provinces, how can my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) appeal in Haldimand, or in any part of the country, or in this House—and let me say I am glad that his appeal in this House is very much more moderate and on a higher level than his appeal in Haldimand—for exceptional privileges, rights and powers to be given to the province of Manitoba? I trust these remarks will be understood in the spirit in which they are given. In the first place my object is to protest against any attempt made in this House or out of it, to create disturbance in the country, by crying out that an attempt is being made to force Catholic schools upon a Protestant majority so large as that of Manitoba. I say that this exceptional legislation is a portion of our constitution; I say that if the Catholics enjoy rights, they enjoy them like other subjects; I say that Protestants have their rights specially guaranteed under the constitution in certain sections of the country; I say that for this exceptional legislation Protestants are more responsible than the Catholics; I say that if the exception had not been made in Quebec in the first instance, you would have had no guarantees of a similar kind in the other provinces. Therefore, I ask you to deal fairly, as I know the people of this country are ever ready to do, notwithstanding the efforts to mislead them and to confuse the issue by men who rejoice more in causing strife than in the peace and prosperity of their country, men who have no standing while the country is in a condition of quiet, and who only hope to succeed in the storm and whirlwind of sectarian feeling, men who sow the seed of strife and whose only activity is in sowing that seed for a bad purpose—among them some men who, in the opinion of many, were fitted for better things. Many things, Sir, make us all feel proud of the great deeds accomplished by our late chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald. They stand as monuments to his memory, and his countrymen are proud of them. But there were some things he could not accomplish. He undertook to make a useful statesman of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He used his influence, he used his prestige, he did everything he could to promote the interest and the welfare of his young friend at that time, but it all proved

an utter failure. That hon. gentleman has disappointed the hopes of that great statesman, and he will disappoint, if he has not already done so, the hopes of his friends in this country in seeing him become a useful public man. Now, Sir, having said so much with regard to the spirit in which we should approach this question, finding that it is not a question that we can afford to deal with in a small and narrow-minded way, the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House is to approach it solemnly, honestly, and candidly, as patriotic Canadians; the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House is to remember that it must have an important bearing upon the future of this country, that it is one fraught with danger and harm, but the harm will be minimized according to the character of the debate, and the manner in which the question may be dealt with if it should come here. Therefore, I say it is the duty of every Canadian, in the first place, to know what the constitution is, what we are bound to do under that constitution; it is the duty of every Canadian in this House, on behalf of the people of this country, to establish this broad principle, that no matter whether a man is a Catholic, or a Presbyterian, or a Protestant——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I take that as a confirmation of what I said in starting out because it shows that, having spoken nearly half an hour upon this question, I have said nothing so offensive as to prevent the House from enjoying a very hearty laugh at a little Irish slip of mine. I say that in dealing with this question we should approach it in a broad spirit, in order to establish the confidence of every citizen in this country that the constitution is strong enough to protect him in all the rights he enjoys under the constitution, and that this Parliament, and the representative men in this country of both political sides, can have no two opinions upon that subject. The constitution must be observed, all rights under that constitution must be preserved, so that every citizen in the country may feel that in our constitution he has a safeguard that no demagogueism can destroy.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the Address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such Members of this House as are of the hon. the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That this House will, on Thursday, resolve itself into committee to consider of the Supplies to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to oppose the motion, but I may take the opportunity of inquiring whether the hon. gentleman expects to have the Estimates ready by Thursday.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That a special Committee of Seven Members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday last, the 18th instant, to be composed of Mr. Foster, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir Richard Cartwright, and Messieurs Costigan, Haggart, Laurier, and Mills (Bothwell).

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time; the said committee to be composed of Messrs. Beausoleil, Béchard, Cameron, Charlton, Davin, Hazen, Innes, LaRivière, Lépine, Prior, Scriver, Somerville, Taylor, Weldon, and White (Cardwell).

Mr. LANGELIER. I hope the committee will take means to have the translation pushed forward more rapidly than it was done last year or the year previous. It was a perfect farce to keep members waiting so long for the French translation as was the case last year. The translation was not of the best, and its production was such a slow matter that the French version of the debates was practically useless to members. A considerable expense is involved in having the translation made, and if it is to be made, and we all wish this to be done, it should be carried out with such speed as to render the translation useful to the French members of the House, which was not the case during the last two years.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. member is about the only one in the House who complains of the translation, but he has always failed to quote one phrase or sentence that is badly translated.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. gentleman did not understand me. I did not complain about the quality of the translation, but as to the slowness of the production of the French version. I did not say a word about the quality of the translation.

Mr. AMYOT. The translation is more quickly done and better done than at any previous period.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Foster.)

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ended 31st December, 1894.—(Mr. Daly.)

Summary Report of the Geological Survey Department, for the year 1894.—(Mr. Daly.)

Report, Return and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1894: Part I. Excise, &c.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Inspection of Weights and Measures and Gas, Part II., for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT.

Mr. CHARLTON. When will the full report of the Geological Survey be laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. DALY. The annual summary report I have just laid on the Table. The completion of the annual report will depend upon the facilities afforded, and I think it will not be ready for some months.

ADJOURNMENT—HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the House has done a considerable amount of work in discussing the Address, and if hon. gentlemen opposite will give their assent we will not return to-night. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I will take advantage of this early opportunity to call the attention of the hon. gentleman leading the House to what I consider to be a very grave subject. It was stated in the press some few weeks ago that the Government had passed an Order in Council making advances of money to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company to the sum of $2,500,000. I desire to know from the hon. gentleman if that statement is true.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot recall at this moment the exact nature of the Order in Council, but I will give the hon. gentleman exact and full information at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has any money been paid?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been none paid.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will place on the Table the order itself.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give full information, certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman's memory has failed. This is an important matter, and yet he cannot recollect the terms of the order, and the order should be laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be responsible for full information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the answer of the hon. gentleman is not at all satisfactory. Hon. members are entitled to know what are the contents of the order.

Mr. FOSTER. The House shall.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The order itself should be produced to the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 24th April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to make certain provisions in place thereof. He said: Mr. Speaker, I propose to-day, in moving the introduction of this Bill, to follow the custom of the Imperial House of Commons, and to make some remarks as to the nature of the measure. I am actuated in this course by the fact that for the last session or two it has been a matter of uncertainty whether a public Bill would be reached for second reading. This Bill was put upon the Orders among the first last session, but was not reached again. Under the rules of the

House, in certain cases notices of motion are transferred from the place where they properly belong and are placed at the head of Bills and Orders; and it was owing to the operation of this rule last session that the Bill was not reached. I propose, therefore, now to enter upon a discussion of the changes which are embodied in the Bill I am about to introduce. The history of the Act which this Bill proposes to repeal is one very well known to the majority of the members of this House. The session of 1885 was convened on the 29th day of January of that year; the Franchise Bill was introduced on the 19th day of March following, and received its second reading on the 16th day of April. The objection was raised to the Bill at the time it had been introduced —that its introduction came at a stage of the session so late as to preclude a full consideration of its provisions. This objection had no weight with the Government, and the attempt was made to force the Bill through. It will be within the recollection of all who were members of the House in 1885 that one memorable sitting took place, lasting from three o'clock on Thursday until midnight of the following Saturday, and that the attempt was made by the Government to force the Bill through by tiring out the Opposition. The Government party made no pretense of defending propositions in the Bill and left the discussion of the measure entirely with the Opposition; so it became necessary for the Opposition to maintain their ground for the period intervening between three o'clock on Thursday and midnight on Saturday. Numerous attempts were afterwards made to force the Bill through. The Bill finally became law, and the House closed its session on the 20th day of July, so that the Bill was under consideration from April 16th to within a few days of July 20th. Among the propositions of the Bill, as it was first introduced, was one which gave to Indians, without reference to location, or qualification, or character, or civilization, or education, the right to vote. The Bill also gave to women the right to vote. It provided that the revising barrister should be a barrister of five years standing. No matter what his qualifications or character, simply a barrister of five years' standing would serve the purposes of the Government for the responsible position of revising barrister. And the Bill was characterized by the arbitrary power conferred in the mode of making the lists, in the mode of procedure, and in its forms and decisions.

Now, Sir, the chief reason advanced for the introduction of this measure was the desirability of having a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion. It was urged among other reasons, that the voters' qualifications in various provinces differed very widely, and that the Dominion Franchise should be of a uniform character throughout the Dominion; and that it was necessary to introduce a measure which would do away with the existing anomaly. But before the discussion on the Bill ended, and before the Bill became law, it left the qualification of voters nearly as divergent in the various provinces as they had been under the provincial laws. It gave universal suffrage in British Columbia; it gave universal suffrage in Prince Edward Island, and a franchise based upon the possession of personal property—fish nets, boats, &c.—in the other maritime provinces. So that as finally passed, it was, as I say, as widely divergent from the principle of uniformity of franchise, as the original provincial laws had been with reference to the same matter. While this Bill was under discussion, various amendments were offered and rejected. Among these, one of the most important was the proposal to leave with the people the preparation of the voters' lists through their own officers. This was rejected. Another was that no Indians should have a vote who were not enfranchised. This was rejected. Another was that no Indian not enfranchised should be put upon the voters' list without his own consent. This was rejected, and the right was reserved to put Indians upon the voters' list contrary to their wishes and without their own consent. Another amendment was that it would be preferable to use the provincial lists; another was that the county judge in each county should be the revising barrister; this also was denied. Another was that persons having votes at provincial elections should have votes at Dominion elections; another was for providing for appeals to superior courts against revising barristers' decisions. All these amendments were rejected, and the chief amendments of the Bill allowed by the Government were one providing for the punishment of Indian agents that interfered in elections; and another that judges might be revising barristers of their own judicial districts. The character of the change will be thoroughly understood by referring to the provisions of the British North America Act, in sec. 41. By the section it is provided as follows:—

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the Union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely:—The qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections, and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution,—shall re-

spectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same severed provinces.

Under the provisions of this sec. 41 of the British North America Act, extending over a period from 1867 to 1885, the lists provided by the provinces for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly of each province, were used as the lists for the elections for the Dominion House of Commons. Now, Sir, one would suppose, after eighteen years of practice under an arrangement for using the provincial lists, that the Government would scarcely have ventured to make a change in the arrangement without some evidence of popular disapproval, without some evidence that the plan of using provincial lists did not meet with popular favour, and was objectionable in some respects. But it never was pretended that any such popular discontent with the arrangement existed ; it never was pretended that the slightest friction existed ; and the introduction of this new measure on the part of the Government was purely and entirely without production of any evidence of public feeling in favour of a change. Sir, the Government ought to have been aware that the introduction of this arrangement would be likely to be productive of bad results ; they ought to have been aware that in the country to the south of us, upon whose institutions our own were to a large extent founded, a country from which they have borrowed very much of their policy, such as the gerrymandering of constituencies and the National Policy—they have certainly borrowed the worst features of that Government's policy, and they ought to have given some attention to one of its best features—they ought to have known that this same principle with regard to franchise as applied to national elections, had been acted upon in the United States, and their experience in this matter was one which might have afforded to us a valuable lesson if we had been willing to profit by it. The section of the United States constitution referring to this matter of federal qualification for electors, is as follows :—

Sec. 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of members elected by the people of the various states, and the qualification in each state shall be the qualification recognized for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature.

Sir, this Act was professedly copied from the constitutional convention which convened in May, 1787. The matter had been very fully considered by that convention, and various alternate propositions had been made. It had been proposed to have the members of the House of Representatives elected by the state legislature of the respective states ; it had been proposed that the state legislature of the respective states should define the mode by which the members for each state were to be elected ; and it had also been proposed that the system which was adopted by our own Government in 1885, the system of an electoral franchise to be fixed by the general government, should be adopted. After consideration of these four propositions, the three I have named and the one which was adopted, and after full and mature consideration, the proposition contained in the constitution, that the qualification of electors for members of Congress should be that required for the election of the most numerous branch of the state legislature in the state, was adopted. Now, this provision went into effect in 1790, it has been in operation in the United States 105 years, and it had been in operation in that country 95 years at the time this law was passed in Canada. During that 95 years there had not been the slightest friction, there had never been a whisper of a proposition to change the basis of the franchise. There never has been the slightest indication that the plan had not worked satisfactorily and well ; and no man conversant with the situation of affairs in that country will for one moment claim that the introduction of a franchise law, or an electoral law, by the Congress of the United States, providing a uniform franchise for election of members of Congress and President of the United States, a separate list from the list used in the state elections, would have been workable, or would have been continued if it had been introduced into that country. Certainly our own experience in reference to the operation of this electoral franchise law is not calculated to prove that its operation is in any degree beneficial.

Now, when this confederation was formed, the first step taken was to secure the consent of the provinces. The provinces took the initial step, and that initial step is set forth in the preamble to this British North America Act :

Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united in one Dominion.

That was the foundation, the basis of the arrangement, the expressed desire of the provinces that were about to enter into this arrangement ; and acting upon that expressed desire, the Imperial Parliament sanctioned and ratified the arrangement with regard to the formation of this Dominion. Now, Sir, the powers possessed by this House, the powers possessed by this Government, are not inherent powers, but they are powers derived from the people, powers derived primarily from the various provinces that expressed their desire to unite in a confederation ; and the entity of those provinces, their original jurisdiction, and their having, through their own volition, entered upon that arrangement, is not consistent with the assumption on the part of the Dominion Government of the powers wielded and exercised through the operation of this Franchise Act. By this British North America Act, what are the powers that were delegated to the

Parliament of Canada? These powers are set forth in the 91st section of this Act. We see by this same instrument what were the powers reserved to the provinces. These powers are set forth in the 92nd section of this Act, and among the rights reserved by the provinces are rights with regard to civil affairs, are all civil rights. Now, Sir, the exercise of the franchise is a civil right, it is a right that lies at the foundation of all civil rights; and I hold that the interference on the part of the Dominion Government with the principle of the franchise, the passage of that Act which took into their own hands the power of adjusting the franchise, regulating it, settling what the qualifications should be, providing machinery by which voters should be put upon the voters' lists—I hold that the exercise of this power on the part of the Dominion Government, was a violation of that principle in our constitution which gives to the provinces control over civil rights, because the exercise of the franchise is in the highest sense a civil right. This right is one that should be controlled by the people who own it. It is not a right that should be controlled by the Government that seeks to own and control the people. This Franchise Act, therefore, is an attack upon the basic principle of provincial autonomy; it affects the principle of provincial autonomy, because it takes from the representatives of the people the power to exercise for themselves the right to say who shall be voters, what citizens shall vote for the men who are to be sent to Parliament to look after their interests, and to watch their interests in this House. It takes from them the power of exercising in its fullest sense the rights that pertain to them of having representation upon the floor of this House. It is the exercise of a power on the part of the Dominion Government that is subversive of the principle of popular sovereignty, that is subversive of the principle of popular rights; and for that reason I repeat, Sir, that the Franchise Act is an attack upon the basic principle of provincial autonomy.

Now, this Act was professedly copied from the English system. When the Bill was introduced and when reasons were urged by the Government in justification of its introduction, the chief reason put forward by its advocates was that in England they had revising barristers who revise the list and it was proper in this country to adopt the English system, that the English statutes provided who should be voters, what the qualifications of voters should be, what the provision should be in respect to placing names upon the list, with respect to appeals against placing names on the list or removing names, and what the function of the revising barrister should be, and provided the whole machinery by which the electoral lists of the country were arranged. But there was this difference between England and Canada. There was no home rule, there were no provinces there, there was no division of legislative authority between the Imperial Parliament, of different kingdoms or provinces, but there was a union of kingdoms, and power was centralized in the Imperial Parliament as it formerly was centered in united Upper and Lower Canada; and consequently the arrangement of the electoral lists in England was a power that belonged properly to the English Parliament, for there was no other power to exercise it. But the case was different in Canada. We have provinces united in creating this Dominion, we have provinces invested with certain rights that may be termed the rights of home rule, we have provinces united to exercise the functions of civil rights and through whose union this Dominion was erected; and the central Government stepped in and usurped the power that properly appertained to those provinces. I want to point out the contrast that exists between the English law, which appoints revising barristers to finally revise the list, and the Dominion law with respect to the electoral franchise. There have been many statutes passed in England in regard to the exercise of the franchise: the first was passed in the reign of William IV. in 1832, the next in 1843, next in 1865, next in 1878 and next in 1885. Under the provisions of these laws the lists are in all cases made by the overseers of the poor. Those overseers are not appointees of the Imperial Government, they are not officers who owe their appointment and position to the Crown or to a commission, but the overseers are municipal officers just as our township councillors are, and these overseers, the officers of the people, exercising their functions by virtue of the authority emanating from the people making the lists. The overseers require application to be made to them respecting names to be placed upon the list, they receive protests against names being inserted on the list or removed from the lists, they exercise their own discretion in putting names on and leaving names off the list; and after the overseers, these officers of the people, have made the preliminary list, as provided by the law with its carefully guarded provisions, that list was finally revised, not by an appointee of the Crown, but by a revising barrister, who holds office for one year, an appointee of the courts, and whose functions are strictly and entirely judicial. The character of his functions may be shown by a few quotations I shall make from the Act of 1885. That Act provides that the clerk of the peace shall issue instructions to the overseers of the poor annually as to their duties. On page 16 of chapter 15 of 48 Vic., are two precepts which are to be given by the clerk of the peace in counties or the town clerk in boroughs and cities to the overseers of the poor:

Part I. of this precept informs you generally of the persons entitled to be registered as voters, and of the meaning of the expressions

used in this precept, and also as to the mode in which you are to make out and publish the lists.

Part II. gives you, in order of time, the several matters which you are required to do.

Then this Act goes on to give the overseers of the poor instructions as to notices and inquiries, instructions as to the list of voters, instructions as to the names and exceptions; and after this list has been prepared by the overseers and by them held to be a complete list, prepared by virtue of their appointment as officers of the people, it is submitted to the revising officer, who is appointed by the senior judge of assize in counties and the Lord Chief Justice at Westminster, London, in the county of Middlesex, and after this judicial revision has taken place the list is ready to use. How does this system correspond with the Dominion procedure? It does not correspond at all. We have no intervention of the municipal officers to make the list; there is no officer exercising judicial functions delegated to him by the courts. There is no point of comparison between the English and the Dominion system. How does the English compare with our provincial system? It almost exactly corresponds with the Ontario system. In Ontario we have similar functions to those exercised by the overseers of the poor performed by the municipal council. The machinery is almost identical as regards the preparation of the list. They receive applications, they hear objections, they hear claims to be placed on the list, they make a list, and they do so as officers of the people. They hold, finally, a court of revision. By power delegated to them by the people to fix the privileges that the people shall exercise, they act, and when the court of revision is held and the list is finally completed so far as the action of the municipal council is concerned, then the county judge comes in and performs the same judicial act as does the revising barrister in England, and he performs functions exclusively and purely judicial. If it is desired to follow the English precedent, we have it followed in Ontario, and substantially followed in all the other provinces, but we have not a single point of comparison between the Dominion procedure and the procedure in England. In Canada the municipal officers do not prepare the list; in England they do. In Canada the municipal officers do not manage the preliminary revision; in England they do. In Canada the municipal officers possess no authority, they exercise no function; in England the municipal officers possess all power but authority connected with the final judicial revision of the list. While the revising barrister is appointed in Canada by the Crown, while he is practically an autocrat in function and act, while there is no check from co-ordinate municipal functions or associated municipal authority, the revising barrister in England exercises judicial functions alone, and he has a check from co-ordinate municipal functions and associated municipal authority. It is more than a check; it is a primary act. This officer in Canada is appointed at the pleasure of the Crown, he holds office during the pleasure of the Crown, and he is entirely removed from all responsibility to the people. This officer in England is appointed annually, he is appointed by the senior judge of the assize, and his duties are entirely separated from the exercise of political functions. In this country the lists are printed by the Government, and in England the lists are printed by the municipal authorities. In this country there is no provision for a safeguard with regard to these lists after the final revision. After the final revision by the revising barrister, and when these lists come back to the Government printing offices at Ottawa, any kind of a fraud or scandal can be perpetrated. The lists can be stuffed at pleasure, and the only restraint placed on the Government is their own sense of modesty and their own sense of honour; not a great restriction. There is no colony in the Empire where the making of a preliminary and final revision of the voters' lists is confided to an appointee of the Crown, and there is no colony in the Empire where the printing of such lists is performed by the Crown. Here the making of the lists, the printing of the lists, and the whole machinery is under the control of the Government, and the rights of the people have been trampled upon. The principles of popular sovereignty and popular rights have not been considered at all in this matter. There are various other objections to this Franchise Act besides those I have already outlined. One objection is, that the procedure is complicated and expensive. Another reason is, that undue power rests in the hands of the revising barrister. There is no proper appeal from his decision. You can appeal from it on a question of law, but not upon a question of fact, and in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand the question arising before him is one of fact, and not of law. As to the judgment of the revising barrister on that question of fact there is no appeal, and he is practically an autocrat. Although the franchise is a popular right, belonging to the people of this country, yet they have not the slightest participation in the creation of these lists. The presence of the people is ignored, and the whole thing is placed in the hands of a minion of the Government. Another objection to this Franchise Act is, that the expenses are very great and are unnecessary, so great, indeed, that the Government have been ashamed to carry out the provisions of their own law, and have shrunk from giving us annual revisions, because of the inordinate cost. We have had three revisions since this Act passed, in 1885, and we have one nearly completed now. The three revisions that have been completed were, in 1886, 1889, and 1891, and these revisions cost the coun-

try $900,000 in round numbers. Besides this expense there was the cost of putting in the plant in the Government Bureau necessary for the printing of these lists, and there are various other items of expense not embraced in the sum I have mentioned. The elections of 1891 were held upon lists two years old. There was not an individual in Canada under twenty-three years of age who was permitted to vote in the general election. This, Mr. Speaker, is an outrage that few free people in this world would stand, and, to bring people to submit to an outrage of this kind, you want fifteen years of the process of debauching public sentiment by that class of legislation and Acts which this Government has been guilty of. Nearly all the by-elections have been held upon old lists. If we had had the coming elections at the time the Government desired to have them, we would have had them upon a list three years old. If this Government remains in power I venture to say that there will not be another revision for three or four years, and every by-election held after the next general elections will be held on antiquated lists. Then, there is another feature about it. The existence of a voters' list for provincial purposes, and the existence of a list for Dominion election purposes is confusing and perplexing to the electors. Many electors who obtain their franchise as provincial voters imagine that that is all that has to be done, and in neglecting to attend to the Dominion voters' lists they lose their votes, the precious and inestimable privilege of every freeman. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the country are sick of this measure, and I venture to say that a great many of the Government supporters are sick of it also. I presume that the average cost of each revision to members of this House is not less than $400, and that is an unnecessary drain upon their resources. Then, the list is not a good list and it is not as much in accordance with the principles of popular representation and justice as are the provincial lists which are made without charge almost, and without cost. The Bill which I now propose, provides for the absolute repeal of the Dominion Franchise Law, and all its amendments, and it provides for the adoption of the provincial lists in each province. If this principle is adopted we have a provincial list which is, first of all, made by the people of each province. The qualifications to vote are established in accordance with the wants and requirements of that people. We discovered in 1885, when discussing the Franchise Act, that we could not have a uniform franchise. The condition of affairs in the provinces varies. In British Columbia and Prince Edward Island it was thought proper to have universal suffrage, and in Nova Scotia it was deemed right to give the fisherman a vote on his net and his boat. If we adopt the provincial franchise, therefore, we will adopt a franchise which is in accordance with the genius and requirements and interests of the people of the provinces. They know what their wants are and they know what their proper basis of representation should be. When they exercise the right of voting for a man to represent them in this Parliament they know who, amongst their people, are entitled to vote. This Government does not need to tell them that. Then, Sir, having adopted that provincial franchise, we have a qualification in accordance with the wants of the people of the provinces. We have a list made by the representatives of these people, and if there is anything in the creation of that list—after all the safeguards of courts of revision and hearing claims to put on, and hearing claims to put off, before municipal officers—if there is anything wrong in that list, then we have the strictly impartial, judicial revision of that list by the county judge. We would have in the provincial lists, a list greatly superior to this Dominion list, made, as it is by a creature of the Government, holding his office during the pleasure of the Government, and, presumably, supposed to serve, so far as he can, without undue stretch of his conscience, the interests of the Government. I may call attention again to the fact that the measure which I now propose is not a mere experiment. We have lived under the use of the provincial lists for Dominion elections from 1867 to 1885. We know there was no friction; we know by actual experience how the law works. We know there was no injustice; we know there was no popular discontent, and we know there was absolutely not the slightest reason for a change in the provisions of the franchise law under which we existed from 1867 to 1885. We know, also, that it worked satisfactorily. We do not talk theoretically about this matter; we appeal to the experience of the past, from 1867 to 1885, as proof of the assertions we make to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why was this system adopted? What could have been the motive of the Government in changing a system that had existed for eighteen years, and that had given universal satisfaction? Why was this law introduced and forced through in the face of the greatest parliamentary fight in the history of this Dominion? Were the Government actuated by a desire to give to the people of Canada greater liberty? I fear not. Why, after providing for the creation of lists by their own creatures, did they, after the first year's experience of printing the lists in the printing offices of their party friends, bring them to their own printing office and have them printed there? And after having provided for such frauds and outrages on the people as might be perpetrated by the revising barristers, if they felt so disposed, why did they go further and provide for the wholesale stuffing of the lists, if they

desired to do it, under their own supervision and without any possible check? I say, why did they do these things? Well, I think it is not unreasonable for us to assume that we know why. I think it was a gross political job. This law is one of a trio of political infamy, and it has as its brothers the gerrymander and the boodling transactions of the Government. That was the motive of the Government. I say it boldly, because I believe it to be true, that the only motive of the Government in introducing this Bill was to secure unjust political advantage. Three years before they had introduced that Yankee political cutthroat, the gerrymander, by which they gave power to a fraction more than half of the electorate of the province of Ontario to elect over three-fifths of the representatives from that province in this House. They followed that villainous act with the introduction of this law which I am now discussing, and they practised before and have practised since the system of boodling to such an extent as to make a fine art of it. Why, the Americans, although we got the gerrymander from them, could come and learn boodling from us. They have not got it to the state of perfection which it has reached in this country. There is often a manifestation of the power of the public conscience in that country. Oakes Ames was anathematized because of his connection with the Credit Mobilier frauds. Schuyler Colfax was driven from public life because it was suspected, though never proved, that he had received $1,500 from the Credit Mobilier. Boss Tweed died in prison; Boss Kane, of Brooklyn, is now in Sing Sing. Both of these men suffered for crimes that would have been condoned in Canada, where McGreevy and Connolly have been released because their health suffered from incarceration. Now, I have no doubt that the late lamented Sir John Thompson intended to purge the Government, and he set to work by casting out John Charles Rykert, and then he took McGreevy and Connolly in hand and they were sent to jail. But that gentleman found the evil so deeply seated that he saw that he might have to go further than he had expected. He was something in the position of a little Scotch boy in a Sunday school one day when the lesson was about Ananias and Sapphira. The teacher asked the class why God did not now strike people dead for lying. After a while the little boy held up his hand. "Well, what is it?" asked the teacher; and the boy answered: 'If he did, there wud'na be onybody left." And that is the reason why Sir John Thompson abstained from purging the Government of all the boodlers; he saw that he would not have a colleague left on the Treasury benches; and out of sheer shame he could not continue to punish McGreevy and Connolly, and so they were released. I do not know where Connolly is, but McGreevy is now to come back to receive his reward. He is to be introduced here, and I would suggest that he be introduced by the Postmaster General and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Turcotte), and that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals form the rear guard and come in behind.

Mr. HAGGART. What about perjurers?

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman has any charge to make, we will consider it in due time. We are now talking about plunderers and boodlers and political criminals of various kinds, and I can refer the hon. gentleman to certain charges demanding investigation which were made two or three sessions ago, and in which some Ministers of the Crown were interested, and to the course taken by the Government on that occasion, when a resolution was introduced by the gentleman who now fills the responsible position of Premier, which resolution practically, on the part of the alleged criminal, drew a new indictment, and then preferred the charges before a court the judges of which were chosen by himself, and the verdict of which was a foreordained conclusion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had assertions made here as to the potency of the principles held by our hon. friends opposite. We have heard very often of the triumph of the National Policy, and the strength of that policy in the country; and the success of the Government in the elections has been attributed to the hold which that policy has upon popular sentiment and popular affection. Do you believe, Mr. Speaker, or do I believe that the character of the policy alone has influenced the results of the elections? Have we reason to doubt that the expenditure of vast sums of money have had something to do with those results? We know that the Government have adopted a regular system of raising election funds; we know that they have made contracts with and granted charters to railway companies; we know that they have granted subsidies of land and subsidies of money by Order in Council during the pendency of an election, as was the case in the last general elections; we know that they have added to the public burdens hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of granting additional mail subsidies and land subsidies for railways already completed. We know that they have given to one class of the population special advantages, and have drawn from them, in consideration of those advantages, large election contributions. We know that they have granted various railway subsidies to the extent of millions of dollars, and in almost every case we may reasonably assume that those subsidies have been tolled, and that the toll has been added to the election fund; and in many cases these subsidies have been granted to districts where they would benefit the Government nominees, they were in fact bribes given to ridings en bloc. With the system adopted in the Public

Works Department, whereby the contracts were manipulated and the Government corruption fund largely reinforced by sums drawn from that source—I say with this system of corruption and boodling extending from 1872, when a railway charter was sold, down to the present day, in vogue, and with these enormous sums raised and expended in this way, I think we may very properly attribute the success of the Government in 1882, 1887 and 1891, to the lavish expenditure of money in corrupting the electors, rather than to the potency of the appeals made by the Government to the reason of the people. The object of this Bill was to strike out from this trinity of evil I have referred to, one of its most important personages; and I close by asserting that in the interests of the country, for the sake of securing simplicity in the arrangements of the electoral lists, for the sake of securing economy by at once sweeping away an expense of over $400,000, direct and indirect, in each revision of the lists, for the sake of securing efficiency, since no list, prepared as this is by a Government appointee, in the way it is prepared, can equal in efficiency the lists prepared by the people themselves, through their own representatives, and revised with strict judicial revision by the county court judges, for the sake of justice, we should do away with the present imperfect lists, prepared on a plan devised and designed for the purpose of giving the Government an unjust advantage. In the interest, therefore, of the public, the demand is a reasonable one, that we should return to the provincial franchises. The present system, it is clear, cannot be perpetuated. The Government itself introduced a Bill last session which confesses that the assertion I make is true, that this system cannot be perpetuated. It is not in the reason or nature of things that so outrageous a system as this can be continued in this country. Born, as it was, out of a desire to secure unjust political advantage, continued, as it has been, in iniquity, it cannot be perpetuated. Why not meet the inevitable and take the credit—which a succeeding Government will take if this one does not—of sweeping this unjust, this obnoxious measure from the statute-books of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to follow the example of my hon. friend and discuss the principle even of the Bill, much less its details. Not having a printed copy of the Bill, it is impossible, of course, to discuss it intelligently at present. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to follow what he says is the practice in the Imperial Parliament. I am inclined to think, however, without finding fault at all with the precedent or the course he has taken, that while it may be very profitable for the House to have an explanation of what is proposed to be done by this Bill, there is nothing special to be gained by attempting to discuss a measure which is not yet before the House in printed form. I shall not, therefore, at present, say anything more regarding it. The hon. gentleman has made a great many very decided assertions which it will be quite time enough to review when, on the second reading, the House is possessed of the whole Bill, and argument will be more pertinent.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no observations at all to offer at this moment about this Bill, but I think the practice introduced by my hon friend is the best, that upon the first reading we should have a very full review of the measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRAUDS UPON THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. EDGAR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) to amend the Acts 54 and 55 Victoria, chap. 23, intituled: "An Act respecting Frauds upon the Government." He said: I wish to be brief, so as not to fall under the criticism of the leader of the House, and will, therefore, say in a few words what is the intention and scope of this Bill. In 1891, Sir John Thompson introduced the Act which I now propose to amend—an Act respecting frauds upon the Government; and while it was receiving the consideration of the House, the leader of the Opposition suggested to him the introduction of a clause containing stringent provision against the contribution by public contractors to election funds of any kind, directly or indirectly. That clause had been introduced several times before on this side, but had been defeated by the hon. gentlemen opposite. However, Sir John Thompson took time to consider that provision, and, to his credit, he accepted it, and introduced the suggested clause into his Bill. In that respect, as in some others, he went considerably in advance of his party. The amendment I now propose is one which, I think, at this particular time, should be widely known throughout the country. It provides severe penalties—fines and imprisonment and forfeiture of contract—against any public contractor who, directly or indirectly, contributes in any way towards the election of any candidate to Parliament or towards an election fund. It may be said that that is a provision which it will be very difficult to enforce. I fail to see that. I do not think that if there were grounds for supposing that a public contractor had made those contributions, it should be left to the slow machinery of an election court to discover those things. I believe that the Government or Parliament should appoint committees or issue commissions to make the most stringent inquiries, so that the proper parties might be punished. However that may be, Sir, what I propose in this Bill is to enlarge the power in a way which, I think, ought to commend itself to this House. The Act as it stands applies

only to persons having contracts with the Government. I propose to make the penalties apply to directors and officers of railway companies who have subsidies, or loans, or advances, or bonuses, from the Government of Canada. And I think, Sir, that this will meet the view of the House and of the public. I hope at a later stage to discuss the matter more fully.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION NOTES ACT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Excuse me; I suppose that the object of the Bill to amend the Dominion Notes Act is to put in the proviso which, in a most extraordinary fashion, was dropped from the measure last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Precisely that.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. McCarthy) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The object of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, may be very briefly stated. Of its provisions—one is a most important one—to make railway companies that carry voters to or from the polls free of charge, guilty of a corrupt practice, and also to make any persons who abet the railway companies in doing so guilty of a corrupt practice. In fact, the object is to put a stop to the practice which is well known to prevail, especially as shown during recent elections, of railway companies making themselves election agents and carrying voters free from one end of the Dominion to the other to please the Government of the day. The other portion of the Bill relates to acts of personation. We have on our statute a clause referring to this offence. The Ontario Legislature has passed an Act which provides for summary process in cases of personation. Any one can easily understand that cases of personation will frequently arise, especially in the more remote districts of the country, where the population is sparse, and where strangers can come in and poll votes on behalf of persons who are not present. This Bill enacts, as an amendment to the existing law, a similar provision to that of the provincial Act, which provides for summary process in regard to personation. These are the main provisions of the Bill. I therefore beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Bryson, for leave to introduce this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—DUAL LANGUAGE, ETC.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. McCarthy) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to amend the North-west Territories Act. He said: On behalf of Mr. McCarthy, I beg to introduce this Bill, which has been introduced on several previous occasions in this House and which has not yet met with the support which its advocates hoped it would meet with and which they believe it will ultimately meet with. I need say but little with regard to the provisions of the Bill, for they are well known. The object is to give the North-west Territories power to deal with the subject of education and to abolish the use of the French language as official in these Territories. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill has not met with the support in this House which I hope on the present occasion it will meet with; but I may say if it has not met with the support in this House which we think it ought to meet with, it has met with a very large support throughout the country, except in the province of Quebec.

Mr. AMYOT. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Which the hon. gentleman who interrupts me so ably represents; and, Sir, the public have come to the conclusion that they are not the demagogues who strive by every means in their power to do away with these distinctions of race and religion which are the cause of nearly all our troubles; they are the real demagogues who fatten and batten and grow into political power and influence by means of these distinctions. Sir, it is within the knowledge of this House that gentlemen who are hardly qualified to fill the position of third class clerks have been put in high office in the Cabinet, and have been retained there from year to year, from one administration to another. Kept there, and kept there why? Not on account of their merits, because nature never gave them any such qualifications as to entitle them to fill these positions, but simply and solely because they represented a certain race and a certain religion. And, Sir, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a case in point. The hon. gentleman illustrated his position most admirably on a recent occasion. The hon. gentleman referred —or perhaps it would be more parliamentary to say reference was made—to the power which the late Sir John Macdonald had of judging character and choosing men, very seldom making mistakes in that respect. Well, Sir, Sir John Macdonald made no mistake in the case of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He made no mistake because he never thought that with all his powers it was possible to make a statesman of the hon. gentleman, but he did believe—and that belief has been justified by events—that the hon. gentleman would make a most admirable placeman. A most admirable placeman he has been, a most admirable placeman he still continues to be. I do not propose to say anything further with reference to this Bill, but I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Denison, for leave to introduce the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 18) to prevent the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under

contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. Taylor.)

PURCHASE OF BUTTER BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. RIDER asked, 1. How much butter has the Government purchased during 1895 through the Dairy Commissioner, and at what date or dates were the purchases made? 2. Who are the parties from whom purchased, and what was the price paid? 3. For what market was the transaction intended? 4. Has the whole lot been sold? If so, how much, and at what price? 5. What is the total cost to the Government per pound, including purchase price, charges for freight, insurance, storage, commissions, &c.?

Mr. MONTAGUE. 1. The Dairy Commissioner accepted 915 packages of fresh-made creamery butter from eighteen creameries and from five of the Government Experimental Dairy Stations, for shipment to Great Britain on Government account, to introduce and advertise the quality of fresh-made creamery butter there, between the 12th February and 6th April, 1895. The particulars of the latest shipment from Prince Edward Island have not yet been received. 2. An advance of 20 cents per pound was paid. Payments have been made to date, as per sheet attached hereto. 3. Nine hundred and fifteen packages of butter of fine quality, and in packages suitable for export, were shipped to Great Britain; 246 packages of butter, which was of fine quality, but in packages not suitable for export, were or are being sold, in Montreal. What of it has been sold—and most of it has been sold—has realized more than the price advanced on it by the Government. Two hundred and twenty-four packages were received by the Dairy Commissioner in Montreal, which were not strictly fine in quality, or were made before January, 1895. These were taken charge of by the shippers, or are being sold on their account in Montreal. 4. Account sales in detail have not been received from Great Britain; but reports of sales have been received at from 90s. to 78s. per cwt. 5. The accounts for the freight charges from the creameries to Montreal have not yet been received at the department. The amount to be paid by the Government, for freight charges to Montreal and storage charges there, will be less than one-half cent per pound of butter.

ADVANCES ON CREAMERY BUTTER, 1895.

Date.	Cheque.	Name.	Address.	Packages.	Pounds.	Value.
						$ cts.
Mar. 27..	B 8940	Park, Blackwell & Co.	Toronto, Ont.	94	4,284	856 80
do 27..	8941	S. A. Freeman	Culloden, Ont.	18	1,008	201 60
do 27..	8943	W. J. Burns	Seely's Bay, Ont.	47	2,415	483 00
do 27..	8945	W. S. Campbell	Brantford, Ont.	23	1,288	257 60
do 27..	8946	Ed. Scott	Heckston, Ont.	42	1,260	252 00
do 27..	8947	J. MacHoover	Goldfield, Ont.	6	336	67 20
do 27..	8948	T. J. Millar	Spencerville, Ont.	13	728	145 60
do 27..	8949	Bk. Montreal (R. H. Pope)	Cookshire, Que.	30	1,760	352 00
do 27..	8951	H. C. Garbutt	Lakefield, Ont.	47	2,536	507 20
do 27..	8952	Edwin Culver	Mapleton, Ont.	99	5,240	1,048 00
do 27..	8953	Robt. Barlow	Addison, Ont.	40	2,000	400 00
do 29..	8954	A. A. McCallum	Gladstone, Ont.	11	539	107 80
do 29..	8955	I. Humphries	Warkworth, Ont.	34	1,870	374 00
April 5..	9061	R. H. Pope	Cookshire, Que.	29	1,561	312 20
do 6..	9062	J. H. Wilkinson	Verschoyle, Ont.	7	392	78 40
do 6..	9063	S. A. Freeman	Culloden, Ont.	8	448	89 60
do 6..	9064	Jas. McMahon	Goldfield, Ont.	10	560	112 00
do 6..	9065	W. S. Campbell	Brantford, Ont.	6	336	67 20
do 6..	9066	Hugh McKee	Norwich, Ont.	52	2,251	450 20
do 6..	9067	J. L. Cayouette	Brompton Falls, Que.	10	507	101 40
do 6..	9068	J. A. Ruddick	Kingston, Ont.	18	1,008	201 60
			Government Dairy Station.			
April 6..	9069	Hodgson Bros.	Montreal, Que.	27	1,447	289 40
do 6..	9069	do	Freight.	.....	.....	5 80
do 23..	9218	W. S. Campbell	Brantford, Ont.	6	336	67 20
do 23..	9219	I. Humphries	Warkworth, Ont.	12	654	130 60
do 23..	9220	S. A. Freeman	Culloden, Ont.	16	896	179 20
do 23..	9221	Edwin Culver	Mapleton, Ont.	7	385	77 00
do 23..	9222	M. Gleeson	Greenwood, Ont.	13	728	145 60
do 23..	9223	W. J. Burns	Seely's Bay, Ont.	30	1,680	336 00
do 23..	9224	J. L. Cayouette	Brompton Falls, Que.	8	408	81 60
do 23..	9225	Edward Scott	Heckston, Ont.	31	930	186 00
				794	39,791	7,964 00

In addition to the above, butter was shipped from four Government experimental dairy stations in Ontario and Quebec, and from two Government dairy stations in Prince Edward Island.

SUPPLIES FOR THE CITADEL AT QUEBEC.

Mr. EDGAR asked, In whose name has the contract for the supply of groceries to the Citadel at Quebec been standing in each of the months of the year 1894 ? To whom have cheques been issued in payment for such supplies delivered during the year 1894 ; giving dates and amounts and name or names of endorsers in each case ? In whose name has the contract for the supply of groceries for the Citadel at Quebec been standing for the expired portion of the year 1895 ? To whom have cheques been issued in payment for such supplies ; the dates and amounts and name or names of endorsers in each case ?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract for the supplies of groceries to the Citadel at Quebec in 1894 was awarded to J. B. Provost, and in 1895, to Louis Cantin. Cheques were issued and endorsed as follows, for the following amounts :—

Year.	Paid.	Amount.	Order of	Endorsed by
1894.	1894.	$ cts.		
January	20 Feb.....	503 91	J. B. Provost...	P. pro J. B. Provost, O. E. Larose, Arthur J. Turcotte & Co., for the credit of Merchants Bank, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
February...	15 March...	459 08	do	P. pro J. B. Provost, O. E. Larose, Arthur J. Turcotte & Co., for the credit of the Merchants Bank, of Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
March.....	20 April....	403 19	do	J. B. Provost, Arthur J. Turcotte & Co., for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
April	19 May.....	439 62	do	P. pro J. B. Provost, O. E. Larose, Arthur J. Turcotte & Co., for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada. J. C. More, manager.
May.. ...	18 June....	439 40	do	J. B. Provost, for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
June.....	20 July. ..	408 27	do	P. pro J. B. Provost, O. E. Larose, for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
July.....	23 Aug.....	495 33	do	P. pro J. B. Provost, O. E. Larose, for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
August.....	19 Sept	461 45	do	J. B. Provost, for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
September..	24 Oct.....	485 43	do	J. B. Provost, for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
October . ..	23 Nov.....	521 13	do	J. B. Provost, for collector and credit of La Banque du Peuple, Quebec, No. 8. A. G. Dumoulin, manager.
November..	20 Dec.....	533 39	do	J. B. Provost, for the credit of Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
December ..	1895. 19 Jan.....	542 80	do	J. B. Provost, for the credit of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Quebec. J. C. More, manager.
1895. January....	14 Feb.....	570 85	Louis Cantin....	Louis Cantin, for collection and credit of La Banque du Peuple, St. Roch de Québec. N. Lavoie, manager.
February...	13 March ..	533 17	do	Louis Cantin, for collection and credit of La Banque du Peuple, St. Roch de Québec. N. Lavoie, manager.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What is the amount of the whole expenses in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic ?

Mr. FOSTER. The whole amount paid on account of expenses in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic,

so far as advices have been received by the Finance Department, is $89,376.73. There is a further expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does that include anything for printing?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the whole expenditure so far.

Mr. EDGAR. Then that is not the whole?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the whole.

Mr. FORBES (for Mr. Flint) asked, Whether the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic has yet reported its conclusions to the Government? If so, on what date does the Government expect to lay such report before Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe this question was asked the other day by another hon. gentleman, and was answered. The same answer applies to this question.

SUIT AGAINST LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1. Whether the Government has settled or compromised the suit instituted by the Minister of Justice against the late firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and if so, on what terms and conditions? 2. Have the defendants in said suit complied with the conditions of said settlement and paid to the Government the amount so agreed upon? If so, was the payment made in cash or otherwise?

Mr. CURRAN. 1. The action was compromised, pending the trial, by the authority of the Government, upon the advice of counsel for the Crown. By the terms of the agreement, judgment by consent was entered for the Crown for $100,000, and for the defendants upon the counter-claims for $40,000; the latter amount being a set-off, left a balance of $60,000 in favour of the Crown for which by the terms of the settlement the defendants are held liable as follows:—Patrick Larkin for $10,000, payable on the 1st December, 1894, with interest until payment at the rate of 4 per cent; N. K. & M. Connolly for $35,000, payable one-half at six months from the date of judgment and the balance within twelve months, the whole with interest at 4 per cent. The balance of $15,000 stands against Robert McGreevy. As Robert McGreevy was a Crown witness, the remedy against him was not availed of. The judgment was so obtained on the 11th day of September, 1894. 2. The defendants have not paid any portion of the judgment, but the solicitor for the Crown has been instructed to issue process for the collection of the amount due, also for the remainder if not paid when due.

Mr. LAURIER. What was the date of the order for process?

Mr. CURRAN. I have not got that here, but it is within a short time.

Mr. FOSTER.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Have any contracts been entered into on account of the Trent Valley Canal? If so, for whom and for what amounts?

Mr. HAGGART. A contract has been entered into for a six and a half mile section, extending from Balsam Lake towards Lake Simcoe, with Andrew Onderdonk. The schedule price of the contract will be, approximately, $429,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the only one?

Mr. HAGGART. That is the only one.

CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Have any other contracts for public works been entered into? If so, with whom and for what amount?

Mr. HAGGART. Is it in reference to the Railway Department, or the Public Works Department?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had reference to the Railway Department more particularly, but I mean it to cover both.

Mr. HAGGART. There is an immense number of contracts on the Intercolonial Railway, and on the St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals. Will you specify more particularly?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as the hon. gentleman was concerned, I referred more particularly to canals.

Mr. HAGGART. I will have the information to-morrow.

DOMINION GOVERNMENT CREDIT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the amount now at the credit of the Dominion Government in Canadian banks? How much in London or elsewhere not in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. There is now in Canadian banks, $5,929,526.24 at the credit of the Government; in London, $964,172.69.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total amount of unexpended railway subsidies voted by Parliament to date?

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount of unexpended railway subsidies voted by Parliament to date, is $8,749,271.81.

R. C. PENITENTIARY—JAMES FITZSIMMONS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Was James Fitzsimmons dismissed or suspended from the office of Deputy Warden of the penitentiary

at New Westminster, B. C., by the late Sir John Thompson? 2. If so, was such action based on any, and what, inquiry or report? 3. When will the report and other papers connected with the case be laid before the House? 4. Has James Fitzsimmons been reinstated in his former office, or appointed to any other office, and when?

Mr. CURRAN. 1. James Fitzsimmons was not dismissed or suspended from the office of Deputy Warden of the British Columbia penitentiary by the late Sir John Thompson. An investigation into the affairs of the penitentiary was authorized by a minute of His Excellency in Council of the 22nd May, 1894, and a commission was thereupon issued to the Hon. Mr. Justice Drake to inquire into the administration and affairs of the penitentiary, and by direction of the late Minister of Justice, Mr. Fitzsimmons was relieved of his duties as Deputy Warden, pending the inquiry. He was afterwards, by minute of His Excellency in Council of the 24th October last, retired from office without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary service. 2. Mr. Fitzsimmons was so retired upon consideration of the evidence taken at the investigation, and the report of the Hon. Mr. Justice Drake. 3. When so ordered. 4. He was reinstated in his former office by order of His Excellency in Council of the 25th of March, 1895.

COLLECTORSHIP OF CUSTOMS, MONTREAL.

Mr. BORDEN (for Mr. Landerkin) asked, Is the office of Collector of Customs at Montreal vacant? If so, when did it become vacant? Why is it kept vacant? Have any applications been made for it? If so, who are the applicants? What is the salary? Is it the intention soon to appoint an officer? If not, will the office be abolished?

Mr. WALLACE. The answer to the first question is, yes; to the second, the office became vacant on 15th January, 1893; to the third question, pending the selection of a suitable officer; to the fourth question, yes; to the fifth question, it is not usual to name the applicants; to the sixth question, the salary is $4,000 a year; to the seventh question, the answer is, yes.

WORLD'S FAIR—MR. LARKE'S SERVICES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is Mr. Larke, one of the Commissioners to the World's Exposition, Chicago, still in the employ of the Government? When did his services cease as Commissioner to the World's Exposition in Chicago, and when did his present engagement commence? What is his salary? What amount has been paid him for travelling expenses since the date of his present engagement? What, if any, other expenses in connection with his present position have been paid him or his family, or are to be allowed him?

Mr. IVES. Mr. Larke is still in the employ of the Government. His services as Commissioner to the World's Exposition in Chicago ceased on 21st August last. His present engagement commenced on 25th August last. His salary is $3,000 per annum, with travelling and removal expenses. He has received an accountable advance of £200 sterling.

WHARF AT WEST POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have any petitions been received by the Department of Public Works during recess, or at any time, from the inhabitants of West Point, Prince County, P.E.I., asking to rebuild the wharf or pier at that place?

Mr. OUIMET. No such petitions have been received by the department.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS—TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have any borings been made during the season of 1894, across the Straits of Northumberland, with the view of further getting information with respect to building a tunnel across the straits from Cape Traverse, P.E.I., to Cape Tormentine, N.B.? If so, how many borings have been so made? What is the amount already expended in borings and other experiments across the Straits of Northumberland in connection with the proposed tunnel? Is it the intention of the Government to expend any further sums in that connection at an early date?

Mr. FOSTER. An effort was made in the season of 1894 to put down a series of borings, but, owing to the season being unusually boisterous, the contractors did not even succeed in putting down one hole. Therefore, no payment was made to them. The amount expended by the Government was $8,557.56. The contractors declined to proceed with the work, they having spent nearly $4,000 in the effort during the season of 1894, and negotiations are now in progress for continuing the work of boring during the season of 1895.

LOBSTER PACKING—LICENSE FEES.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries extended the time for paying license fees by lobster packers? If so, to what time? Has the order been made public?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The department has not extended the time for paying license fees by lobster packers, consequently no such order has been made public. Packers may,

however, proceed with their business if they forward their application and fees for licenses.

CONDUCTORS ON CATTLE TRAINS.

Mr. MULOCK asked. Whether the Government have discontinued the practice of appointing conductors as Government officers to take charge of cattle trains carrying cattle from the United States to Canada in bond? If so, when?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Agriculture never appointed conductors as Government officers for the purpose of taking charge of cattle trains. The appointment of conductors as cattle guardians has not been found necessary. The last forms issued appointing such were in May, 1890.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Notices of Motion are called, I would ask the Minister of Finance if he is now prepared to lay upon the Table of the House the Order in Council with regard to a subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railway Company?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to lay on the Table the Order in Council and papers with reference to the Hudson Bay Railway, for which the hon. gentleman asked yesterday. The Order in Council has connected with it several important papers, and I would much rather that my hon. friend would put a notice of motion on the Order paper. I will have the papers prepared, and by the time he gets his motion carried, they will be ready for the information of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose I cannot have them otherwise.

Mr. FOSTER. They should all come down together.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the hon. gentleman yesterday that although he would not bring down the papers to-day to lay on the Table, yet he would be ready to give some information as to their contents.

Mr. FOSTER. The information that the hon. gentleman seemed to be anxious for was as to whether any contract had been entered into with the Hudson Bay Company, and as to whether any money had passed. Neither is the case.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that it has been promised, though not paid yet?

Mr. FOSTER. Full information will be contained in the papers.

CENSUS OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to call the attention of the Government to the fact that, two sessions ago, I moved for the returns from the city of London giving the census for the various industrial establishments there. That order was then passed by the House. Last year I reminded the Government that the return had not been brought down and it was again promised. It has not come down yet. I would like to know whether that order is to be brought down this session immediately or not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no knowledge of this matter, but I shall call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FOSTER laid on the Table of the House the reports of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, and the evidence taken before the Commission.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY LINES.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Statement showing petitions presented to Parliament, during last two sessions, from Municipal Councils, asking for legislation to secure improved facilities for drainage across lines of railway; giving date of presentation, by whom presented, and a copy of each form of petition, with names of municipalities from which each petition was sent.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my object in asking for this information is to call the attention of the House to the fact that a great deal of difficulty has been experienced by private individuals and municipalities in securing outlets for drainage across the roadways of the different railway companies. It used to be supposed that the right of drainage across the railway was governed by the provincial Acts concerning drainage, but since this Parliament has assumed control of all railways, the companies resist that interpretation of the law and claim that they are not bound by the same Acts which secure rights of drainage across the property of private individuals or other corporations throughout the country. Members will recollect that within the last session or two many petitions have been presented from different municipalities asking for relief in this respect, and to-day I have had to present a petition from the county council of Elgin asking that the provisions of the Ditches and Watercourses Act of Ontario should be enforced in regard to railway companies. I intend to call the attention of the House to a Bill on this subject later on, and it is for use in connection with the discussion of that Bill that I ask for the information required by this motion.

Motion agreed to.

"DAIRY PRODUCTS ACT, 1893."

Mr. McLENNAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to introduce a Bill to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893.

Motion agreed to.

LAND GRANTS TO RELIGIOUS BODIES.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Return showing grants made from public lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories of Canada since 1st January, A.D. 1880, to religious denominations, religious sects, religious corporations and churches; with details as to date of each grant, area of the same, and name of denomination, sect corporation or church to which each grant was made.

He said: This motion was made at an early period of last session, and the return was promised by the Government, but was not brought down. I do not know whether there were any reasons actuating the Minister of the Interior in withholding this return or not, but I hope that this session the information called for will be forthcoming within a reasonable length of time.

Mr. DALY. As the hon. gentleman states, a similar motion was made last year, and the preparation of the return was commenced, and will be finished in about ten days. If the hon. gentleman will allow this motion to drop, the information will be laid on the Table of the House on the order of last session. If this motion is carried, it will necessitate a duplication.

Motion withdrawn.

SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. INNES moved for:

Return of all correspondence, reports or other matters on record between the Department of Agriculture and our High Commissioner in London with the British Board of Agriculture or any other Imperial authority in reference to the continued scheduling of Canadian cattle in the ports of Great Britain, subsequent to the return ordered by the House on the 6th February, 1893, and not included in the appendix to the Report of the Minister of Agriculture of the 24th January, 1894.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say that the department are anxious to place before the House every information in regard to this subject; but in the report of the Minister of Agriculture all the correspondence of any importance whatever bearing upon the subject is printed. There are some quite unimportant letters in the department which may be brought down if the hon. gentleman wants them. But everything of importance is contained in the report.

Mr. MULOCK. Further down on the paper there is a motion of mine germane to this subject, and not covered by the motion of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Innes). It would be a proper subject of amendment to the motion, unless the Minister gives the same answer to me that he has given to my hon. friend. If he chooses to take it as a substantive motion, I have no objection.

Motion withdrawn.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Statement showing date of appointment of the Royal Commission on Prohibition, names of the commissioners and number of days on which the commission sat. Also, statement of total expenses incurred up to date, on account of such commission, showing, separately, rate of pay per day allowed to each commissioner, and total amount so paid to each; amount paid for travelling expenses of each commissioner, and total travelling expenses; cost of reporting evidence taken by the commission; cost of printing such evidence, and the report of the commission; estimated total amount yet required to meet all remaining expenses connected with concluding the work of the commission.

He said: I have no doubt that some of these particulars may be contained in the report laid on the Table this afternoon, but I wish to have a statement of them in the form asked for here. I have no doubt also that some of the things asked for in this motion will not be so easily accessible in the report itself. I am sure that a statement giving the information I ask for will be very interesting. The public have been watching the proceedings of this commission with great interest and great patience. For years, the labours of the commission have been drawn out—so many years that I confess myself unable, on the spur of the moment, to say exactly how many. Last year we had a report from the party representing the liquor interest on that commission—a gentleman who might be looked upon by prohibitionists as the devil's advocate, Mr. Kribs. He spoke, as he alleges, not for bad spirits, but for good spirits, and we ought to hear from those who are opposed to the selling of all kinds of spirits. It will be very interesting to the public to know how much it has cost us to obtain the mass of information which, no doubt, will be disclosed when this report and the evidence connected with it are published. It has been the duty of these commissioners for this long time past, to make pleasant excursions, not only to all parts of Canada, but to a great many parts of the United States. They felt themselves bound, in virtue of the commission given them, to find out all the liquor dives in every place they visited and to sample the kinds of liquor obtainable there. I do not know how that work was divided up among the total prohibitionists, the moderate prohibitionists, and the moderate drinkers, and those, if there were any such on the commission, who came under none of these categories. It was clearly understood, as part of their duty, that they should go to Scott Act counties, prohibition states, &c., to ascer-

tain if liquor was obtainable in these places, and if so, whether it was fit for human consumption. It was a serious and important duty they had to discharge, and we hope to learn they have discharged it thoroughly. I hope they have ascertained just how much microbe killer in New Brunswick, corn juice in Maine, and cold tea in Prince Edward Island it takes to destroy the nervous system of an ordinary mortal. This information will be interesting, but it will still remain for the country to decide whether it is worth what we have paid for it. We have ascertained to-day from the Finance Minister that the expenditure amounts to something in the neighbourhood of $70,000, and the accounts are not all in. I am asking for an estimate of the probable amounts not yet in, because we should know something approximate to the total cost of the commission, at a very early date.

Motion agreed to.

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. DEVLIN moved for:

Statement showing the gross earnings of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway since the 30th day of June, 1894; also, a statement showing the total expenditure of said railway from same period. Also, a statement showing the total expenditure of said railway from the same period on the following accounts respectively:—(a) Wages and salaries of employees; (b) Payments to the president as such; (c) Payments to the directors as such; (d) Payments for other working expenses; (e) Payments on construction account not included in above.

He said: It will, perhaps, be well to give a reason or two why I make this motion. It is not a very pleasant task to bring a matter such as this before this House, but I think it is a question of public duty. I do not wish to reflect in any way on the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, but desire merely to find out what has been done with the money and earnings of that road. We have had this road before the House, and before committees, on many occasions. It has been the subject of agreat deal of discussion, and I do not propose to-day to enter into any of the matters which were detailed in the past, beyond stating this fact that, perhaps, no road in the Dominion has been more generously dealt with than the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway. It has been the recipient of large subsidies from the Dominion Parliament, the Quebec Provincial Government, the county represented by the hon. member for Pontiac, and the municipalities, if I am correctly informed, which are in his county. It has received an extension of time frequently, it is asserted, in regard to provisions which exist in its charter, so that, on the whole, it has been very generously dealt with. In fact, it is said that the road has been built very largely, if not wholly, out of the very grants it has received from the Dominion and Provincial Parliaments. What I am asking for to-day, I know it is not customary for the House to grant, but I think the circumstances I am about to point out will warrant the House in granting the order I am asking for. It appears, and I think my information is perfectly correct, that during the last eight months not a single employee of this road has been paid one dollar of wages, and, if my information is correct, for six months previous, no wages had been paid. This, I may be told, is a matter which does not come under the supervision of the House; but those who are employed by this company know that this road comes to this House and asks for a subsidy, and that to-day there is a subsidy not yet paid, but which has been voted for its construction. I ask that the House shall obtain from this railway company a statement showing what has been done with this money. It is a road which is earning money, for the two railways known as the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway and the Gatineau Valley Railway, belonging to the same company, have—as I am informed—in one year earned more than $16,000 profit over all expenses. And nobody seems to know where this money is going. It is a hard thing for labouring men to thus depend upon a railway company, to work hard for the railway and, in the end, to obtain nothing in return. I may be told that it is quite possible for these men to leave, but employment is not so abundant in Canada to-day that these men can easily secure other positions. It is almost impossible for them to go to the company and make a straight complaint or to threaten the company that they will abandon their positions, knowing that the company may, perhaps, dispense with their services, and thus leave them without employment at all. I bring this subject before the House in the interest of the public. I submit these facts to the Minister of Railways who has already, so I am assured, received certain reports in connection with this road which may enable him to throw some light on the subject. He has, at all events, received a report in connection with the condition of the road, a report which, I am told, pointed out to him that the road was unsafe for public travel and that life was endangered upon it. The hon. Minister shakes his head. Perhaps what I am stating at this moment may not be exactly the case. I shall be glad to be corrected where I am wrong, and at a later period, I will ask for a copy of that report. But what I have stated with regard to the wages is absolutely true—that all the employees of this road, whether conductors, brakemen, engineers, or in whatever capacity they may be employed, have been unpaid for a period of eight months. This is a question that is deserving of the attention

and consideration of Parliament. We are ready to vote large subsidies to the railways; it is well that we should know where this money goes which is thus voted by Parliament. True, no formal application has been made to this House by the employees of this road for redress or for protection. But, Sir, I take it upon myself to-day to bring this, I believe the saddest case known in the history of railways in Canada, before this House. These men have their families for whose subsistence they must provide; and they have been obliged to depend during nearly a whole year upon the generosity of friends. I ask the attention of the Minister of Railways to this subject; I ask also that the House will kindly direct that the order for which I move shall be issued. The resolution is seconded by Mr. Rider.

Mr. BRYSON. Before the motion is adopted I desire to say a word. I do not for a moment pretend to rise in defence of the Pontiac Railway Company or of their conduct; but, Sir, I desire to say with every possible respect, that the subject before the House should receive the favourable consideration of every member present. The hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion, I think, deserves a great deal of credit for doing so. The remarks which he offered, which I must say were very patriotic and very touching, with reference to the labouring men, the sentiments he expressed I can endorse. From my own personal observation, I know of very many cases of hardship arising from the men not being regularly paid on this road. That they have not been paid for several months, I believe to be the fact. But, Sir, we must bear in mind that the present company, although it has been largely subsidized, has been operating a railway through a section of country that has not been able to pay more than working expenses, even if it has been able to pay this much. I believe that it is not with the wish or through the act of the president of the railway company that the present state of affairs exists. I have understood that strenuous efforts are being made by the president of the company to meet the requirements of the men, but on several occasions he has been disappointed in raising the necessary funds and has been obliged to disappoint the men. As reference has been made to the county of Pontiac's contribution to this road, of which this House has heard on previous occasions, we are still in the position of having to contribute a large sum of money to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, without egress at the western end and without an inlet into the city of Ottawa. I hope the matter under discussion will receive the favourable consideration of the Government. In order to meet what I consider the requirements of the employees of the railways, I have given notice of a Bill which, with the permission of the House, I will soon introduce, to protect the employees of the different railways of Canada in the payment of their wages, in the event of a certain period lapsing in which the railway companies have refused or have been unable to pay their men. I hope that this Bill will meet with the approbation of the whole House. And I hope that there may not be a dissenting voice raised in this House to this motion, as this is an extreme case which the hon. member for Ottawa has brought before the Chair.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentlemen I have only to state that there is no information in the department except the statement, which is regularly filed, showing the weekly gross earnings of the road. That I will give to the hon. gentlemen. I have instructed the officers of the department to ask the railway company to give the department the information asked for, and when I receive it I will furnish it to him. The proper plan, I think, is that suggested by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Bryson). It seems a terrible affair as stated by the hon. gentleman, and I have no doubt his statement is correct, that railway employees have been for eight or nine months without payment of their wages and depending entirely upon charity. There ought to be some means by which a railway company carrying on its operations in the country shall be compelled to pay its workmen their wages. I think the plan suggested by the hon. gentleman is a correct one, remedying it in some manner by Act of Parliament. The hon. gentleman went further, and said that information was in possession of the department which showed that this road was in a state not fit to be worked or used for traffic.

Mr. DEVLIN. I said that I had been informed that the department had received a report representing the condition of the road as unfit for traffic.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman was correct. However, I sent to the department only for information in answer to the question which he put upon the Notice paper. I hardly think his information is correct, because if a report came to the department showing that the road was unsafe and ought not to be used for traffic or travel, it would have been the duty of the officers of the department to draw the attention of the company to it, and take means to prevent them carrying on traffic or business.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think the hon. gentleman's department did send an officer. At all events, there was a Government officer sent, either by this Government or the Provincial Government.

Mr. HAGGART. I will inquire.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is hardly necessary for the Minister to suggest that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. HAGGART. No. I do not ask it to be withdrawn. I have sent to the railway company for information, and the moment I get it I will bring it down.

Mr. MULOCK. Because the Railway Act makes ample provision for the Minister obtaining all this information.

Mr. LAURIER. This case is an evidence, if any were wanted, that the manner in which we have been subsidizing railway companies is very loose. We have been in the habit, and are still in the habit, of subsidizing railway companies at the rate of thousands of dollars per mile, and there is no provision in the law at the present time compelling these companies to show to the House in what manner they have invested the charity, as it has been called, at all events, the aid, which the bounty of the country has provided them. This railway has, I understand, been subsidized perhaps more heavily, at all events as heavily, as any other road in the country that I am aware of. It has been subsidized, as my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) has said, by this Dominion Parliament more than once. It has been subsidized by the Local Legislature of Quebec, not once, but several times; it has been subsidized by the county of Pontiac, if I remember rightly, to the extent of $200,000; and also, as I understand, by several municipalities besides. But with all these heavy subsidies, provincial, municipal and Dominion, amounting in all, if I am not mistaken, to more than $30,000 per mile, this railway company is not in a position to discharge its most pressing liabilities, not able even to pay the services of the poor men who operate it. I ask the House to consider if, in face of such a revelation, it is at all to be tolerated that we should be asked year after year to give money to these companies and never exact from them a return as to how the money is applied. Sir, the inference is strong that if the money had been properly applied for the building and management of this road, its employees would not be in the sad position they are in at the present time. On one or two occasions I have proposed a motion to this House, asserting that whenever a company receives the bounty of Parliament to aid in the construction of a railway, it should make an ample return as to the manner in which the money is applied, and this revelation is the best evidence of the wisdom of that proposition, which has been on several occasions rejected in this House.

Motion agreed to.

SEIZURE OF SHIPS IN BEHRING SEA.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government and between the Imperial Government and the United States Secretary of State concerning the payment to Canadian sealers of the damages resulting to them from the illegal seizure of their ships in Behring Sea by order of American authorities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to inquire of the leader of the House, or whoever is particularly in charge of this, if they have any information with respect to certain further demands that are alleged to have been made on behalf of the American Government for reopening this arbitration; or do they prefer to reserve that information?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I rose to call the attention of the hon. mover of this motion to the fact that negotiations are now going on between the Imperial Government and the United States Government with regard to these claims. I hope he will not press the matter, as bringing down the correspondence now would prejudice the negotiations with regard to these claims. They are not only negotiations between Canada and the Imperial Government, but between the Imperial Government and the United States; therefore, I ask the hon. gentleman not to press his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a matter of notoriety that these negotiations have been concluded, and that an agreement has been entered into between the predecessor in office of the present Minister of Justice, and the other authorities concerned, for the payment of a lump sum of $425,000, which proposition has been rejected by Congress. I cannot see that there can be any objection to bringing down the correspondence on this point, or to bringing down all the correspondence which led to the agreement accepting a lump sum. As to the correspondence which arose in consequence of the refusal by Congress to vote an appropriation for the payment of that sum, if the hon. gentleman thinks that it may not be in the public interest to bring that correspondence down, I will not press for it, seeing that other negotiations are now pending. But I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that in so far as correspondence was concluded by making agreement between the two interested parties, such correspondence ought to be brought down, and can be brought down without prejudice to anybody.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman had better not press his motion at present.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not press for anything subsequent to the refusal by Congress to grant an appropriation, but everything antecedent to that it seems to me we ought to have.

Mr. LANGELIER. In connection with this matter, I think the hon. gentleman ought to be in a position to give the House information in regard to a rumour which

has been published, not in Opposition papers, but in Ministerial papers, amongst others the "Morning Chronicle," of Quebec, a most important Ministerial paper, inasmuch as it is the special organ of the Postmaster General. The rumour I refer to is that one of our Ministers received a terrible snub at the hands of Mr. Gresham, the Secretary of State of the United States. The whole story was told in the newspapers. When the discussion was commenced it was carried on between the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State of the United States. The Secretary of State at first very plainly endeavoured to snub the Minister of Justice, but without seeming to be impolite. At last seeing he was re-commencing the discussion, he stated to the Minister, according to the newspaper, that it was a piece of impertinence on his part—these were the very words used—to take part in the discussion, the Secretary having previously asked him if he had any credentials from the British Government and having been answered by the Minister that he had not. Then it was, according to the newspaper, that the Secretary said it was a piece of impertinence on the part of the Minister, and he left. Then the paper added that Sir Julian Pauncefote, after the Minister had left, chuckled at the snubbing he had received. I do not think there is any truth in the report, as the leader of the Opposition has already stated; but it will be of interest to know if there is anything whatever in the story, for I do not think the whole of it is true.

Motion agreed to.

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copy of instructions given to the Queen's Printer and the Dominion Statistician relative to the number of copies of the last edition of the Statistical Year-Book which should be printed, and the method of distributing the same to members of the House and others.

He said: I make this motion largely for the purpose of calling attention to what I consider is a very objectionable order of things in connection with the distribution of the Statistical Year-Book for the past year. I received through the mail a copy of the book when published, and having temporarily lost it I wrote for another copy, and received a reply that no more were to be had. On coming down to Ottawa I inquired of the Dominion Statistician for other copies, and was told that the edition was exhausted. I asked how many copies had been printed and I was informed that the edition was 2,500. I asked if any reserve had been kept for the use of members of the House and was told no, that a few copies had been reserved for each Minister and that the rest were sent to the various applicants for them. I was further informed that, with one or two exceptions, members had not obtained more than one copy each. It appears to me that with an edition of 2,500 copies, 215 members of the House should have obtained more than one each. I may, perhaps, be paying an undue compliment to this publication by complaining that I cannot get a sufficient number of copies. We have been in the habit of saying that this compilation to a large extent is a campaign sheet, and I am afraid there is some ground for this complaint. I do not say the figures in the Year-Book have been falsified, but there are peculiar classifications adopted and peculiar calculations made, which are evidently for the purpose of producing a certain effect upon the minds of the reader. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition suggests that they are not more reliable than the ministerial newspapers, and I must confess there is considerable similarity between the assertions in those publications. Whether the Year-Book copies from the ministerial newspapers, or those newspapers from the Year-Book, it is not for me to say. I may call attention to one instance, the classification of lumber as a manufactured article. Only a few years have elapsed since lumber began to be classified as a manufactured article, it formerly appearing as the product of the forest; and we have seen during late years a most remarkable increase in the manufactured exports of Canada, due entirely to the export of lumber being classified under that head. When you examine the old Year-Books and the Trade and Navigation Returns and the exports of manufactured goods and compare them with the later ones, a considerable boom will be observed under the head of our exports; but if hon. members will consult the edition of the Year-Book for the last year, in which the principle of including lumber under manufactured products has been carried out through all these years, it will be observed that the exports of manufactured goods have fallen off. Whether the Year-Book is a campaign document or not, it is the only record available in the line of classified and compiled comparative tables of our financial and other affairs for use either by the press or on the platform, or for personal use. I urge that with all its faults it is a publication of which hon. members, without distinction of party, are entitled to receive a considerable number of copies, say ten or a dozen to each member. I also urge that the wants of members should be first attended to, because they are responsible to their constituents for the management of the financial affairs of the country and are called upon either to attack or defend the Government. If it should become necessary to print an edition twice or three times as large, it should be done; but with the edition that has been printed, I insist that members should have received the first consideration and have obtained a considerable number

of copies. I submit this motion in order to obtain information as to what instructions were given, and to urge on the Government the necessity of revising those instructions for the future. What I said about the distribution of an extra number of copies of the Year-Book is equally true of the Auditor General's Report. Year after year we have to complain that we cannot get a sufficient number of these. It would seem—and I say it without fear of contradiction, because it is the only explanation I can give of it—that the Government are afraid to have too large a circulation of the Auditor General's Report, which is compiled under the authority of an officer directly responsible to Parliment, and of the Statistical Year-Book which is compiled by an officer under their own auspices. The solid facts of the one might perhaps contradict the classification, we may say, of the other. They are both documents which contain information upon which the mind of the country has to be made up at election times, and we should receive more of them than we do now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the motion passes, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) that the Government, of course, are very pleased to give the information asked for in the motion. I have to say, too, that we are somewhat delighted at the fact that after the very great deal of abuse heaped on this Statistical Year-Book in the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, that we have heard now in the face of Parliament (and I hope it will be printed in the public press of the country) the highest compliment that could be paid to that statistical record, namely, a desire that a great many more copies of that useful work shall be given to the members of the House. The complaint which has been made by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) with regard to the distribution, is one in which members of the Government and members on this side of the House may join. The number printed was limited on account of a desire on the part of the Government to meet the wishes of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and others who are sincerely anxious that the greatest economy should be practised with regard to these expenditures. These books are sent to foreign Governments, to members of both Houses of Parliament, to members of the local legislatures, and to the various Mechanics Institutes, and such societies throughout the country, and consequently the 2,500 copies printed do not go very far. The complaint of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that he was unable to get a copy of the Statistical Year-Book some time after it was published, might also be made by members of the Government and by members on this side of the House, because, when they asked for extra copies they were unable to obtain them. The certificate of character which has been given to the Year-Book by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and which, I am sure, is concurred in by gentlemen on his side of the House, is such that we shall see whether or not a larger number can be printed and distributed, and we shall have great pleasure in giving some to the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), in the hope that he will send them out to his constituents so that they shall know with accuracy the facts contained in that publication. I have to say further, that, according to the report of the department, the members of the Opposition have been treated in this matter just the same as members on this side of the House, and as the members of the Government themselves. In fact, if any discrimination has been used at all, it has been shown in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite in order that they have no reason whatever to complain. Certainly, no attempt has been made to withhold these works from them.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Secretary of State has referred to me, and I am very glad indeed to hear from him that the Government are disposed to adopt a system of economy. I must, however, tell the hon. gentleman that our experience in the past, and I am afraid it will be so in the future, is, that the course of the Government in this respect has been to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. They have done economizing in the matter of issuing the Statistical Year-Book, and I trust they will give evidence of economy in respect to matters very much more important than that.

Mr. CASEY. My remarks on the Year-Book were not those of unqualified compliment to the book itself, but as it was the only tabulated form of statistics we had, we needed it, such as it was. I am afraid the argument of economy which the Secretary of State referred to will hardly pan out. It appears to me that the only economy the Government have been desirous of in the matter, has been an economy in giving information to the public and not economy with regard to the expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To prevent any misunderstanding, I may just observe that although I have not taken the trouble to look at the book for a year or two—having found it about as worthless a record for the purpose of conveying any reliable information, as I ever saw, short of a campaign sheet issued by the hon. gentleman's own special direction and supervision—I beg entirely, on my part, to dissent from any idea that we complain of the economy of the Government in not issuing more copies of this book. I would like to see a decent Statistical Year-Book which

could be relied upon, which could be appealed to, and which could be fairly placed in the hands of those desirous of obtaining correct information. I say nothing of the book as regards the last year or two, because I have not looked at it, but the last time I did look at it I found it entirely misleading, and I was sorry for the credit of the country, and for the credit of the Government, that such a thing had ever come out of the Government press.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would suggest to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that he might get an extra copy from the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I had the book, it would not be long finding its way into the waste paper basket.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all decisions of the Courts of Manitoba, of the Supreme Court of Canada, and of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council, as to the constitutionality of the Manitoba School Act of 1890, or as to the rights of any minority of the population of Manitoba under the provisions of said Act, or in opposition to such provisions. Also, copies or statements as to any legislation by the Manitoba Legislature, or action by the Manitoba Government relative to the Manitoba School question subsequent to the School Act of 1890, that may at this time be in the knowledge or possession of the Privy Council of Canada. Also, minutes of hearings and proceedings before the Privy Council of Canada on applications for remedial orders or Dominion interference of any character with the School legislation of Manitoba. Also, copies of any orders issued or action taken by the Privy Council of Canada relative to such legislation; and all other papers or correspondence of an official character having relation to the said Manitoba School question.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all despatches, communications and papers relating to the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England as to the Act passed by the Parliament of Canada, in the session of 1894, intituled "An Act respecting the Speaker of the Senate."—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Return of all correspondence, agreements, reports, papers, &c., relating to the Canadian Mutual Life Association, and the Massachusetts Benefit Association, and for all correspondence, complaints, &c., from policy-holders; also, all particulars regarding the amalgamation of the two companies or associations.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Sproule.)

Copies of all Orders in Council and departmental orders respecting the collection of tolls on public wharfs in the Lower St. Lawrence, and specially at St. John, Island of Orleans, and of all reports made by the collector respecting the collection of tolls at the said place.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of all correspondence not yet brought down between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government, and between the Imperial Government and the French Government, concerning the French Treaty.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of all documents, letters and contracts respecting the sale of newspapers on the Intercolonial Railway, executed or exchanged between the Canada Railway News Co., of Montreal, and the Government, for the years 1892-93, 1893-94 and 1894-95.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Return, in the form used in the statement usually published in the "Gazette," of the exports and imports from the first day of July, 1894, to the first day of April, 1895, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries; and comparative statements from the first day of July, 1893, to the first day of April, 1894.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th April, 1895

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House, that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of

Colin F. McIsaac, Esq., for the Electoral District of Antigonish.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. REID moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: The object of the amendments that I propose are, first, with a view to economise in the public expenditure; second, to change the system of examination so as to prevent the chances of candidates committing fraud by impersonation or otherwise at the examinations held annually, as has been done under the present system; third, to extend the limit of age; fourth, the general improvement of the service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. BERGIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) to amend the Dominion Fran-

chise Act. He said: In the county which I have the honour to represent, on the last revised list of voters there are one or two polling subdivisions which contain more than 300, and the object of this Bill is to amend the Act of 1891 so as to make it perfectly clear that the returning officer or the revising officer has power to make an extra subdivision in such cases.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Colin F. McIsaac, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Antigonish, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fraser.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That a select committee, composed of Messieurs Amyot, Cockburn, Davis, Davin, Edgar, Fraser, Laurier, McNeill, Mills (Bothwell), O'Brien, Rinfret, Scriver, Weldon, and White (Shelburne), be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library, and that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That a Message be ordered to be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.:—Messieurs Amyot, Bergin, Bourassa, Charlton, Costigan, Davin, Grandbois, Innes, Kaulbach, Landerkin, LaRivière, Lépine, Maclean (York), McLean (King's), McMullen, Putnam, Rider, Somerville, Stevenson, Sutherland, Taylor, and Tisdale, will act as members on the part of the House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on the 18th instant, presented the following Report:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs:

Adams,
Amyot,
Baker,
Beausoleil,
Bruneau,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Choquette,
Coatsworth,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Edgar,
Flint,
Fraser,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Ives,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leclair,
Lister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McLeod,
Martin,
Masson,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Préfontaine,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Weldon, and
Wood (Brockville).—41.

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs:

Bain (Soulanges),
Belley,
Bennett,
Boston,
Cameron,
Carroll,
Corbould,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Dugas,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Flint,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grieve,
Harwood,
Haslam,
Henderson,
Hutchins,
Legris,
McDonald (Victoria),
Pridham,
Pope,
Reid,
Robillard,
Ryckman,
Simard,
Somerville,
Temple, and
Tyrwhitt.—30.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Adams,
Allan,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Borden,
Boston,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Calvin,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Carignan,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leclair,
Leduc,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McInerney,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean (King's),
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan,

Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Davin,
Davis,
Delisle,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Fairbairn,
Fauvel,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Frémont,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Godbout,
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guay,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Harwood,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Ingram,
Innes,
Ives,
McMullen,
Madill,
Mara,
Martin,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Mignault,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Montague,
Mulock,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pope,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Proulx,
Putnam,
Reid,
Rider,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Smith (Sir Donald),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Vaillancourt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmorel'd), and
Yeo.—164.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs :

Allan,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Barnard,
Beith,
Belley,
Bennett,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Brodeur,
Campbell,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Casey,
Chesley,
Choquette,
Cleveland,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Corby,
Craig,
Davies,
Delisle,
Denison,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Frémont,
Gillmor,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Guillet,
Harwood,
Hazen,
Hodgins,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kenny,
LaRivière,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McInerney,
McKay,
McKeen,
Madill,
Marshall,
Mignault,
Miller,
Moncrieff,
Monet,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Pelletier,
Prior,
Proulx,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Smith (Ontario),
Stairs,
Vaillancourt
Weldon,
White (Shelburne), and
Yeo.—73.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

Bain (Wentworth),
Bergeron,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burnham,
Cargill,
Colter,
Desaulniers,
Dyer,
Earle,
Featherston,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Gillmor,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grieve,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Lavergne,
Macdowall,
McInerney,
McKeen,
McNeill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monet,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pridham,
Rinfret,
Rosamond,
Rowand,
Scriver,
Semple,
Stevenson,
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—46.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs :

Amyot,
Bergin,
Bourassa,
Charlton,
Costigan,
Davin,
Grandbois,
Innes,
Kaulbach,
Landerkin,
LaRivière,
Lépine,
Maclean (York),
McLean (King's),
McMullen,
Putnam,
Rider,
Somerville,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Taylor, and
Tisdale.—22.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs :

Adams,
Baker,
Béchard,
Belley,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Boyle,
Joncas,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Lister,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Algoma),

Bryson,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Chesley,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Devlin,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hughes,
Jeannotte,
McDougald (Pictou),
McGregor,
McInerney,
McKay,
McMullen,
Madill,
Martin,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Mulock,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Rinfret,
Scriver,
Somerville,
Sproule,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmorel'd).-65.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of nine members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Allan,
Amyot,
Bain (Wentworth),
Baird,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Borden,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bruneau,
Burnham,
Calvin,
Cargill,
Carignan,
Carling (Sir John),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Charlton,
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colter,
Corby,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dyer,
Earle,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdowall,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton)
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Mara,
Martin,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Putnam,
Rider,
Rosamond,
Rowand,
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Stairs,
Sutherland,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Turcotte,
Wallace,
Welsh,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilson,
Wood (Westm'd), and
Yeo.—119.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of nine members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Boston,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Boyd,
Brodeur,
Burnham,
Calvin,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carignan,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Cleveland,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Forbes,
Fréchette,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
LaRivière,
Leclair,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdowall,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McGregor,
McLean (King's),
McLennan,
McMillan,
McNeill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Metcalfe,
Mignault,
Miller,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pope,
Pridham,
Proulx,
Putnam,
Reid,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Westm'd).—107.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to report Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Commissioner of Dominion Police Force, for the year 1894, under Revised Statutes of Canada, Chap. 184, section 5.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, for the calendar year 1894.—(Mr. Montague.)

DOMINION VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What is the entire cost of the recent revision of the Dominion voters' lists? If the cost is not yet fully ascertained, how much of it is ascertained, and what is the estimate of the Government of the amount of the unascertained expenses?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The amount paid to the revisers up to April 25, 1895, was $148,248.16; the probable amount required to complete payment to revising barristers is placed at $12,000. The amount paid for printing is $35,166.89. All the lists are printed.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. The list for my county is not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Practically, they are all printed,—there may be one or two lists unfinished.

Mr. CASEY asked, Which of the voters' lists for 1894-95 have been, or are being printed elsewhere than at the Government Printing Bureau? Where have they been printed, or are now being printed? Was the printing of them let by tender? What rates have been agreed on for the printing of such lists?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Montreal—St. Antoine, wholly; St. Anne, wholly; St. James, wholly; Maissoneuve, wholly; St. Mary's, partly; St. Lawrence, partly; Hochelaga, partly. Toronto—East, wholly; West, Central, wholly. York—East, wholly; North, wholly; West, wholly. They have been printed, or are now being printed, as follows:—Montreal—St. Antoine, Gazette Printing Company; St. Anne, Gazette Printing Company, balance completed in Bureau; St. Mary's, Gazette Printing Company (part), the Trait d'Union, Journal of Commerce (part); St. James, Journal of Commerce (part), E. Senécal & Son (part), La Presse (part); Hochelaga, Le Monde (part), balance completed in Bureau; Maissoneuve, La Minerve; St. Lawrence, Journal of Commerce, balance in Bureau. Toronto—Centre, Catholic Register (part); Thomas Moore & Co. (part); West, The Sentinel (part), Thomas Moore & Co. (part); East, the Mail Job Office. York—West, William Briggs; East, J. S. Williams; North, Thomas Moore & Co. The work was not offered to tender. The rates agreed on for the printing of the lists is 3 cents a name, and 50 cents for headings, being the rate allowed for printing supplementary lists throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BRODEUR (for Mr. Lavergne) asked, To whom did the Government intrust the printing of the electoral lists for Drummond and Arthabaska, Megantic and Richmond-Wolfe, for the last revision?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The electoral lists for Drummond and Arthabaska, Megantic and Richmond and Wolfe were printed at the Government Printing Bureau.

TAY CANAL—REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, 1. What amount of revenue was derived from the Tay Canal during the season of navigation, in the year 1894? 2. What was the cost of maintenance and management of the Tay Canal during the year 1894?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount of revenue derived from the Tay Canal during the season of navigation, 1894, was $126.69. The cost of maintenance and management for the year 1894 was: Staff, $1,314.25; repairs, $1,144.64; total, $2,458.89, of which $1,012.67 was for renewing lock gates carried away by the steamer "Rideau Belle," which is an exceptional expenditure.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the total amount of railway subsidies voted at the last session of the Canadian House of Commons?

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount of railway subsidies voted at last session was $4,661,160; revote, $1,700,580; new vote, $2,960,580.

CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Have any other contracts for public works been entered into? If so, with whom, and for what amount?

Mr. HAGGART. The following contracts in connection with the canals have been entered into since 30th June, 1894:

Date.	Name of Contractor.	Nature of Work.	Name of Canal.	Approximate Amount.
1894.				$ cts.
July 17	Canadian Loco. and Engine Co.	Machinery for lock gates	Sault Ste. Marie	29,000 00
do 20	Wm. Carson	Brick sewer	Cornwall	11,500 00
Aug. 30	J. W. Grier	Sewer	Beauharnois	6,000 00
Sept. 21	C. J. de Sola	Cement	Soulanges	31,900 00
do 22	McNamee & Mann	Deepening canal	Lachine	300,000 00
Oct. 1	Weddell Dredging Co	St. Louis channel	Lake St. Louis	860,000 00
do 23	Wm. Kilt	Grading	Rideau	1,000 00
do 26	J. B. Deslorier	Brickwork, &c., of store	Lachine	15,200 00
Nov. 9	Battle & Newman	Repairing Dalhousie pier	Welland	18,000 00
do 15	Dominion Bridge Company	Steel bridge superstructure.	Soulanges	9,800 00
do 19	Battle & Newman	Rebuild culvert	Welland	6,500 00
Dec. 4	J. C. Hague	Masonry pier	Beauharnois	1,500 00
do 13	Miller Bros	Lock gates	Rapide Plat	3,200 00
do 19	S. O'Donohue	Repair lock	St. Peter's	15,200 00
do 26	M. Ryan	Build retaining wall	Rideau	1,350 00
do 27	Dominion Bridge Co	Steel bridge superstructure.	Beauharnois	2,290 00
1895.				
Jan. 14	Nicholson & Stewart	Masonry	Grenville	4,700 00
do 18	S. Hourigan	Bridge masonry	Rideau	2,300 00
Feb. 2	Miller Bros	Spare lock gates	Sault St. Marie	13,100 00
do 14	S. H. Fleming & Co	Booms	do	5,650 00
do 18	A. Onderdonk	Construction	Trent	492,100 00
March -	Canadian Bridge Co	Steel bridge superstructure.	Rideau	2,690 00
do 27	Dominion Bridge Co	Movable dam	Sault St. Marie	75,700 00

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of whoever is responsible for the distribution of our "Hansard"—I suppose that it is the "Hansard" Committee—to a complaint which has been made to me by some gentlemen of the press, and which I think would deserve their attention. These gentlemen tell me that as regards the distribution of "Hansard" to the press, that all they receive are the "Hansard" sheets a fortnight or three weeks old, and then in uncorrected form, so that they are of little use. Now, I think it is very desirable that if we distribute "Hansard" to the press at all, it should be forwarded at once, and I can see no reason at all why this should not be done. For all practical purposes the "Hansard" reports are very fairly correct, and as the unrevised edition is the edition distributed, there seems to me to be no reason at all for holding it back for two or three weeks when it would be of service to these gentlemen if they got it immediately. I do not know which member of the Government holds himself responsible for "Hansard" or who at this moment is the chairman of the committee, but I think it would be well that these "Hansard" reports in their unrevised state should be sent at once to the newspapers which are in the habit of receiving them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that after the lapse of two or three weeks the unrevised edition was sent?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the statement made to me. One gentleman says: "We get the "Hansard" sheets a fortnight or three weeks old, and then in uncorrected form." It struck me as a curious statement, but so it is made. I think what these gentlemen would like to get would be the "Hansard" as it comes out, and although occasionally some of us may find little curious errors—I recollect, for instance, on one occasion when I quoted a saying of Themistocles, it was debited to Mr. Peter Mitchell—still I do not particularly object. I think, Sir, it would be a great advantage to the press—these gentlemen are prominent members of the press, who write to me—to get the "Hansard" as it is issued to ourselves, and no harm would arise from it as they would be aware that it is uncorrected.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the informant of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has misled him. The "Hansard" used to be distributed immediately to the press and some hon. gentlemen, one of whom, I think, is present here, represented to the Committee, that the press would prefer to have the revised edition. I may say that I, knowing something about newspapers, stood up and said that that was a very extraordinary way of doing it, because if I were editing a paper I should like to get the full report as quickly as possible, especially as we

had no newspaper which gave full reports. Those of us who held that, and I think nearly all of us who knew anything about newspapers held it, were overborne by the strong representations made to us that the press preferred to have the revised edition. I think that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) will find that the only ground of complaint of his informant is that he gets the revised edition two or three weeks late, and that cannot be helped if he wants the revised edition. If it is the general desire to have the unrevised edition it can be sent to them immediately just as it is supplied to the members, and as it used to be supplied to the press before these representations were made to the Committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) must have been somewhat misinformed. The representatives of the press here at Ottawa get the unrevised report immediately, as soon as it is published. The intention is to send to the other papers throughout the country the revised report which cannot be sent for some days of course, because of its being required to be corrected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand, then, that any gentlemen of the press who apply for the unrevised edition will get it daily. If that is so, I suppose it will meet the difficulty.

Mr. DAVIN. I think so.

Mr. SCRIVER. The Committee will meet to-morrow and will decide that.

PROCESS OF EXECUTION AGAINST THE MESSRS. CONNOLLY.

Mr. LAURIER. The Solicitor General promised to give us to-day information which he could not give us yesterday, with regard to the date of issue of the process of execution against the Messrs. Connolly.

Mr. CURRAN. The process was issued only a few days before the hon. gentleman put his notice on the paper. You will understand the delay in reference to the first $10,000 which is due, not by the Connollys, but by Mr. Larkin, and which fell due only a short time ago. That is the case with reference to the first payment of the Messrs. Connolly also, so that there was no time lost.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not what I asked. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Curran) told us yesterday that the share of Mr. Larkin had been paid in September, if I remember aright. I asked him to give us the date of the issue of the process.

Mr. CURRAN. Instructions were given about four or five days ago.

Mr. LAURIER. We cannot have the exact data after all. The answer is only "four or five days ago."

Mr. CURRAN. I cannot give you the exact date. It was a day or so before the question was put on the Order paper.

DAIRY PRODUCTS ACT, 1893.

Mr. McLENNAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee:

To consider a certain proposed Resolution to introduce a Bill to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Explain this Bill; we have never had a word of explanation on it yet.

Mr. McLENNAN. Mr. Chairman, the object of this Act is to amend subsection 1 of section 5 of the Dairy Products Act of 1893, and for the purpose of marking butter and cheese. I will state to the Committee the changes that I propose to make in section 5 of that Act: First, by striking out the words "any foreign country," in the second and third lines thereof, and adding instead thereof, the words "Canada or the United States," and by adding after the word "produced" in the fourth line thereof, the words, "and the month and year of manufacture thereof," and by adding after the word "legible" in the fifth line thereof, the words "and indelible," and by adding after the word "same" in the sixth line thereof, the words "and in the case of cheese, on the cheese itself before leaving the place of manufacture." If I read the clause as I propose to place it before the House, perhaps it will explain my intention more clearly. The clause will read as follows:—

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

Subsection 1 of section 5 of "The Dairy Products Act, 1893," is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

No person shall sell, offer, expose, or have in his possession for sale, any cheese or butter which is produced in Canada or the United States, unless the name of the country where such cheese or butter was produced, and the month and year of manufacture thereof is branded, stamped or marked in a legible and indelible manner upon the outside of every box or package which contains the same, and, in the case of cheese, on the cheese itself before leaving the place of manufacture, in letters not less than three-eighths of an inch high and one-quarter of an inch wide.

The reason I have put in the words "Canada or the United States" is because these are the countries most interested in the export of butter and cheese from Canadian ports. I have substituted the United States for "any foreign country" because otherwise this

Bill might interfere with traders and grocers in this country who keep some French and German cheese for sale. So that I think it considerably simplifies matters to make the Bill apply only to butter and cheese from Canada and the United States. Now, the principal object of this Bill is to secure the branding of the cheese itself with the month and year of manufacture. It is very important that this should be done, because a great many farmers sell their cheese every two weeks or every month and only get the current prices prevailing at the time. Then the cheese passes into the hands of the trade; and in the past two or three years the speculative element in the trade, through the increased facilities of cold storage in Canada and Great Britain, have been in the habit of storing a large portion of the cheese of June, July and the first half of August, and holding it until November, and sometimes until January of the following year. Then it is offered to the trade without representation as to the date of its make, and is sold in the English market as the finest Canadian cheese, at a season of the year when our choice Canadian fall cheese is being marketed. Therefore, it can be easily seen that this placing of the cheese unfairly before the purchasers is injuring our product in the market, and must affect the prices the farmers, who are the producers of this article, would then obtain. The object of the Bill is to secure the branding of the cheese in such a way that the matter will be placed fairly and squarely before the purchasers in the old country, without any deception or misrepresentation, and they will know exactly what they are buying. The English market is the market we have to depend upon for the sale of our dairy products, and it is very necessary, in the interest of that industry, that we should keep faith with the people there. I have it from the best authority—from men who are prominent exporters in the city of Montreal—that about 90 per cent of the cheese coming into Montreal is re-coopered more or less when received in the warehouse and before being shipped, and that about 10 per cent is broken in such a way that new covers or new sides for the boxes, in some cases new boxes, are required. It is easy to see that in such a case American and Canadian cheese might easily become mixed, and American cheese might be placed upon the market as Canadian. This is another reason which makes it absolutely necessary that the cheese itself should be properly branded. This provision is asked for by purchasers in England, and I am sure that the House will agree with me that it is one that we should enact. I have received a copy of a memorial on this subject, signed by sixteen of the leading firms of Bristol, England, who deal in this article, and the honorary secretary of the Bristol Produce Trade Association, in a letter informs me that this memorial has been sent to the Secretary of State. It reads as follows:—

To the Honourable the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Canada in Parliament assembled,

This memorial showeth:

That we, the undersigned importers of Canadian products, are strongly of opinion that it would be a distinct advantage to both producers and distributors of Canadian cheese if the date and make were legibly and indelibly marked on each cheese before it leaves the factory where made.

Your memorialists, therefore, pray your honourable House to pass a law making it compulsory upon all manufacturers of cheese in Canada to so mark each cheese before it leaves the factory where made.

Bristol, England, 25th March, 1895.

Now, I am sure that every member of this House on both sides is very much interested in the advancement of our dairy interests, and I should be very glad to receive any assistance or suggestion in order to make this Bill as perfect as possible. This is the most important industry we have in Canada, and I am sure there can be no harm in placing this matter fairly and squarely before the people of Great Britain, upon whom we depend for our market.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do hope that a Bill of this kind will pass the House. During the last season, our cheese industry, which is a very important one, suffered very much from summer cheese being held back and placed on the market as fall cheese. I think it is absolutely necessary that all cheese should have the date of manufacture and the name of the factory or manufacturer indelibly stamped upon it. The English market is very susceptible to improper influences, and if it is found that our summer cheese is being held back and put upon that market as fall cheese, it will injure one of the most important industries in Canada—an industry which, during all this time of depression, has held its own and a little more; and it is about the only product of the farm that has done so. I do hope that this Bill will come before the House and become law, so that fair protection will be afforded to those who are honestly placing their cheese products upon the market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the proposition of my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr McLennan) is chiefly to compel the stamping of the date upon each package of cheese.

Mr. McLENNAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very glad to hear it. I quite accord with his view that it is absolutely necessary, for the protection of our cheese industry, that no possible chance shall be given for anything

that can deteriorate the quality of that great article of export.

Mr. TAYLOR. As will be seen by the Notice paper, I have a motion dealing with this same question. I presume the Bill of my hon. friend has covered the ground which my motion was intended to do, except, in so far as I can gather, no provision is made for inspection of the factories. That is something which, I think, should be added to the Bill before it leaves the committee. There should be some penalty imposed upon the producer, in the case of negligence on his part in not branding the cheese. This is a very serious question. I have a letter from a friend of mine dealing with this question, as regards the shipment from Montreal. He writes :

I notice by the Montreal "Gazette" that you have a resolution before the House respecting the branding of cheese. I presume it refers to Canadian cheese, and it is probably the result of a controversy between the English buyers and the Canadian exporters regarding September cheese. If I remember right, it was claimed by the English buyers that July or August cheese was branded "September make," and placed by the exporters on the English market as being September cheese. This allegation the Canadian exporters indignantly denied, and retorted that, if such cheeses were so branded, it must have been done in England and by the English themselves. Without entering into the discussion or even venturing an opinion on the subject, I beg leave to give you some information, which may or may not be of use to you. I know that you are very much interested in the agricultural industries and that you take a deep interest in the cheese production as a staple industry. Therefore, I merely state for your information, that last fall I saw load after load of Canadian cheese sent down to the vessels for export with the words "September make" branded on the boxes in large letters. Whether branded thus in the factories where made or in Montreal warehouses, I know not, neither do I know whether or not it was September cheese. I merely relate the fact that cheese left the port of Montreal with that particular brand on the boxes. I mention it to you in case you may find it of service ; if not, there can be no harm done.

From my experience, there is no factory in the country which has branded its summer cheese, September make, but the buyers have purchased cheese in June, July and August, and with the facilities now enjoyed for cold storage they can hold it until the fall, and brand it on the boxes as September make, and it goes home to England as September make, although made in June. We see by the newspapers that a good deal of agitation was caused in England in that regard. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Montreal "Star," containing a telegram dated London, 16th :

(Montreal "Star" cable).—A meeting of the British commission merchants who import Canadian cheese has been called for an early date, to protest against alleged frauds said to be perpetrated on the trade by some of the largest Canadian shippers. These people, it is said, are sending out summer-made cheese labelled as September made, and thereby securing much higher prices for a much inferior article. Such actions on the part of Canadian shippers are, it is represented, sure to imperil Canada's cheese trade with the British islands, as well as other European countries. A deputation is to wait on Sir Charles Tupper, Canada's High Commissioner, and request that the Dominion Government legislate forthwith, to ensure that each cheese, instead of each box, be branded with the date of making. A London dealer to-day purchased 12,000 cheese of the maritime provinces make.

I understand that the Bill makes provision for the branding of the cheeses themselves as well as the boxes, because unless the brand is on the cheese itself there is very little use putting it on the boxes. The cheeses should be branded as well as the boxes, and then, back of that, there should be some means provided for inspection either at the factory or at the boards of trade where the cheeses are delivered. I shall have very much pleasure in withdrawing my motion if this Bill goes far enough to cover the ground, as I presume it does, save that portion referring to inspection. I may just say here that I have another clipping from a newspaper, the official organ of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, which admits the superior quality of Canadian cheese :

Mr. N. Simon, of Neenah, Wis., who won such a fine reputation for the making of full cream cheese at the Columbian World's Fair, went to England the past summer to see what he could do in making a market for the fine goods he is making. Let it be remembered that he was in the market largely possessed by Wisconsin cheese only a few years since. The spirit and response he met with was very disheartening and may be stated in the words used by a Liverpool dealer : 'We want no more to do with your Wisconsin cheesemakers. We have tried you and have been swindled. You will send us a few fine cheese, and then first thing we know you dump a lot of filled cheese on us. We shall trade no more with men who cheat and defraud. When we want good cheese, we send to Canada.' What is true of the English market will soon become true of the best home market. "A bad name is soon known to all the earth," says the old proverb.

Whether this fraud be perpetrated by the exporter or the merchant in England, it is in the interests of the Canadian producer that his goods should leave the factory branded with the month and the year of production, and a penal clause should be enforced compelling the producers to do this, and also inflicting a penalty on the purchaser or exporter who removes the brand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I need scarcely say that the Government recognizes this as a very important matter, and I wish to inform the House that they are seriously considering the question which has been brought to our attention by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), as well as the hon. mem-

ber for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). There can be no objection whatever to the resolution passing. Indeed, the House is indebted to the hon. member for Glengarry, as well as the hon. member for South Leeds, for the attention they have paid to the subject and the information they have given, and when the time comes for dealing with the Bill, the Government will be prepared to explain their policy to the House. I have now to say that I do not quite understand how far the hon. member for Glengarry proposes to go. If he proposes to deal only with the dairy products which are exported, that is a matter which certainly comes within the jurisdiction of this House. But if he proposes to deal with dairy products sold in the local markets, that might be a matter more particularly under the jurisdiction of the local authorities. Under any circumstances, the Government are quite aware of the importance of the matter, and are giving it due consideration. They are also aware of the importance to Canadian producers of keeping up the character and reputation of Canadian cheese in the British market. And I was glad to hear the testimony given by an hon. gentleman opposite to the fact that the prices of Canadian cheese in Great Britain had not become reduced during the past year, when low prices were the rule. No doubt, the hon. gentleman who spoke is well aware that that fact is due to the very high standing which Canadian cheese obtained at the World's Fair in competition with the cheese of other countries. The Government are giving the matter their very best attention with a view of promoting in the best possible way the dairy interests of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I think it would be well if the attention of the Minister of Agriculture was directed to the North-west Territories from this standpoint. In a new country like the North-west it would be very desirable that means should be taken to encourage the manufacture of cheese. We have some cheese factories and, as you are well aware, Sir, our milk is probably the richest milk in the Dominion as cream-producing milk. There is no doubt that cheese is destined to be a staple product in those territories. I would urge upon the attention of the Secretary of State, who, no doubt, represents the Minister of Agriculture here, to consider, seeing that we there are still in a state of pupilage, whether or not now, or not too far in the future, some substantial aid—although it would really amount to a very small sum in the aggregate—should not be given to the districts in order to encourage, for a short time, the manufacture of cheese in those districts. I hope my hon. friend the Secretary of State will bring this subject before his colleague the Minister of Agriculture, Hon. Senator Angers.

Mr. McMULLEN. Undoubtedly, this question of the cheese industry is a very important one, and I am glad to learn from the Secretary of State that the Government intend to give it their best consideration. So far as the character and standing of Canadian cheese in the English market is concerned, that is due more to the record it has made in the English market for itself than to any advantage we gained at Chicago. Undoubtedly we made a very creditable exhibit and gained an enviable name, which will prove an additional advantage. But the Canadian cheese has, from year to year, so risen in the estimation of British consumers that it now enjoys the very highest reputation in that market. I hope it will continue to win the appreciation of the consumers in England, which will keep it in strong demand and maintain its price. With regard to the North-west, and the suggestion which my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has been pressing upon the consideration of the Government, I am sure we should be rejoiced to see the North-west prosper in the production of cheese. However, in my humble opinion, in the present financial condition of this Dominion, I fancy the North-west will have to strike out for itself and manifest the enterprise necessary to build up the cheese industry for which, no doubt, that country is well fitted. The pasture lands of that country are rented at one or two cents an acre to the ranching companies, and, if men with the advantages they possess cannot produce cheese without a bounty from the Dominion treasury, I am afraid my hon. friend will long press the consideration of his proposal upon this House before he will gain its sanction. There is another point I should like to see embodied in the Bill when it is brought down, and that is, that not merely shall the name of the factory and the date, but also the province in which the factory is situated be branded upon the cheese. The province of Ontario, and some portions of Quebec have a very creditable reputation for their cheese product, one that it has cost them a great deal to make, and one that is very valuable; and we want to see that that record is not injured by having cheese branded as Canadian which is from districts of the Dominion whose cheese would come far short of the high standard that the best Canadian cheese has now attained in the English market. So, I hope that when this Bill comes down, it will provide for the name of the province, and of the county as well, will be branded upon the cheese, so as to protect those who have contributed so largely to the very high reputation which Canadian cheese now enjoys in Great Britain.

Resolution reported.

Mr. McLENNAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) to amend the Dairy Products Act of 1893.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION—TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior and Mr. Schomacher, Rev. T. D. Phillips, Mr. P. F. Daly, Captain Holmes, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and any other persons; and also all reports received by the said department from any of its agents or other persons as to the transportation of a number of Jew pedlars from Chicago to Calgary with the intention of settling the same upon farms near Calgary, referred to in a letter dated 29th December, 1894, signed L. M. Fortier, addressed to the editor of the Winnipeg "Free Press," and published in that paper on 4th January, 1895; also a statement showing what became of said Jew pedlars and how many of them were committed to jail in Calgary, and for what offences.

He said: Last session I introduced a resolution which was carried on the 7th May, asking that information similar to that which is asked for in the resolution I now submit. Although that motion was duly carried in the House, no papers were brought down in response to it; and I desire to enter my protest against the conduct of the Government in regard to that motion, and the system of procedure which they seem to have adopted very generally with regard to resolutions moved by gentlemen on this side of the House, asking for information. I consider that the action of the Government in paying no attention whatever to the resolutions of this House, duly passed, is directed, not against the Opposition, but against the House as a whole. It seems to me that it is very much against the dignity and against the rights and privileges of this House that the Government, having allowed motions of this nature asking for information to pass, should adopt the system that they appear to have adopted as a regular policy, of declining and refusing to bring down the information which has been asked for. I may say that I had occasion, with regard to a considerable number of returns which I moved for last session, to call upon the Government, and other members of this House had occasion to call upon the Government, day after day, asking when the information was to be furnished. The Minister concerned invariably promised that he would look into it, and that was the last we heard of it. It would appear to me that the proper course for the Government to adopt, if they are unwilling to furnish any particular information, is to take the manly course of refusing to allow the motion to pass, and to give their reasons for it. But to burk the natural desire and the rights of members of this House to inquire for information, by the system adopted of allowing a motion to pass and then neglecting to bring the information down, seems to me subversive of the privileges of this House, and I, as one member, protest very strongly indeed against that system. I may say that one motion which was allowed to pass without any opposition, without any discussion, last session, was an order of the House for a return showing the expenses incurred by Ministers of the Crown in their trips through the country for the purpose of obtaining information as to the working of the tariff. After having allowed that motion to pass, the Government, towards the end of the session, coolly stated to the House that they did not intend to bring down the information. In another case a motion was passed at my instance, asking for the expenses of Canada in detail with regard to the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago. That motion was passed, and also a motion somewhat similar in its terms made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I had some correspondence sent to me by officials of the department, inquiring whether the two returns might not be consolidated together. I replied that I was quite agreeable that it should be done in that way as long as all the information that I asked for was communicated to the House. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, and in spite of the fact that Mr. Larke, and I think other officers who were employed at Chicago, were kept here in Ottawa all summer, presumably engaged in the work of closing up the affairs of Canada as to that exposition, that return has never been brought down to this day. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the particular matter as to which I now move, fortunately considerable light has been thrown upon the transaction by some correspondence which has appeared in the public press in Manitoba in regard to this matter. I asked last session for information as to the immigration efforts of the Department of the Interior which had resulted, as I had been informed, in bringing a number of settlers to Calgary, presumably with the intention of locating upon farms and becoming settlers in the country, while, as a matter of fact, it appeared that those persons were Jews, whose occupation in life had been that of peddling, and that instead of coming as settlers to take up farms, those persons, after they had been brought out at a large expense to the Government, had resumed their occupation of peddling, and a number of them had found their way in a short space of time into the Calgary jail. The hon. Minister of the Interior entirely denied, as I understood him, the suggestion that I made. His remarks will be found in the "Hansard" at page 2420: "I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman should have seen fit to give out to the world, through his utterances in this House, that any class in that country are in the condition he describes. It would be well for the hon. gentleman to secure better information on subjects of this kind before undertaking to deal with them.

Now, as to the Jews, of whom he speaks as having come from Chicago to Calgary, he has also indulged in exaggeration. It appears that the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway agent in Chicago was called to the fact by Rev. T. D. Phillips, late of Ottawa, and for some time residing in Chicago, that there was a number of people, consisting of Germans, Hungarians and Poles, who were in his parish in Chicago, and who were desirous of emigrating to the North-west, or to portions of the North-west states, where they could go upon farms. The information given to the Canadian Pacific Railway was that these people were farmers, that they had been accustomed to farming in the old country, and that some of them had done farming in the States since they came out, and also that they were possessed of money ranging from $300 to $600 each. Upon these representations of the Rev. Mr. Phillips, the Canadian Pacific Railway agent notified the Government agent, Capt. Holmes, of these people's desire, and I will read from Mr. Holmes' report what he says concerning them. It is on page 150 of the report of the Department of the Interior :

Letters having been received from Rev. Mr. Phillips in Chicago, representing some 70 families in Chicago, and from parties in Idaho, Washington and Oregon, I was instructed by the department to visit these places and make arrangements for representatives of these people to visit the North-west. In Chicago I saw Rev. Mr. Phillips and met several of the people about whom he had corresponded. They made arrangements for a mass meeting on the following Sunday evening at Rochester Hall, where I met some 700 people and explained the requirements for homesteading.

I found them a mixed lot, consisting of Germans, Poles and Hungarians principally, with about 25 per cent Jews among them, the remainder being Lutherans, Roman Catholics and other persuasions. They selected four of their number to go to the Calgary district and select land, and asked to have an agent familiar with the country sent with them. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company kindly furnished transportation for the party over their lines, the delegates paying for their own transportation to the boundary and return.

This is the statement of the department as to what really did occur :

As a result of this expedition, some twenty heads of families left Chicago in the month of June and took up homesteads on the line of the Calgary and Edmonton Railroad. They took with them sums of money averaging about $500 per family. Some of them have since sent for their families, and all have been self-supporting.

Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to say for himself :

Now, it appears, as stated here, that 25 per cent of the people whom Captain Holmes met were Jews, and that amongst the delegates was one Jew. It appears that this man did most of the talking, and because he was a Jew and did most of the talking, the press opposed to the Government of that country, naturally concluded that all the rest of the people were Jews. But Captain Holmes' report speaks for itself. He says that these twenty families went there, that they are as good subjects as it is necessary for us to get into that country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on account of the failure of the Government to furnish the return I asked for, that was the only information that was available on this question. My information was exactly the contrary to that given by Captain Holmes to the department and reiterated by the Minister of the Interior. My information was that these men were taken out, not by accident, not hurriedly, but after the fullest inquiry, after a special agent of the department had been sent to Chicago to investigate the question, after he had met a number of them, after a special agent of the department had been sent with the delegates representing these people to conduct them to the North-west, and to see that Yankee land agents did not get hold of them and take them away en route ; that after the delegates returned and reported, a number of people were sent out, 20 heads of families, and the announcement was made that they would really become good, law-abiding citizens. I say in opposition to that view, my information was that those men were not farmers at all, that they had not been engaged in the business of farming, but in the business of peddling, that when they reached Calgary, instead of taking up land they resumed their occupation of peddling, and it has been reported, and I have no doubt it is a fact, that many of them were people of a far from desirable class, and that a considerable number of them shortly after arriving in Calgary were locked up in jail charged with serious offences. This charge was reported by the press in the west, and eventually Mr. Loftus M. Fortier, who is head of this branch of the Interior Department, thought it incumbent on him to write to the newspapers in respect to the very serious attacks made on the Minister in this and other respects, as regards his entire failure to carry out his promise of carrying out a vigorous immigration policy in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I will quote the letter written by the hon. gentleman's officer. It appeared in the 'Free Press,' published in Winnipeg, on 6th January last, and is as follows :

To the Editor of the "Free Press" :

Sir,—I have before me the leading article entitled "The Department of the Interior Down on Us," which appeared in your issue of the 24th December.

I am glad to find that you did not after all mean to go so far as to state, as might be inferred from your article of the 5th December, that the net result of the immigration work of the department, since Mr. Daly became Minister, plus ten times as much similar work done

by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the same period, was the arrival in the North-west of "a few pedlars and similar immigrants."

It seems that in using this phrase you were referring to a "particular incident of immigration," and as that incident has impressed itself so deeply on the editorial mind that the columns of the "Free Press" have never ceased dilating upon it, it would perhaps be well for me to take this opportunity of enlightening your readers as to the facts.

You are mistaken in supposing that the incident in question had any connection with the World's Fair. The foundation of our action in the matter was a letter dated the 17th of March, 1893, from the General Passenger Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Montreal, stating as follows :—

"I understand from our Chicago representative that there are quite a number of Germans in and around Chicago who might, by judicious work of a Government agent, be secured for the Canadian North-west. * * * * Do you care to do anything in the matter ? If so, the agent whom you may appoint might see our Mr. Lee in Chicago, who will give him all the information in his power."

About the same time the department received a communication from a well-known Canadian clergyman, the Rev. T. D. Phillips, formerly mathematical master in the Collegiate Institute here, and who now occupies a prominent position in ecclesiastical circles in Chicago, and, as Mr. Phillips spoke highly of the people in question, and we had, and still have, every reason for attaching weight to any representations made by him, especially when, as in this case, they were so thoroughly coincided in by the Canadian Pacific authorities, the department certainly thought that the matter should at least be looked into, and our chief agent in the United States, Captain Holmes, was sent to Chicago for this express purpose, with instructions to take such action in the premises as he might deem advisable, after consulting with the District Passenger Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Rev. Mr. Phillips, and the people themselves.

Soon after his arrival in Chicago, Captain Holmes reported, in effect, that from his preliminary inquiries he believed there was something in the business ; that he had arranged to meet representatives of the proposed emigrants, and that he would at such meeting recommend them to select three or four delegates who could go and spy out the land and report to the others. He added : "In this connection I respectfully submit that, in view of the activity of the agents of the Great Northern and Northern Pacific railways and their efforts to attract settlers to the lines of their roads, this party (of delegates) should not be allowed to leave excepting under escort, as everything depends on their getting to our country before being loaded up with false statements."

On receipt of this report, Captain Holmes was instructed by telegraph to employ the best man he could get as escort, and, entirely on the recommendation of Mr. Lee, District Passenger Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Chicago, and without even knowing of his relationship to the Minister, he appointed Mr. P. F. Daly for this service, Mr. Lee and other prominent railroad men in Chicago testifying to his capability and general fitness. I might quote letters from Mr. Lee and Captain Holmes detailing the whole circumstances of this appointment, but time and space will not permit.

I may say a word or two with respect to this matter. Mr. P. F. Daly is a brother of the Minister of the Interior, and this clerk in the department seems to find it necessary to make very elaborate explanations to the effect that it was entirely without any knowledge on the part of the immigration agent, Captain Holmes, that Mr. Daly was employed to do this service, he being a brother of the Minister of the Interior. I do not see why the representative of our part of Canada in the Cabinet is not entitled to the same rights so far as having his relatives, brothers, cousins and other connections appointed to office as have Ministers of the Crown coming from other portions of Canada. I cannot understand why Mr. Fortier should think it so important and necessary to draw the attention of the public to the fact that this appointment was made by the Government in entire ignorance of the fact that this gentleman is a brother of the Minister at the head of this department. I must say that, so far as my observation goes, Captain Holmes must be a very poor judge of appearances if he was unable to see the strong personal resemblance between Mr. P. F. Daly and his brother, the Minister ; but, at all events, from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite, there was nothing wrong in that, and I am simply entering my protest against the idea that Manitoba should not have its rights in this respect as in other respects. The letter continues :

The proposed meeting was held, delegates selected, and in due course the delegates went to the North-west under Mr. P. F. Daly's guidance ; they looked over the country, and on their return Captain Holmes again visited Chicago.

I read this letter in full to show the House that this matter received due consideration from the department, that its highly paid agent, Captain Holmes, was instructed to give it his personal attention ; and I do this with a view to ask the House to consider whether the officers of the department engaged in this work are very trustworthy, whether their efforts are likely to furnish an adequate return for the large expenditure paid year after year for their salaries and expenses, when this work, undertaken with plenty of time at their disposal and every means of ascertaing exactly what they were doing, resulted in the very lamentable fiasco which is admitted at the closing portion of the letter. The letter continues :

What then took place, and the justification for our subsequent action, will best be explained by the following extracts from a letter from the Rev. Mr. Phillips :—

"They (the delegates) came back delighted with the country."

Evidently they thought Calgary was a very good place in which to do a little peddling. They were also, no doubt, delighted with the Government, which had been kind enough to give them a fine time, to provide a man for

their guidance and to show them special attention, and to take them up as delegates to spy out this land flowing with milk and honey. The letter continues:

"They reported to me at once. At Captain Holmes' request, adopted with the earnest solicitation of the delegates, I attended a splendid meeting of steady, well-dressed, extremely intelligent men, in Rochester Hall, on the evening of the 7th (May). * * * * I was glad to hear him giving the emigrants the same advice as I had previously tendered them, that is, not to attempt to move, as they had contemplated, four hundred families at once. Accordingly, I have this morning prepared from notes given me by the delegates a list of 83 heads of families, i.e., married men, 58; widower, 1; single men, 24; 48 of them being farmers, the rest—butchers, 2; carpenters, 7; labourers, 6; shoemakers, 4; smiths, 2; teacher, 1; teamster, 1. These with their families, in all about 329 souls, propose to start on or about May the 20th."

Any lingering misgivings the department might still have had about this movement were completely dispelled by the following paragraph in your issue of the 16th of June, 1893, announcing the arrival of the first batch of the people at Winnipeg:—

"IMMIGRATION FROM ILLINOIS."

"A large party of German immigrants from Chicago arrived this morning from the East in charge of Immigration Agent Shoemaker, of Illinois. There are twenty-one adults in the party besides a number of children, and all are in comfortable circumstances. They will remain over here for three or four days before proceeding west. They intend looking over the Red Deer, the Innisfail and the Macleod districts before finally determining where to locate."

Mr. Fortier thinks that the "Free Press" was as much deceived with regard to these people as he admits that the Government and their agents were, but it is only necessary to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in an item of this kind, the reporter of a newspaper, no doubt, gets his information from the agent in charge, and he was simply re-echoing the opinion of that gentleman in putting this in as a matter of local news. Mr. Fortier continues:

This party went out in charge of Mr. Schumacher (not "Shoemaker"), one of our German officers, and included the persons previously conducted by Mr. P. F. Daly as delegates.

I am sure that your impartial readers will admit that up to this point the department had ample justification for its action in the matter, and good cause to feel satisfied with the immediate and prospective results.

I would say that if the department had trustworthy agents, and if it had a system which was likely to prove successful, after what had been done, they could have been assured that these men were as represented, and that they were men likely to be valuable settlers for the country. What does Mr. Fortier proceed to say:

But, to make a long story short, the reports we soon afterwards received from Mr. Schumacher, and from one or two others of our agents, convinced us that the Canadian Pacific authorities,——

I don't see that they ever had so much to do with it except in a very general way.

——the Rev. Dr. Phillips, the department, and even the "Free Press," had been deceived in these people, and that in truth they were not at all a desirable class of settlers, and we thereupon dropped the matter, and took care that no more of them went out under our auspices.

Dropping, at the same time, a very considerable amount of the immigration grant for that particular year. Now, Mr. Speaker, this agent admits, practically, that these settlers were not desirable immigrants, and I have no doubt that the facts are as I have stated them, namely, that when they got out there it was found that they were not farmers, that they were not blacksmiths, that they were not carpenters, and that they were not settlers whom it is desirable to encourage to come to our North-west; but that they were not a lot of Jew pedlars who were accustomed to make their money in that business, and against whom there is no particular objection, possibly, except that they belong to a class that it is not necessary to encourage to come to the country, because we have any number of them already. More than that, it appears that they were not even reputable citizens, because I am credibly informed that a number of them shortly after their arrival in Calgary were incarcerated in the jail for somewhat serious offences. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to get proper and full and correct information with regard to this matter. I have stated to the House that I endeavoured to do so last session, but that when I made statements somewhat similar to those I have been making to-day, and without as full information as I have to-day, I was met with the reply from the Minister of the Interior that I was entirely incorrect, that my statements were without foundation in fact, and that this particular immigration to which I was alluding was a most successful one, and that these men were in possession of homesteads, and had become good settlers in the country. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) allows the motion to pass, I hope he will not take the same course that he did last year, and fail to bring down the information. If he is unwilling that the House and the country should have correct information as to the effect of the money spent by his department in regard to immigration work, then let him adopt the more manly course of opposing the resolution, and there will be an end to it. But, if he allows the motion to pass, I hope he will bring down the information fully and completely. Before leaving the matter, I would like to say with regard to the real facts of the case—that I have been able to find out after very considerable trouble, and

probably never would have found out fully only for the information volunteered by Mr. Fortier, this clerk in the department—I have to say that I believe that this is a fair sample of the result of the vigorous immigration policy which the hon. the Minister of the Interior has introduced. There is really nothing that interests more the people of Manitoba and the Territories than the very serious problem of getting more people into that country. We have a great many matters brought up in this House with regard to our western territories. We have the difficulties of settlers discussed, we have the great railway problem, the question of the high freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which is considered by many of the people out there to be one of the greatest evils that we labour under; we have all these questions up here for discussion, but what, after all, is the real difficulty that underlies all these evils that come to the surface? The real difficulty is that the country is not filled up with immigrants. Preparations have been made there for millions of people, while the truth is that there are only a few hundred thousand inhabitants. Canada at large has spent large sums of money in opening up that country, in surveying it, in providing it with railway communication, in carrying on government there, in furnishing it with postal facilities, and Canada at large is very much interested in the development of that country which can only come through a large increase in its population. A really vigorous immigration policy is what the country demands. The hon. gentleman promised it to us. He has, it is true, spent the money regularly each year, but he has failed utterly and entirely to provide any substantial increase in the population during the years that he has been in office. In fact, since the Department of Immigration was changed from the Agricultural Department to the Department of the Interior, under his control, immigration has steadily fallen off. The money continues to be spent, lectures are sent over to the old country, and Mr. Fortier, in portions of his letter which I did not read, alludes to the advertisements which are inserted in foreign newspapers, and the large sums of money that are paid out for literature, which is scattered over the old countries. Why, there is one gentleman, a resident of the city in Manitoba in which the hon. the Minister of the Interior made his home before he came here, who is in the habit of now and again opposing the Government, and coming out very strongly in his newspaper against the policy of the Government. After that has gone on for a few months, the hon. the Minister of the Interior knows very well what that gentleman wants, and knows how to stop his attacks upon the policy of the Government. He gets him to write an immigration pamphlet, and he also gets him to print it in his printing office, and this pamphlet is sent over at large expense and distributed in different parts of the old country. That is what the hon. gentleman understands as a vigorous immigration policy. I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Speaker, that the large sum, comparatively speaking—not larger than it should be, and, in fact, to my mind, much less than it should be—that is voted by this House each year for the purpose of immigration, is almost entirely wasted. The department seem to have the ability to select such men as Captain Holmes, who are capable of going to Chicago and addressing a meeting of pedlars under the supposition that they are farmers, and taking them to the North-west to grow wheat and raise cattle. This is the kind of expenditure which the hon. gentleman has induged in since he promised to inaugurate a vigorous immigration policy. His policy has been an entire failure; but I hope to see the day when this Parliament and the Government will initiate a policy which will have the result of increasing very largely the population of the North-west. When that is done effectually, then Canada, will begin to be recouped for the sums of money which it has spent in opening up that country, by the taxation which it will receive from the people who settle there. There is nothing wrong with that country. It is admitted by all who have visited it to be a country capable of holding millions, and well calculated to receive the surplus population from other parts of the world. It does not do so. Why not? Will the hon. gentleman explain to us? Does he attempt in his reports to explain why, after all the expenditure he has incurred, his efforts have been so entirely fruitless? He did last session claim that he was to a certain extent successful in bringing a few immigrants to the Edmonton country. I admitted then that he had brought some good immigrants into that portion of the country. So far as the hon. gentleman does successful work, I have no hesitation in giving him credit for it; but I have no hesitation in saying that his vigorous immigration policy, since he has undertaken the work, has been, on the whole, considered fairly, almost an entire failure.

Mr. DALY. I am sure there is not the slightest objection on the part of the Government to bringing down the papers which the hon. gentleman asks for. He complains that certain papers which he moved for last session were not brought down. The motion to which the hon. gentleman refers read as follows:—

Return showing the number of settlers brought into the Yorkton and Saltcoats districts from Dakota, and into the Calgary district from Chicago, and showing in each case the nationality of such settlers, the cost of obtaining them, and

the number that still remain and the occupations those remaining are engaged in.

That is an entirely different motion from the one the hon. gentleman makes to-day. But I may say that I was not aware until this morning that this information he asked for was not brought down, and I will lay it on the Table to-morrow. I regret very much that in the pressure of business the matter was overlooked, because I wish the House to understand that the Government and the Department of the Interior have nothing to hide in this matter. But I think the House has arrived at the conclusion that it is a matter of indifference to the hon. gentleman how many Jews may have been brought to Calgary so long as he has an opportunity to get a fling at me. I am the Jew he is after; I think there is no doubt about that. When the papers are laid before the House, I think the hon. gentleman will see that the Department of Interior did everything they could do to protect the public interest in this matter, and if they were to a certain extent deceived, it was not the fault of the department or their officers. Now, the hon. gentleman would lead the House to suppose that we took into that country no people but Jews, and that they all came from Chicago, because in his opening remarks he said that we were bringing settlers into Calgary, that they were all Jew pedlars and that a great number of them were committed to jail.

Mr. MARTIN. I was referring entirely to this particular episode.

Mr. DALY. According to my information, there has been only one of those men incarcerated in the Calgary jail, and that man was incarcerated at the instance of one of his associates, and it was some time after they arrived. I think that three times in the course of his speech the hon. gentleman repeated that we had brought in Jew pedlars, that they were not farmers, and that most of them were incarcerated in the Calgary jail; and it turns out that only one was incarcerated and for an offence not against any of the old settlers, but against one of his fellow countrymen. Now, what are the facts? It appears that on the 17th of March, 1893, the following letter was received by the Deputy Minister of the Interior from Mr. McNicoll, General Passenger Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal:—

A. M. Burgess, Esq.,
Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I understand from our Chicago representative that there are quite a number of Germans in and around Chicago who might, by judicious work of a Government immigration agent, be secured for the Canadian North-west. The agent, of course, would require to be a German. Do you care to do anything in the matter. If so, the agent whom you may appoint might see our Mr. Lee in Chicago, who will give him all the information in his power. In this connection, of course, some German literature would be necessary.

Yours truly,
D. McNICOLL.

In addition to that, there was transferred to the Department of Interior by Mr. Lowe, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, a letter received by him from the Rev. T. D. Phillips, as follows:—

47th St., Chicago, Feb. 24, 1893.

Dear Mr. Lowe,—I have been approached by some Germans who tell me that they represent a community of four hundred, who think of emigrating to the Canadian North-west early this spring to settle on homestead grants. They are chiefly agriculturists from the neighbourhood of Mensal in Germany. They are certainly not rich, but from what I know of them they are industrious, and would, as far as I can form an opinion, make good settlers. They have artisans enough among them to constitute an independent community. They can muster means enough to carry them to the North-west and probably have a little to start farming with. The one or two of them who have heard through me of the advantages of Canada speak very fair English. Indeed, one of them, my shoemaker, has worked in London. Evidently, they have found, as far as Chicago is concerned, that all is not gold that glitters. They are being pressed by the tremendously increased rents and corresponding increase in the cost of living. It might be worth while to send a German-speaking agent among these people. At any rate, I have promised to do all I can to forward their wise intention of leaving for Canada, and should like copies of any emigration literature published by the department in German. If you will kindly have such sent to me at once, I will see it put where it will do most good. I sincerely hope that beloved Canada will use the forthcoming exposition as her advertising medium. With my regards,

Yours faithfully,
THOS. D. PHILLIPS.

After the receipt of Mr. Phillips' letter, Captain Holmes, the immigration agent in Chicago, wrote as follows:—

I have met a Mr. Leet, who represents some 300 or 400 families, all of whom have been brought up on farms and know the work, but who are now working in Chicago at various trades, such as carpentering, blacksmithing, bricklaying, labouring, and some few at shoemaking and tailoring. They have a meeting called for Sunday afternoon next, at which I am to be present and set forth the advantages of our North-west. They want to send four of their number as delegates at as small a cost as possible, and suggest that the Government should pay their expenses. They are of all religions, and, as I take it, they want a representation of the four leading sects. I told Mr. Leet that, if they selected four men who will pay their fares to Winnipeg and return, via American lines, we will pass them to points west and return to Winnipeg. But this will cost about $36 per delegate, and they cannot afford it. I have told them in reply that if they will pay their railroad fare to Detroit and return, perhaps I can get them free transportation over the Canadian Pacific Railway from that point to Winnipeg and return, but have explained the distance and time required.

The next letter I have is one from Captain Holmes, dated 17th March, 1893. He says :

I had an interview this morning with Mr. J. Francis Lee, Deputy Passenger Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, after talking the matter over with him, he thinks we can take the delegates from here to Edmonton and return for about $20 each. He thinks we can obtain passes to St. Paul and return. Then a ticket from St. Paul to Gretna and return will cost $20. From Gretna to destination and return, pass over Canadian Pacific Railway. On getting this information, I went down to Kenwood and saw the Rev. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Leet, the delegate who has done most of the negotiating so far. I explained the situation, and Mr. Leet thinks his people will consent to raise the amount necessary to carry this out. This party should not be allowed to leave except under escort, as everything depends on their getting to our country before being loaded up with false statements.

Then, the next step that was taken was as follows. Mr. McNicoll writes on the 22nd March :

I have your favours of the 18th and 20th of March regarding the German colony at Chicago. Our Mr. Lee will be in a position to supply transportation for this party from the boundary line forward to Winnipeg, and give a letter of introduction to our Mr. L. A. Hamilton at that point. I shall also instruct him to arrange the very best terms possible between Chicago and the boundary line. From your letter I imagine that he has obtained a promise from some of our Chicago connections. I trust this will be satisfactory.

I read these letters to show the connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway with this matter. As stated by the hon. gentleman, these delegates went under escort of Mr. P. F. Daly to Calgary, and they came back, according to what the hon. gentleman also read, perfectly satisfied. The hon. gentleman said he did not know why Mr. Fortier in his letter dealt so particularly on the fact that Captain Holmes was not aware, at the time of the employment of Mr. P. F. Daly, that he was my brother. I may say that I do not know myself why Mr. Fortier should have laid any particular stress upon that, because I do not think it is any detriment to the gentleman who escorted the party that he should happen to be my brother. As far as I was personally concerned, I was not aware of his employment, and knew nothing of it until the thing was over, but as regards qualifications, no doubt his long experience as a travelling passenger agent upon American lines was what induced Mr. Holmes to employ my brother for that service. These delegates went to Calgary. They came back, and they held a meeting of some seven hundred people, at which Captain Holmes and Mr. Phillips were present. At that meeting, as detailed in a portion of the letter which the hon. gentleman read, the delegates expressed themselves well satisfied with their trip, and the people came to the conclusion that they should leave Chicago for the west. According, also, to the statement made by Captain Holmes, 83 heads of families, in all 329 souls, proposed to start on the 20th May. The hon. gentleman referred to that, and said that although 329 souls were expected to leave, only 21 adults arrived at Winnipeg. The simple reason, it appears, was that at this meeting, Captain Holmes and Mr. Phillips came to the conclusion, after having received instructions from the department to be very careful in their selection, to select twenty-one families who were ready to go. These people were not, as the hon. gentleman says, pedlars. The majority of them were men who had farmed in Dakota and in the old country, as will be shown by the correspondence brought down. These people went up there, and over twenty adults were in the party. As stated by the hon. gentleman, in reading from the Winnipeg "Free Press," there was nothing to indicate, so far as outward appearances went, that these people were not, all of them, what they represented themselves to be. They went to Calgary and got an insane idea into their head that they should go on to Fort Macleod. But they were persuaded not to go there, because, in order to farm there successfully they would have to go into irrigation, which would be very expensive. They were taken to Witaskiwin, where there are eight heads of families living on their farms, I am advised, and the rest are scattered about on different portions of the territory. As stated by the Winnipeg "Free Press," this has simply been an incident of immigration. It is extraordinary to me that after two and a half years of my administration of the department, neither the Winnipeg "Free Press," which seems to have kept this sweet morsel to turn the editorial tongue over for the past two years, nor the other Grit papers in the country, nor the hon. gentleman, are able to point out any other mistakes or grievous injury I have done except in this matter of having been deceived by these Chicago people. Now, Sir, I presume in every man's business and in every undertaking mistakes are made. The mistake made here was not made advisedly, it was not done through any desire not to do what was right. But if, after the representations which were made by Mr. Phillips and by Mr. Lee, the District Passenger Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other gentlemen who were upon the ground, the department had not taken the steps it did and had made no efforts to secure these people, possibly we would have been held blameable by the hon. gentleman and thers for our remissness. But the hon. gentleman is not satisfied to refer to that question alone ; but he takes pleasure in saying that ever since I took charge of the department, immigration prospects have fallen off and immigration has declined, and that I have

not carried out the vigorous immigration policy that I foreshadowed. Of course the hon. gentleman would not be charitable enough to think for a moment—or, at all events to say—that my administration of the Department of the Interior began about the same time as the depression which has existed the world over ever since. Immigration has declined to every British colony, it has declined to the United States; but it has declined in a less ratio to Canada than to South Africa or to any other British colony. And I think that, considering the amount of money at the disposal of the department, the work done during the last two years and a half is, possibly all that could have been done under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman admitted that, so far as the immigration from the United States is concerned, it is quite acceptable to him. I can only say that the work we did in the United States a year ago and two years ago has borne fruit to a remarkable extent; that the number of people going into the North-west from the United States is very large and is composed mainly of a very fine class—British born, or Germans, or Norwegians, three of the best classes of people that can be brought into any country. The hon. gentleman forgets also, when he speaks of the work of the department and its agents this year and last year, that it takes some time before we can see results from the work that is done. Particularly is this true of the old country, where people are slow to move. Owing to the depressed condition of trade in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, it is a moral impossibility at this moment to get people in large numbers to make up their minds to leave their present homes. But I am glad to say that the reports of the officers of the department at Halifax and Quebec, who have had large experience, and their statements to me personally, lead me to believe that the old country immigration we have had last year and up to this time this year, though not as large as in times past, is made up of a better class than we have had heretofore. Now the hon. gentleman, I think, would not have done wrong, while speaking on the subject of a vigorous immigration policy, to refer to what has been done by the provincial government of Manitoba, of which he was formerly a member. He contends that that country needs population, and that what this Government should do is to hold out its right hand to people coming in and to do everything possible to bring them here. But what has Mr. Greenway's Government done, and what is it doing at the present time? It is doing nothing, Mr. Greenway has withdrawn his officers from Great Britain and his agents from the older parts of Canada, and he is absolutely sitting in his office and doing nothing, so far as concerns the directing of immigration into that country. I am glad to say that I have it from the mouths and under the hands of Mr. Greenway's colleagues, that, so far as the immigration policy of this Government is concerned, it is not what the hon. gentleman has described. Not long ago we had a delegation here composed of Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General, and Mr. McMillan, the Treasurer. They came down here to meet the Minister of Finance and arrange for the increased per capita grant to the province. The representation made by these gentlemen to the Finance Minister was that the population of Manitoba, up to 31st December, 1894, was 207,000. My recollection is that, according to the census of 1891 the population was but 162,000—that is an increase of about 45,000 in three years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I ask the hon. gentleman if they paid on this estimate?

Mr. DALY. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. DALY. I will explain to the hon. gentleman. The grant was not made on that estimate because the calculation made by the provincial representatives was on the calendar year, and the province was only entitled to be paid according to the estimate for the fiscal year. Deducting from their figures the increase for six months, the number left, if I remember well, was 202,000. Then a doubt arose as to whether their provincial statistics of the natural increase were correct, and a compromise was made as between the Finance Minister and the delegates which fixed the figure at 190,000. But there was no doubt in the minds of Mr. Sifton and Mr. McMillan, that the population of Manitoba, according to the figures they brought down, was 207,000; and I do not think the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) will be disappointed—at least I hope not—when the quinquennial census is taken, as it will be next year. Here is an indication that we have had a large increase of population since 1891, according to the figures, not of the Department of the Interior or of the Government of Canada, but according to the figures given to the Finance Minister by the Attorney General and Treasurer of Manitoba. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman complains that we are not getting the worth of our money. I forgot to say that he would give the House to understand that the Government were put to large expense in transporting from Chicago these people of whom he speaks. The total cost, so far as I can ascertain, was not more than $250. The hon. gentleman will see that the only expense in the matter was the living expenses of the agents and of these delegates. So far as the other expenses were concerned, the Government did not meet them; these peo-

ple paid their own way or got free transportation from the railway. Now the hon. gentleman, in order to get a fling at me, said that there was a gentleman in Brandon, where I live, who was running a newspaper, who used to get away from his party allegiance occasionally, and that the only way I could bring him round was to give him the opportunity of writing an immigration pamphlet which he also printed. Since I came into the department, Mr. Cliffe, proprietor of the Brandon "Mail," to whom, no doubt, the hon. gentleman refers, has never received a five cent piece from the department for printing or writing any pamphlet——

Mr. MARTIN. Or in any other way?

Mr. DALY. No, nor in any other way since I have been at the head of the department. So the hon. gentleman's bubble is pricked and exploded. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I am not placed in the position of himself and the Greenway Government. They gave work to a Brandon Grit editor to write and publish a pamphlet, and it was so badly written and printed that it could not be distributed. Now, comparison is a good thing, I think, Mr. Speaker. This hon gentleman has tried to establish in the remarks he has made, that the immigration policy of this Government has been a failure. Now let us compare the regime of Mr. Mackenzie with the present, and the work that was done then with the work that is being done now. Let us ascertain what was done by Mr. Letellier, the Minister of Agriculture who presided over the Department of Immigration from 1873 to 1875, and let us ascertain from the comparison whether this Government is doing good or poor work. I maintain it is doing much better work than was done during the Mackenzie regime. Now in 1875, which was Mr. Letellier's third year in office as Minister of Agriculture and Immigration, he had to deplore a steady falling off in immigration since he assumed office. He stated in his report for that year that the number or ordinary settlers, that is immigrants from beyond sea, was less in 1875 than in any year within the period of ten years with respect to which he gave information; but in spite of that, the special Mennonite immigration in 1875 numbered 3,285 souls. Now, what are the figures? In 1873 there were 39,560 immigrants; in 1874 26,080. In 1875 they fell to 16,932, a decrease of 34·3. From 1873 to 1875 the decrease was 54·20. Now during those years when Mr. Letellier only got 39,560 he spent $234,000; when he got 26,080, in 1874, he spent $251,000. In 1875, when his immigration fell down to 16,932, he spent $296,692. In addition to this the Parliament of Canada made a grant of $70,000 for immigration to the Maritime Provinces in that year. Now, in recent years the appropriation has only been about $200,000 a year, and with that $200,000, in 1892, we got 27,810 immigrants; in 1893, 29,455; in 1894, 20,080; with an expenditure of $200,000 per annum, as against a total expenditure in three years by Mr. Letellier of $851,814.59. Now, in 1875, under Mr. Mackenzie's Minister of Agriculture and Immigration—when they were not bringing Jew pedlars into Calgary, because people could not get into that country owing to the vigorous railway policy of the Government—they brought 1,631 indigent immigrants who were assisted into Montreal by the department at an expense of $5,789.91, showing, as far as the policy of this Government compared with the policy of the Mackenzie Government is concerned, that with less money we have had greater results; and if the results have not been as satisfactory as I am sure I would like, and as the other members of the Government would like, and the people would like in this respect, it is not the fault of the administration of the department, it is not the fault of the departmental agents. We are in the same condition as are people in other countries looking for immigrants, and as I said before, the immigration into the United States has declined in a greater ratio than it has into Canada. In conclusion, I have only to say that the hon. gentleman can have all the information he asks for at the earliest possible moment, so that the House will be in full possession of all the facts pertaining to this question of Jew pedlars as the hon. gentleman terms them, taken from Chicago to Calgary. I hope that the few contradictions I have given to some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman will convince him that he has not stirred up such a mare's nest as he thought he would do when he placed this notice on the paper.

Mr. MARTIN. I have only a word to say in regard to what the hon. gentleman has brought forward, and I would not have anything more to say if he had not introduced considerable new matter into the discussion. As to the question that I brought before the House, I do not know that the hon. gentleman has made any statement at all inconsistent with those that I made. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why it was that, knowing all these things, being fully conversant with all these matters, being fully aware that my statements of last year were true and correct, that the department had been deceived, and that the money, $250, or whatever it may have been, had been entirely wasted and thrown away, when he stood up in his place and gave a flat contradiction to everything I had to say one year ago, or thereabouts, with regard to this matter—I ask him why it was that he did not think it well to make the admissions then that he has made to-day, namely, that the department had been mistaken, and why he did not throw himself then upon this House, as he has done to-day, and ask to be forgiven for that particular mistake. I think the hon. gentleman

would do well, when he makes a mistake, to admit it. I have to agree with him that it is not always possible to be correct, but it is to be remembered that a year ago the hon. gentleman came boldly before this House and denied all these statements and charged me with making false and exaggerated statements for the purpose of bringing contempt upon his department, and contempt upon him personally, and now he comes here, a year after when I had obtained an admission from an officer in his department which he could not go back upon, and admits that I was correct, and says that after all it was not a very bad mistake, it was not so bad as it might have been. There is something a little peculiar about this pamphlet. As I say, this was only one of several letters which Mr. Fortier, the head of this department, wrote to the "Free Press," and the "Free Press" published a number of editorials dealing with this matter. The hon. gentleman is possessed, according to general repute, of an organ of his own in the city of Winnipeg, called the "Nor-Wester." Incidentally it may be mentioned that the sheriff sold it out the day before yesterday. This newspaper published in pamphlet form the correspondence between Mr. Fortier and the "Free Press," and the "Free Press" editorials, headed as follows: "Hon. Mr. Daly's efforts to promote immigration—Aspersions of the Winnipeg "Free Press" and answers from an officer of the Department of Interior at Ottawa." This was published for general circulation, but for some reason or another, whether at the hon. gentleman's request I do not know, a request came from some quarter to suppress it, but a copy was sent to me with the following notice upon it: "By request this pamphlet has been withdrawn from general circulation." I admire the sagacity of the hon. gentleman himself, or of some wise friend of his, who induced his overzealous friends in Winnipeg to withdraw from general circulation a pamphlet containing these letters, containing, according to his own admissions to-day an exposure of the way in which the department, through its own officials, had allowed themselves to be swindled and misled. Now, the hon. gentleman has made some references to the policy of the local government in discontinuing their expenditure for immigration purposes. Well, I do not know that this is the place for discussing the policy of the local government. On a number of occasions I have protested against the hon. gentleman's continual desire to discuss the local politics of Manitoba in this House. I have said before, and I repeat it, that I do not consider that this House is much concerned with the local affairs of Manitoba, as to whether its local government is good or bad, or whether my actions when in the local government were good or bad. I am at all times prepared to discuss those matters, but I do not think the hon. gentleman improves his position by bringing them forward here. Since, however, he has referred to them, I will say that the local government has discontinued any expenditure for immigration purposes because they have come to the conclusion that as long as the present policy of the Dominion Government towards that country is continued, it is entirely hopeless to endeavour to get any immigrants into that country. They have come to the conclusion, from actual experience, that money spent by the Dominion Government in endeavouring to induce people to go to Manitoba and the Territories has been absolutely thrown away, because those people are not content with the circumstances in which they find themselves placed. They are entirely discontented with the tariff and also with the monopoly which hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed on them in connection with railway freight rates; and under these circumstances, I think the local government acted wisely, they not having much money to expend owing to their means being very limited, in making no further expenditure for immigration purposes at the present time. However, when the time comes, as we hope it will soon, when the tariff policy of the country is changed, when the position of settlers in the Northwest is made more favourable, and they will be able to look forward to an era of prosperity on account of a change of policy in the fiscal affairs as well as the general administration of Canada, then, no doubt, the local government of Manitoba will undertake to again carry out the immigration policy which they pursued for a number of years past. The hon. gentleman has endeavoured to argue that he is entitled to credit because it has been represented here by the local Ministers of Manitoba that the population of that province has considerably increased during the two years and a half following the census of 1891. The hon. gentleman is entitled to no credit whatever for that fact, because, while it is true the population has moderately increased, as is claimed by the local Ministers, that increase is not due in any appreciable extent to immigration from the old countries of Europe, but to immigration from Ontario, Quebec and other provinces of the Dominion, and I do not imagine the hon. Minister will undertake to claim that any expenditure on his part for immigration purposes has been devoted to removing people from one part of Canada and planting them in another. That, however, is where the increase has come from, so far as Manitoba is concerned, and also, of course, from the natural increase of population. The hon. Minister made some reference to the Mackenzie Government, and he compared his administration of immigration affairs with the administration by that

government. It has been so often shown that the immigration registered at the Atlantic ports afforded no index whatever to the number of immigrants settled in Canada, that it is utterly useless to make any comments on that point. The hon. gentleman is himself well aware that the number of immigrants reported as arriving at the ports of Halifax, Quebec and Montreal, is no index whatever as to the number settled in Manitoba and the North-west, and in fact a very large proportion of those immigrants are brought there through the efforts of the Canadian Pacific Railway to obtain a fair share of the transcontinental travel for their railway. It is well known that train load after train load, landing during the years since the hon. gentleman has assumed control of the Immigration Department, have passed over the Canadian Pacific Railway and settled in Dakota, Oregon and California, and generally upon the Pacific coast. To-day the city of Winnipeg has a claim pending before the Immigration Department which illustrates in some degree this point, and when it was announced a short time ago that a general election was about to take place, we had strong hopes that the claim would be paid, as the hon. Minister has promised to pay it time and again.

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. MARTIN. The people of Winnipeg certainly have that understanding—they understand that the Government will pay the account. This incident, I say, illustrates my contention. An immigrant train arrived at Winnipeg containing a large number of immigrants who were found to have among them several cases of small-pox. The whole batch of passengers were taken out, housed on the prairie and isolated for the necessary time in order that all fear of contagion might be removed. This was done at the expense of the city of Winnipeg, thousands of dollars being so expended, and this expense was brought upon the city by the action, jointly, of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, through the Immigration Department, and under these circumstances, the claim is one which the Government very properly has been asked to meet. It turns out that every one of the immigrants affected with small-pox, and thus kept at large expense by the city of Winnipeg, was ticketed to some point outside of Canada, that, in fact, those immigrants were Dakota settlers, who had been brought in, I cannot say by the Government, but they were included in the return which the hon. gentleman has been reading of arrivals at our Atlantic ports, but who were booked through to Dakota and other Western States. So I do not consider that any comparison which the hon. gentleman may see fit to make between the administration of the Immigration Department by the Mackenzie Government and by himself has any bearing on the question. If the hon. gentleman will show what proportion of the immigrants who landed at our Atlantic ports actually settle in Canada, and what portion simply pass through owing to the activity of the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway in securing a share of the transportation from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we shall then have some means of making a comparison.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has greatly laboured to point out that there was some great difference between the explanation given between the Minister of the Interior and the explanation given last session. If the hon. gentleman will refer to "Hansard," he will see that both explanations are precisely on the same line, and the only difference is that one is an explanation with a little fuller information, as one might naturally expect after time was afforded to obtain fuller knowledge on this subject. In regard to the point frequently made about the immigration to the North-west and to Canada generally, I should like to point out that in the United States they have precisely the same difficulty to face that we have, a difficulty that has frequently puzzled, and indeed excited the political indignation of the hon. member for South Oxford. It is this: that when we come to calculate the immigrants who have come in and the natural increase of population, we are ready to ask, where have the people gone? The United States immigration, according to their returns, for the decennium, was 5,571,643. The census showed a total population of 62,622,250. This is a ratio of 24·80 per cent increase, including immigration. Mr. F. A. Walker, the superintendent of the United States census of 1870-1880, and one of the recognized statisticians of the United States, has shown that the natural increment of that country ought to have been during the ten years stated, 18,246,673, and when the immigration is added, the total addition should be 23,818,286. The actual figures were only 12,466,467, leaving 11,351,810 lost or not accounted for. So that Uncle Sam has precisely the same problem before him, to account for a loss of population, as we have in Canada. In Canada we say when we think some millions should have been here who are not here, that they have gone to the United States; but as we have lost a large number of persons, or we suppose we have lost them, and think they have gone to the United States, the eleven millions the United States have lost in ten years have certainly not come to Canada. Where have they gone? It may turn out that our theory of natural increase, which is often made so much of, has really no scientific basis at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know whether I correctly heard what the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr.

Davin) stated, but if his statement be correct, that statisticians estimate the natural increase of the United States in ten years, from 1880 to 1890, at eighteen millions, I beg to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the attention of the House to the fact that that would be an increase very considerably more than 3 per cent per annum, a rate I never heard given by any man who deserved to be called a statistician or who possessed any information on the subject worth noticing. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggests, that is an increase which may take place in a rabbit warren, but hardly, I think, in a civilized community. However, I am not concerned with the gentleman's calculations. I have, however, Mr. Speaker, a word or two to say in regard to a statement made by the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman gave us the estimated number of immigrants who had arrived under his regime, which he compared with the number of immigrants who were stated to have come into Canada under the Mackenzie Administration. Now, we have only one way of ascertaining the results likely to accrue from the administration of the hon. gentleman, and that is by comparing the results which are likely to accrue with those which we know to have accrued during the ten years from 1881 to 1891. During that decade, at a cost of many millions of dollars to the people of Canada, the department over which the hon. gentleman presides stated to this House and to the country, not once, but ten times over, that they had imported intending settlers into Canada to the number of 886,000 souls. When the census returns were taken, we found that of these 886,000 only 150,000 answered to the count; so that for every six immigrants reported by that department only one materialized. I propose to apply to the hon. gentleman's statement today a comparison between it and the statements of the department that he presides over in these ten years, and I very much fear, although I should be glad to be disappointed, that the results will be precisely the same, and that for every six immigrants claimed by the present Minister of the Interior, but one will materialize.

Mr. DALY. I wish to answer one remark made by the hon. gentleman, as I do not wish to be misunderstood. The hon. gentleman asked me as to whether I had agreed to pay the bill of the city of Winnipeg, and I replied that I had not. I do not want to be understood that I refused to pay the amount that was in dispute as between the city and the Government, and its liability, and without prejudice, it may be possible that some arrangement can be made with the city of Winnipeg. But the Government, or the department, does not hold itself liable in any way whatever.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MARTIN. I suppose the settlement depends upon the date of the elections.

Mr. DALY. Not at all. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. CHARLTON. One word with regard to the census statement made by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He tells the House that the increase in the United States in the last decade was 24·80 per cent, and that the immigration was in round numbers 5,000,000, and he draws a comparison between the condition of things in the United States and the condition of things here, favourable in his estimation, to Canada. If the immigration amounted to 5,000,000 in the United States, it represents an increase of 10 per cent, and, deducting that increase from the total increase of, in round numbers, 25 per cent, it left a natural increase in the United States of 15 per cent. If we compare that with our own record for the decade ending in 1891, I think we will hardly have as favourable a showing. We received, according to our own statistics, in that decade, 886,000 immigrants, amounting to an increase of 18 per cent upon the population with which we commenced in the year 1881. We had, according to our census returns, a total increase of 11·66 per cent, or we lacked 6 per cent of having, in our total increase, as great an increase as our immigration returns show that we derived from immigration. We should have had an increase of 18 per cent from immigration, and, with a natural increase equal to that of the United States, we should have 15 per cent more, and the increase from immigration and natural increase in Canada, upon exactly the same basis as the United States, should have been 33 per cent, whereas it was only 11·66 per cent. Whatever may be said of the condition of affairs in the United States, certainly the showing, so far as we ourselves are concerned, is a most unsatisfactory one, if we did receive that number of immigrants. If we have, in addition to that, a natural increase of population of 2 per cent a year, our increase of population should have been nearly or quite 1,800,000 in ten years, and this number would fall considerably short of a natural increase of 2 per cent per annum added to an immigration of 886,000, in place of this we had a meagre increase of 11·66 per cent of 508,000 souls; being over a million and a quarter short of what it should have been if our immigration statistics were correct. The less that is said about the condition of affairs in Canada, and the fewer comparisons that are made with other countries as regards increase of population the better for ourselves. We certainly need no better evidence that the condition of affairs in this country is not satisfactory than the evidence furnished by our census; and if we have received

even one-fourth of the number of immigrants that are stated, and we cannot reach a total increase of 12 per cent, something is radically wrong, and patriotic Canadians should set themselves about the task of ascertaining what the trouble is, and of providing a remedy.

Motion agreed to.

TARIFF STATEMENTS.

Mr. AMYOT moved for :

Statement showing : 1. The several items on which duties have been totally abolished under the Canadian tariff, from 1879 up to date ; 2. The date of such abolition ; 3. The amount of duties so abolished for each item ; 4. The total amount of duties which would have been paid into the public treasury had the duties been maintained, taking as a basis the quantities imported each year since the abolition of such duties.

Mr. EDGAR. I was going to suggest an amendment which I have no doubt the hon. mover of the resolution would accept, as it would make the return much more complete. If he would insert, that the several items upon which duties have been increased also should be added, then we could get more information.

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman will give me notice of his motion, I will give him an answer.

Mr. WALLACE. It will not be possible to furnish all the information asked by the hon. member (Mr. Amyot). For instance, item 4 of the resolution says :

The total amount of duties which would have been paid into the public treasury had the duties been maintained, taking as a basis the quantities imported each year since the abolition of such duties.

In the revision of the tariff last year, we have made in many cases an entirely different classification, so that it would not be possible to give all the information asked for here, but we will be glad to supply the hon. gentleman with all the information that we can.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) ought to inquire what is the amount of the deficit that would have existed at the present time if the rate of duties remained as they were in 1878.

Mr. AMYOT. My motion is very simple, and I do not know why the members of the Opposition take such an interest in it. I only want the information for myself, and then, perhaps, for the country.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. AMYOT moved for :

Comparative statement showing, side by side, the Canadian tariffs : (1.) Of 1868—31 Victoria, chap. 44 ; (2.) Of 1874—37 Victoria, chap. 6 ; (3.) Of 1879—42 Victoria, chap. 15 ; (4.) Of 1894—57 Victoria, chap. 33. The said statement to show in separate columns the duties under each tariff, and the items admitted free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this is a very fair motion, and the information the hon. gentleman wants will be of use. But I think there should be a column reducing the ad valorem and specific duties to an ad valorem basis, so that the comparison might be intelligibly made. It would save a good deal of trouble and inconvenience.

Mr. FOSTER. On the basis of the prices ruling at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the basis, if you like, of the prices ruling at the time and now.

Mr. FOSTER. There would be a good deal of work in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There would be some work, but it would be of use.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. AMYOT moved for :

Statement showing :—1. The several items on which the duties have been reduced, by the Canadian tariff, from 1879 up to this date ; 2. The date of the reduction ; 3. The amount of the reduction on each item ; 4. The total amount of the duties which would have been paid into the public treasury if such reduction had not been made, taking as a basis the quantities imported each year since the reduction of such duties.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to know how the Minister would interpret the third clause here—whether he would mean, as I suppose my hon. friend means, the amount of duties collected, or the percentage of reduction. It seems to me that we ought to have the total amount of reduction, and if so, I do not see the necessity of the fourth paragraph, because we could easily ascertain what it calls for from the third.

Mr. WALLACE. I would also suggest that the amount of the reduction on the abolition of duties be included.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing in detail all moneys paid or allowances made to Hayter Reed from 30th June, 1879, to 30th June, 1894, for salary, rents of houses, offices or other buildings or quarters in Manitoba or the North-west Territories ; with copies of correspondence relating thereto, whether the said Hayter Reed was proprietor of such building or buildings, and if not, who was ?

The authority under which such payments or allowances were made.

All allowances made to or received by the said Hayter Reed from the Dominion Government from 30th June, 1879, to 30th June, 1894, in any way for board, fuel, light, rations, forage for horses, or servants and wages when absent from his headquarters, and when not absent, separately.

The authority under which such allowances were made; the authority, if any, given to the said Hayter Reed to use himself, or allow to be used by others, horses, carriages, cattle, agricultural implements, seed oats or other grains or other things, the property of the Dominion of Canada, or to exact service from employees of the Indian Department for his benefit or convenience; and copies of all correspondence and instructions given to the said Hayter Reed in connection therewith.—(Mr. McMullen.)

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. As the next motion on the paper will probably cause a little discussion, and as it seems unnecessary for us to come back to-night for the business we have to do, I would ask the hon. gentleman to postpone it until to-morrow, and I would move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a matter which I wish to reach at as early a day as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will reach it to-morrow without doubt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Finance remembers that he expected to give us the Estimates to-day. I suppose they are not ready.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not quite ready.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will they be ready to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. It may be to-morrow, or it may not be until Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the hon. gentleman give us any idea when he will deliver his Budget speech? A number of gentlemen in the country who wish to hear it would like to know.

Mr. FOSTER. Barring accidents and the like, I hope to be able to make the Budget speech not later than Friday of next week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A statement was made to-day that a number of returns ordered by the House last session had not been brought down. As a matter of practice, I think the Government ought to lay on the Table of the House all the returns which were ordered during the previous session, and which have not been brought down, or they ought to submit a statement specifying what orders have not been complied with. An order of this House is a serious matter, and the Government cannot surely intend to disregard it. I think there are a good many orders that have not been brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some of two years' standing.

Mr. FOSTER. If some are of two years' standing, it might not be necessary to bring them down now.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. WALLACE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House, that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of

Thomas McGreevy, Esq., for the Electoral District of Quebec West.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented the first report of the Official Report of the Debates of the House, as follows:—

The Committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. LAURIER. The House, I think, will expect the hon. gentleman to give some explanation of the reason for the proposed change. Five seems to be a very small number to constitute a quorum.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is the same number as last year. We find it very difficult to obtain a quorum of eight members, and this is simply following the practice of former years. I may add that a sub-committee has been appointed to take into consideration complaints made with respect to delay in publishing the reports during the past sessions and former sessions, with a view, if possible, of remedying any defect.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 22) to amend the Dominion Notes Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to remedy an omission which took place somewhere between the passing of the resolution and the consummation of the Bill. The resolution as it passed this House contained both clauses of what was to be the Act, but the second clause was subsequently omitted, which made it necessary that the Government should keep for every issue over $20,000,000, dollar for dollar in gold. The Finance Department have lived up to the spirit of the Act during the year, and this Bill is to make the necessary amendment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. BRYSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 23) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the object of this Bill?

Mr. BRYSON. This Bill is one to which reference was made a few days ago, and is framed with a view to secure payment to employees on lines of railway. The Bill will be printed in a few days and distributed. No doubt it will meet with opposition from certain railway companies, but there is no desire on the part of the promoter of the Bill to arouse any objection in that respect. The Bill is purely and simply to meet the special wants and requirements of cases that have come before us with respect to certain railway lines that have been operated during several months without payment being made to the employees.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How does the hon. gentleman propose to remedy the difficulty; what is his proposition, or the substance of it?

Mr. BRYSON. It is to amend the Railway Act, and it is provided that after a railroad has been operated for a certain number of days, or say three months, without payment being made to the men, the railway committee shall have power to appoint a receiver to take over the road and see the men are paid. That is the proposition.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 24) respecting union labels, trade marks, terms, designs, devices or forms of advertisement, and to amend the Criminal Code of 1892.

Mr. LAURIER. Explain the Bill.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The object of the Bill might be shortly stated in this way. Under the Trades Mark and Designs Act, business firms or persons engaged in business have a right to secure for their own use certain marks by which they will designate their merchandise. The Trades and Labour Unions have found that it will be to their advantage to have designs or marks of such a kind as would indicate merchandise manufactured by members of the union. It is not considered that this will come within the scope of the present Act, and the object of the Bill I have introduced is to practically extend the Trades Mark and Designs Act, so as to include this class of designs and trades marks. The reference in the title to the Criminal Code of 1892, is to extend the provisions of the Criminal Code of 1892, so far as they relate to the Trades Mark and Designs Act to the proposed Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to invite the attention of the leader of the House for a moment to an important telegram which appears in to-day's papers with respect to the colony of Newfoundland. A number of newspapers have telegrams upon the subject, but the Montreal "Gazette" has one which professes to be more official than the rest, and with the permission of the House I will read the telegram, and ask the hon. leader a question or two upon it. The following is the telegram:

> St. John's, Nfld., April 25.—The Legislature met to-day. Hon. Mr. Bond, in the Legislative Council, and Hon. Mr. Morris, in the House of Assembly, made the following official announcement:—
>
> "The delegates appointed by the Government of this colony to proceed to Ottawa to discuss the terms of union between this colony and the Canadian Dominion, have reported to the Government that the terms handed in by them as a counter proposal to those admitted by the subcommittee of the Privy Council of Canada are still under the consideration of the Government of the Dominion, and they will, therefore, not be in a position to furnish a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings of conference until further information has been received.
>
> "In order that ample time may be afforded for receiving a final answer from the Government of the Dominion of Canada, it is recommended that the Legislature be adjourned for a fortnight from this date."

That is the nature of the official announcement, and then follows a telegraphic despatch which is not reported to be official, and which says:

> It is reported that two of the terms proposed by the Newfoundland delegates are reserved for further consideration by the Dominion Government, one of them being very important. All the other terms were arranged satisfactorily.

I would ask the leader of the House, in view of the importance of this subject, and the desirability of any terms which may be agreed upon being submitted at an early date to the electorate, whether he would take the House into his confidence now and inform us, first, what terms have been already agreed to; second, what are the points upon which the Government of Newfoundland and the Dominion Government are at variance; third, what are the proposals of the Dominion Government and the counter proposals of the Newfoundland delegates on these disputed points; and fourth, whether a final answer, as referred to in the despatch, has been sent by the Dominion Government to the Newfoundland Government on the two disputed points. I do not propose

to enlarge upon the importance of the question now, but I hope the hon. gentleman will give us the fullest information he can upon these questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Davies), when he thinks over it for a moment, will not press his questions to an answer. He has asked four questions, and it would be impossible for me to answer them without bringing down negotiations which are not yet quite concluded. It would not tend towards the successful outcome of the negotiations if I were to answer the hon. gentleman's questions categorically, as he has asked them. The Government will bring down and lay before the House, when the negotiations are fully completed, all the information, but at the present time, I should not feel it at all right, in justice to what we all wish, namely, the successful outcome of the negotiations, that I should answer the hon. gentleman's questions, and I hope he will not press them further.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if he will not bring down the papers, whether he will answer my last question as to whether a final answer has been sent by this Government to Newfoundland on these two questions.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I might answer that by saying that nothing can be said to be final at the present time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My point is: Whether this Government has since the delegates left here forwarded to the Newfoundland Government their answer on questions which, when the delegates were here, were the subject-matter of discussion but not decided upon.

Mr. FOSTER. I can answer that in the negative.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point which perhaps the hon. gentleman might give us some information about. Have any negotiations been going on, or are negotiations going on at present with the Imperial authorities with respect to the settlement of what is known as the French shore question.

Mr. FOSTER. No negotiations are going on directly between the Dominion Government and the Home Government. These negotiations have for some time been conducted, and are still being conducted I suppose, by the Newfoundland Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that although he does not feel prepared to submit the papers to-day, he gives an assurance to Parliament that whatever final answer is sent to Newfoundland will be communicated to this Parliament at a period, at any rate as early as the Newfoundland Legislature can get it? It seems to me ridiculous that delegates returning from here to Newfoundland should communicate to their people the terms which are in dispute and the ultimate settlement of these matters, and that we are only to know of it here by telegrams from Newfoundland.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that the Parliament of Canada will be taken into the confidence of the Government just as soon as the legislature of Newfoundland is taken into the confidence of the government there.

THEFTS FROM THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FAUVEL (for Mr. Choquette) asked, Whether the Government have held an inquiry with a view to ascertaining the amount of the thefts committed within the last few years in the cars and sheds of the Intercolonial Railway at the station at Rivière du Loup; if so, what has been the result? 2. Have the Government been informed that the man, Germain Dufour, who was sent to prison last year for stealing goods from the cars and railway sheds at the said station, had accomplices; and if so, is it their intention to prosecute such accomplices? 3. Has an inquiry been held in relation to the aforesaid thefts, and if so, what witnesses were heard? Who was entrusted with the inquiry, and what was the result?

Mr. HAGGART. No formal inquiry was held and no witnesses were examined with a view to ascertaining the amount of thefts committed within the last few years in the cars and sheds of the Intercolonial Railway at the station at Rivière du Loup. The railway officials who looked into the matter last June obtained sufficient information to warrant the arrest and prosecution of the man Germain Dufour, and Léon Dubé was arrested as an accomplice. Dufour was convicted, but Dubé was discharged by the court. I have no information in regard to any other accomplices, but if sufficient reliable information is obtained against any one, they will be prosecuted. Claims for freight missing at Rivière du Loup to the amount of $375 were paid, and it is thought this freight was stolen.

EXTRA WORK ON THE SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL.

Mr. FAUVEL (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. What amount has been paid by the Government to the contractors for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal for extra work? 2. Have the contractors now claims pending against the Government for extra work? If so, what is the amount, and is it the intention of the Government to pay them?

Mr. HAGGART. No amount has been granted to the contractors of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal for extra work. The contractors have presented no claims against the Government for extra work, but they have intimated that they intend to present a claim for extras.

ST. JOHN RIVER FISHING REGULATIONS.

Mr. COLTER asked, 1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to change the fishing regulations in the St. John River, New Brunswick ? 2. Has the Government, or any member of the Government, given any pledge to have the fishing regulations changed in that river ? 3. At what point in the St. John River is the tidal boundary fixed by such regulations ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government contemplates changing the fishery regulations in the St. John River, N.B. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has signified his intention of having the fishery regulations changed in that river. The fishery regulations do not fix the tidal boundary in the St. John River, but under the authority conferred upon him by section 8, subsection 6 of the Fisheries Act, Chap. 95 Revised Statutes, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has by formal notice published in the "Canada Gazette" defined the tidal boundary for salmon net fishing within the estuary of St. John River at a line drawn from Crock's Point or Lunt's Ferry, to the opposite shore.

CARAQUET RAILWAY.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What were the gross earnings and expenditure respectively of the Caraquet Railway for the year ending 30th June, 1894 ?

Mr. HAGGART. The gross earnings of the Caraquet Railway for the year ended 30th June, 1894, were $18,083.09. The gross expenditure for the same period was $18,289.68, a loss of $206.59.

THE SUPERANNUATION LIST.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing : 1. The names of all superannuated officers on the superannuated list on the first day of January, 1895. 2. The date of their appointment as permanent civil servants. 3. The amount of salary at time of appointment. 4. The number of years in the service. 5. The amount of salary at time of superannuation. 6. The date of their superannuation and number of years added to time of service, if any. 7. The amount of annual retiring allowance granted. 8. The gross amount paid into the fund by each retired officer on the list on the 1st of January, 1895. 9. The gross amount drawn by each superannuated officer on the superannuated list up to the 1st of January, 1895. 10. The age of each superannuated officer on the list on the 1st of January, 1895, at the date of his superannuation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to that passing ; but in order that we may have the whole subject before us, I am going to ask the House to amend the motion by adding another section as section 11, as follows :—

The names of all persons who have been on the superannuation list since the Act came into force and have died before the 1st of January, 1895, and the information concerning each which is asked for in the preceding nine paragraphs with respect to those mentioned in paragraph 1.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not find fault with the amendment. I only desire to express my hope that the return will be brought down before the expiration of next year. Will the hon. gentleman, if he adds this amendment, undertake that the return will come down within a reasonable time, so that my hon. friend will have it in hand for use this session ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will do the best I can to facilitate it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like a little more definite promise than that.

Mr. FOSTER. When a man says he will do the best he can, what more can he promise ?

Mr. McMULLEN. My only object is to secure a full statement in regard to the operation of the Superannuation Act, and I hope the hon. Minister of Finance is not loading down my motion with additions which will prevent its being brought down to the House in time for consideration this session. I brought this subject before the House last year, and at the request of the First Minister, I allowed the Bill to stand over, simply because the Minister of Finance was not in his place. I earnestly hope that nothing will be thrown in the way of allowing Parliament full opportunity of giving expression to its views on this matter. The Minister of Finance, having stated that the return will be laid on the Table in good time to accomplish this end, I shall make no objections to the addition he proposes to my resolution. If, however, the hon. gentleman cannot give assurance that the return will be placed on the Table in time, I hope he will separate his resolution from mine, and I shall be happy to support it, but I do not think he should encumber my resolution with something that will prevent the return coming down in time.

Mr. FOSTER. My purpose is not at all to prevent the return being brought down, but simply to have a full presentment of the case, if there is to be one at all. My hon. friend must see that his will be only a partial one.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. The return will be prepared with all reasonable diligence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What advantage will be secured by the proposed addition which will not be secured by the paragraphs one. two and six, in my hon. friend's motion ?

Mr. FOSTER. All the information asked for is with respect to persons who were on the superannuation list on the 1st January, 1895. I want to know what superannuation has been going on from the beginning of the Act. My amendment will cover those passed away and not now on the list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see what that has to do with the subject we are dealing with now. My hon. friend is asking for information showing the present state of the superannuation list, with a view to legislation. The hon. Minister must have some other object.

Mr. FOSTER. We want to know the whole burden.

Mr. CASEY. There is no pretension with regard to those who have died, and are off the superannuation list. The hon. member for Wellington seeks for all necessary particulars with regard to those to whom we are now paying superannuation. That, it seems to me, covers the whole case. I have known of motions loaded down in this way by tacking to them information which the mover did not require, and which the case did not require. Whether the intention was to prevent the coming down of the information asked for, it has had that effect, at all events, in many cases before now under the same pretense of presenting the whole case. I think the suggestion of the hon. member is perfectly fair. If the Minister wants other information, he can get it, but the information asked for should be given separately.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

P.E.I. STEAM SERVICE.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Return showing the date the steamer "Stanley" commenced running in the fall of 1894, between Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Pictou, N.S., the date they commenced running between Georgetown, P.E.I., and Pictou, N.S. The date of each trip, both from Charlottetown and Georgetown to Pictou. The number of mail bags carried each trip. The number of passengers carried to and from Prince Edward Island. The receipts on account of passengers. The amount of freight carried both ways and the receipts therefor. The total expense and total receipts in connection with said steamer up to 15th April, 1895.

He said : I have already brought this question before the House on several occasions, but I am sorry to say that, so far, there is no improvement in the service. We all know that there has been a good deal of humbugging in this matter. If we could only have Dominion elections every year, no doubt something would be done. The steamer "Stanley" is a fine vessel, very well adapted for winter navigation, and the captain and crew give general satisfaction ; but we must bear in mind that the Government are not so powerful of late as they used to be, and their powers, in the best of times, were limited. They have no power or control over the ice and elements, and when the ice packs, the steamer "Stanley" has great difficulty in making crossings. With the exception of a few interested parties in King's County, and, I dare say, some in Pictou, the constituency of the hon. Minister of Justice, every one can see that the "Stanley" is in the wrong place, and that she ought to be brought more to the centre of the island, either between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine or Summerside and Cape Tormentine. The press, as a general rule, have made strong protests against running the steamer between Pictou and Georgetown, and are of opinion that there is much better chance of crossing between the Cape and Summerside. The Government itself, I believe, was under that impression. They gave a charter here some years ago to a party in New York to establish a ferry between West Point, P.E.I., and Richibucto, New Brunswick. The Government would be bound, the moment the contractor commenced operations, to give $75,000 a year for twenty years, I think. They have would be bound, the moment the contractor that they were prepared to enter into the contract, and therefore the experiment remains untried. The only place tried so far is between Georgetown and Pictou, and that, to a very large extent, is a failure. The people of the island are very much inconvenienced during the winter. They are sometimes five to twelve days without mail communication. Is that the way the people of Prince Edward Island should be treated ? The Government, having agreed to carry out the terms of confederation, should try the next best thing, they should make experiments, not only in one place, but in different places, and ascertain which is the most favourable route. That they have not yet done. They think nothing of spending three or four, or five or six million dollars to carry out the terms of confederation with British Columbia. They think nothing of throwing the whole Dominion into a state of agitation in order to carry out the terms of confederation with Manitoba. They have had to try their hand at putting down rebellion in the North-west. Now, I am not prepared to say that we on the island are ready to go into rebellion. But the Government had better take care what they are doing. Although we are small in number, we are a strong and determined people. The Government ought to know that we are not to be trifled with. I say,

Sir, that the time will come when patience will cease to be a virtue. The Government are bound in honour. if they have any honour, to carry out the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island in the best possible way. And I say that so far they have trifled with the people of the island. It is true they have given us the steamer. But we know very well that the steamer is not giving the satisfaction which the people of the island would expect. We know the humbug that goes on when the steamer is prevented from crossing and the mails ordered from Pictou to Cape Tormentine. The steamer will make a trip or two. Then the ice prevents the steamer from crossing, and then the Postmaster General will order the mails to be carried back to Cape Tormentine. Hence the delay. Is that the way the Government expect to satisfy the reasonable demands of the people of Prince Edward Island? Is that the way they expect to fulfil their obligation to the people of the island? What is the reason, I would ask, why the Government will not try the experiment of having the "Stanley" left at Georgetown and getting another boat, to cost from $30,000 to $50,000, specially constructed for travel between the capes? Or send a Government engineer to cross every day with the iceboats and make a report as to the possibility of a steamer crossing between Summerside and Cape Tormentine? We have the report of two or three engineers as to the feasibility of crossing between West Point and the Cape. They say we can cross there every day. Why, then, are the Government not prepared to spend a few thousand dollars to do justice to the people of the island? It is a dangerous thing for the Government to administer the affairs of the country in such a way as to dissatisfy even the smallest province. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, the other day, was good enough to answer the question which I asked. I wanted to know how many borings had been made last summer between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse? I wanted to know also the expense of the work, and also whether any more borings were to be made at an early date? I do not know what the Minister of Finance meant in the answer he gave me. I am not sure that he knows what he meant himself. He must have thought that any answer would be good enough for the people of Prince Edward Island. He said:

> An effort was made in the season of 1894 to put down a series of borings, but owing to the season being unusually boisterous, the contractors did not even succeed in putting down one hole.

I do not know that the season was any more boisterous than previous ones. I am not aware that it was more boisterous than the season of 1892, when Mr. Palmer, the English engineer, succeeded in boring nine or ten holes. That was the summer that the then Senator Howland, now Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, was appointed as banker for Mr. Palmer. He had authority to purchase goods, implements, machinery—everything necessary for Mr. Palmer's use, at his own prices and charge Mr. Palmer with all, and, I suppose, to sell what was left of them at a reduction of 50 per cent to his friends in Summerside. How the Government got rid of Mr. Palmer, I do not know. He was here in Ottawa a long time on sufferance, and I suppose they had to smuggle him away, as they were smuggling Chinese the other day between St., John and Vanceboro'. I am not aware that they have paid him one cent. What kind of contract did they make with the gentlemen who were employed on this work last year, I should like to know? Why did not they bore in 1893? I can understand the reason. it is well known that in 1893 we were not on the eve of a general election. But in 1894 every person—except the Finance Minister himself—expected that we were near a general election, and I expected that the Government would strain a point to have a lot of men in the service and a lot of money expended. But, Sir, knowing that we were not to have the elections until the summer of 1895, the Finance Minister did nothing. Then the hon. gentleman goes on in his answer to me:

> Therefore no payment was made to them.

No doubt he means, to the contractors, but I do not know who they are. He says further:

> The amount expended by the Government was $8,557.56.

I suppose this includes the Palmer contract and all the others. I do not know; it is very vague.

> The contractors declined to proceed with the work, they having spent nearly $4,000 in the effort during the season of 1894.

Does the Minister of Finance mean to tell me that the contractors expended $4,000 last year, and did not bore one hole? Why, Mr. Palmer, who was condemned and sneered at by the Government and by Senator Howlan, only spent $8,000 in boring ten holes. Here this gentleman spent $4,000, and the Minister himself acknowledges that they have not bored one hole. Well, I hope they have security for this money. I hope this is not going to be an addition to the large deficit that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has got to stare at, that ugly-looking animal. He says:

> Negotiations are now in progress for continuing the work of that boring during the season of 1895.

Now that lets the cat out of the bag. We are going to have an election in 1895. I believe we are, and that is a very bad verification of what is going to take place.

Now, I want the Minister of Finance to understand that it will take many years, at the rate he is going on, to build that tunnel. Why, Sir, I could not begin to figure the remoteness of the distance when that gigantic work will be completed at this rate of progress. My impression is that the Government of to-day are not able even to comprehend the magnitude of the work, that they are afraid to deal with it, that they just keep it there in that state of agitation in order to serve their political ends at the time of an election. At all events, pending the building of that tunnel, or pending the period when the Government will give up the idea of building it—I do not know which they mean to do, I believe they do not know themselves—but pending that period, I say the Government has a right to do justice to the people of the Island, in ascertaining where the best place for crossing is; and if they find that it is more feasible to cross between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, or between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, or between West Point and Richibucto, why not bring the boat up there? Leave the boat at present on the Georgetown route, and take a smaller boat, or send an engineer across in the ice-boats. These ice-boats begin to cross as soon as the ice is made, and they cross the whole winter. In fact when these returns are laid upon the Table, the House will be in a better position to understand the great drawback that the people of Prince Edward Island are put to. Now, Sir, we found a few days ago, about the first week in April, that we could have sent our potatoes from the west end of the island into the Boston market for 80 cents per bushel. Buyers were then paying from 35 to 40 cents. But we could not ship our potatoes at that time, and to-day prices are down to 20 cents, and because we have no means of communication there, we lose 100 per cent on the price of these articles, and our farmers are out of pocket in the price of their products by 100 per cent. Where is their remedy? The Government are deaf, they will not hear, they will not listen to our complaints, but they will take the taxes out of our people, they will rob them. They are neither afraid nor ashamed to tax the poor farmers of Prince County at the rate of 30 and 35 per cent, and, in some cases, to 70 per cent. They are not ashamed to do that. I say, Sir, that the Government have a right to give the people of the island some return for their taxes; they have a right to do them justice. The Government know as well as I do that they have broken the solemn compact with Prince Edward Island. They have been told by Lord Granville that they have not performed their solemn compact with the people of Prince Edward Island, and his Lordship advised them to carry out without delay the terms of confederation, not to be sleeping, not to be following the old policy of trifling with the people of Prince Edward Island, but to go to work at once, and see what is best to be done. Sir, my impression is that the Minister of Finance to-day has no more notion of spending another thousand dollars there to make borings between the two capes, than he had last year, or the year before. For him to tell me that it was so stormy during the whole summer of 1893, and the whole summer of 1894, that they could not work, is something that I, for my part, am not ready to swallow. I pay no attention to such statements, I have hardly a name to characterize them. It is simple mockery; it is a delusion, it is an imposition, it is political impudence on the part of the Minister to tell the people of Prince Edward Island that during last summer there was not one day when an engineer could bore a hole in the Straits of Northumberland between Capes Traverse and Tormentine. Sir, I wonder that he did not blush when he made such a statement as that. I did not believe him, I do not think he believed it himself. To say that there was not a day in 1893, nor in 1894, when a gang of men could not bore a hole there. The man in whose way an obstacle was placed, did bore nine or ten holes. There is no common sense in his statement, and if the Minister has nothing better to offer the people of Prince Edward Island than a stone when they ask for bread, it is time to tell them that they may go adrift. Let me tell him that if he wants peace and quietness in the island, if he wants to keep the people loyal —I do not mean to the Government, I mean to the constitution—he had better do justice to them, and the sooner he does it, the sooner will the people of the island give them credit for it, and the sooner will he promote the welfare of the island. Why, Sir, this Government thinks nothing of spending money by the million in carrying out the terms of confederation in British Columbia. Are the people of British Columbia dearer to the Government than the people of Prince Edward Island? That may be the case, from one standpoint. British Columbia, I understand, sends a unanimous representation to this House to support the Government, but unfortunately for our tunnel, the people of the island are not of that way of thinking. If the Minister of Finance thinks he is going to coerce the free, independent and loyal people of Prince Edward Island to his own way of thinking, by refusing to give them justice, he is much mistaken. He knows nothing at all about the people of Prince Edward Island. Now, there is a paper published in Summerside called the Summerside "Journal." I am sure the Minister of Finance knows the editor well, and the editor of that paper knows the Government well. Why, Sir, he draws milk out of the Dominion treasury

at the rate of $1,500 per year—I do not know for what, I believe for nothing at all. He has a long editorial advising the Government to change the route from Georgetown to Pictou, and bring the boat, or some other boat, between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, or between West Point and Richibucto. I will not read the whole article. It so happens that I have a little more faith in this paper than my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition has in the Tory press generally. It is in the winding up of the article where the poison comes in :

We believe that it now lies almost entirely with the electors of Prince County themselves to bring this question to a head, and to have the proposed route opened up. While questions like this should be above the petty level of party politics, such is not, we regret to say, always the case.

The fact is we want representatives at Ottawa in sympathy with the Government, to support our claims and to see that we get our rights. The present Government will, we feel confident, be sustained at the approaching election. The signs of the times point to such a result, much more positively than they did at the last election, when the Government was so handsomely sustained. Let the people make no mistake on this point. Every Conservative should stand true to his colours, and every Liberal or waiverer who wishes to be on the winning side should cast his vote for the Conservative nominee.

Is not that a bribe, is not that intimidation ? Hon. members will observe the statement regarding the members of the Conservative party standing together, but as regards Liberal waiverers we have none of them.

East Prince, then, should rally to the support of such a man as Mr. R. Hunt,—if he gets the nomination, and we have no doubt he will,—

I believe he did get it.

—who deserves well of the constituency, and who, when elected, will be in a position to see that the rights and privileges of the people of this constituency and of this county are secured to them. If you elect Mr. Hunt, who has already done a great deal for this county,—vastly much more than any outside man has done or can do,—and who in Parliament can do a great deal more, and he, acting in conjunction with Mr. Josiah Wood, of Westmoreland, other favourably disposed representatives, will have a winter mail route at once opened at the capes, maintaining this service by means of the "Stanley" or some other equally powerful steamer.

If the people were so fortunate as to obtain the parliamentary services of that Goliath, Mr. Hunt, in connection with that Goliath, Mr. Wood, the people of the island would have all the influence they required. But it must be remembered that the Goliath, Mr. Wood, was not able to keep the snow clear from his railway during last winter, and so the mails could not be carried over it to the capes for eight, ten or twelve days. Mr. Wood did not like to spend the requisite money ; he thought it would be too expensive to clear the road over which he has control, and which was largely subsidized by the Dominion Government for the purpose of carrying the mails and passengers between the capes. But if Mr. Wood thought proper not to expend a few hundred dollars to accommodate the people of the island, it was very convenient for him to get the railway built largely by the Dominion Government, and also a pier built at a cost of something like a million dollars of the public money. But what is the utility of these efforts to accommodate the public service when we have no crossing from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine ? The report contending that the necessary work could not be built was a piece of the greatest jugglery I ever knew in my life. I believe the present Government will do nothing to improve the service. For nearly twenty years this matter has been brought to their notice, but no redress has been given to the people of Prince Edward Island. To-day they are as badly off for lack of winter mail communication as they were under the old regime. They still have to fall back on the ice-boats. Last winter was blustery, and during some days the boats could not cross. That, however, was not the fault of the boatmen, who are mostly islanders and are hardy and trustworthy men, always able and willing to do their work efficiently. How much they are paid, I do not know. We propose to ascertain this from the return asked for. In my opinion they are paid very indifferently, whereas they should be well remunerated, as they risk their own lives and have the lives of passengers in their hands while crossing. I do not mean to say that they should obtain as much salary as the Minister of Finance, $8,000 a year, but they should be well paid for the work they do, and at all events they should be better compensated than I believe they are at the present time. I have endeavoured to show that the point where the winter crossing should be is not between Georgetown and Pictou. At all events the Government should ascertain with all care where the best point for crossing is, not from hearsay, not by placing a man on the top of a lighthouse and accepting a report made by such an individual, but by sending competent and trustworthy men, men appointed by the department or by the Government, to different points, to ascertain the most suitable point. Such officers would find that between Capes Traverse and Tormentine a crossing could be made every day ; a similar state of things would be found to exist between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and I believe there would be no trouble in crossing in a common boat almost every day between West Point and Richibucto. If the report favoured the West Point route, then the Government should enter into a contract with the American Company, of which Dr. Bertram is at the head. If the report favoured the Summerside route, that should be established. If the report favoured the

route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, the crossing should be established there. I know the representatives of King's County will be up in arms and fight the proposition, and no doubt they possess influence with the Government which they support. They are personally interested in having a steamer cross at Georgetown, which is in the east of the island. Cape Traverse or Summerside route would be in the centre of the province; but I cast all these sectional questions aside, and I contend that the Government should ascertain where the most feasible crossings are, and then, regardless of any sectional interest, they should establish a crossing at that point which is best adapted to the purpose, according to the report of the engineers.

Mr. YEO. With reference to the motion proposed by my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Perry), I would like to say as one of the representatives of Prince Edward Island, that I have no fault to find with the work done by the steamer "Stanley." She has done her work well, but she falls very far short of carrying out the terms of confederation which were agreed upon when Prince Edward Island entered the union. I think, Sir, it is worthy the attention of this Government, or of any other government which may come after it, to consider the necessity of trying whether a better communication cannot be made between Cape Tormentine and some point in Prince Edward Island. It is the opinion of practical and experienced men that the route from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse, or to Summerside, is by far the most fitting for winter communication. It may be that the Government do not care to put such an expensive boat as the "Stanley" on there, she is of heavy draft of water, and for other reasons perhaps not just suited for that purpose, but I think they should at least experiment with some powerful steam tug. We know it is a very short distance between the mainland and Prince Edward Island at these points. Summerside has a good natural harbour, it is a large shipping port in summer, and there are many reasons why it would be a suitable landing point in winter. If Summerside cannot be reached, Cape Traverse is near to Cape Tormentine and could, in the opinion of many, be reached at any time by a powerful and suitable steamer. I trust the hints which have been thrown out by my hon. colleague (Mr. Perry) will be acted upon. He has made some reference to the tunnel, and although perhaps it does not come up under this particular motion, I may say a word in reference to it. I believe the most sanguine advocates of the tunnel in Prince Edward Island have come to the conclusion that the Government have only been trifling with the matter so far, and that the promises made in the year 1891, were made solely for the purpose of influencing the elections of that year. I hope we are not going to have a repetition of this thing now. It seems strange that during four years the Government has not been able to obtain the information which they promised to obtain in the year 1891. The Minister of Finance told the House the other day that we had very boisterous weather in the Straits of Northumberland during the season of 1894, and that it prevented borings being made. Well, I do not know that the weather was unusually bad, but I do believe that if there had been an earnest attempt made to complete the borings there should have been no difficulty about it. If the intention of the Government is not to take this matter up seriously, I consider that there has been a wilful waste of public money. I, in my opinion, cannot help thinking there was no good reason why the borings were not completed in the season of 1892, and I hope and trust that we are not going to have a repetition of what took place previous to the elections of 1891, in view of the elections which are to take place in the near future. The people of Prince Edward Island are tired of this sort of thing. When anything is proposed which is for the benefit of the province the people want it to take some practical shape, and not to have it dangled before them previous to an election and lost sight of until another general election is coming on. I trust that whatever Government we have—whether we are unfortunate enough to have the present Government or not—steps will be taken to test the practicability of winter communication between Cape Tormentine and Prince Edward Island. Until that has been done the people of the island will not be satisfied. The nearest points are, I think, about seven miles, which is a very short distance compared with that to which the "Stanley" now has to navigate. We know there has been a very large outlay of money on the New Brunswick side, and to a large extent it is thrown away unless there are some means of communication between that province and the island. I am sure that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) will bear me out in saying that there is a very strong impression in New Brunswick, as well as in Prince Edward Island, that the route from Cape Tormentine to some point on the Prince Edward Island side is the most favourable one for winter navigation. If Summerside could be reached there is a good harbour there, and railroad facilities, and in many ways it is the most central and best part of the island at which to land in winter. I hope that the Minister of Finance will give an assurance that an attempt will be made to put a powerful steam tug on that route to test this matter, which is a very important one to the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FOSTER. The returns will, of course, be brought down with all convenient

speed, and perhaps occasion will occur, after this information is before the House, for a second discussion, because I imagine this is, so to speak, only a preliminary canter engaged in by my two hon. friends (Mr. Perry and Mr. Yeo). I believe, however, that my hon. friend (Mr. Yeo) has not quite treated the Government with his usual fairness. He has intimated that last year there was not an earnest attempt made to finish the borings which have been in progress for some years in the straits. I will just put a case to my hon. friend and he will come to his own conclusions on that point. Suppose that my hon. friend (Mr. Yeo) had entered into a contract with the Government by which he was to bore a certain number of holes in the straits during the season, and that if he finished the work he was to receive $6,000, and if he did not finish the work, he was not to receive $1. And if he went there and spent 90 days or more at the work, would he think it reasonable that he would go down and dilly-dally away his time all summer, and pay his men, and spend nearly $4,000, and in the end not do the work and not get any pay for it? I think when the matter is put in that practical way to my hon. friend, that he will say that the attempt was an earnest attempt. A company as good as could be got took the contract, a company with, I think, as good equipment as there is in Canada for that kind of work, and that company worked there during the season. Whether the weather was specially boisterous or not, the facts are that it was sufficiently boisterous to prevent them from getting one single hole sunk. They spent the summer there, they went to an outlay of $4,000, and they have not received a dollar, nor will they receive a dollar from the Government in reference to it. That is proof positive to my mind that the Government was in earnest in the first place, and that the contractors were in earnest in the second place. My hon. friend (Mr. Yeo) must give us credit, and I think he will give that company credit, for making an earnest attempt to carry out the borings. A contract will be entered into again, is now being entered into, with, I think, the same company, to make another attempt this year. They propose to get at it earlier than last year and they have the hope that probably as seasons differ, this season may be more propitious for the work and that they may be successful and recoup themselves to a certain extent, at least, for their great loss of last season.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it all for?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) cannot have been listening to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He must have been out of this House. He must have been out of this House every session when Prince Edward Island members were urging upon the Government to undertake this work, and keeping them up to the point of getting this information; and now my hon. friend from Bothwell rises, with that mild and innocent way of his, and wants to know what all this is about. I commend him to the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island on his side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have told him that it is for an election.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all my hon. friend from Prince wants this boring done for?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am afraid it is all the Government wants it done for.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend backs him up in undertaking to keep the Government to the scratch. My hon. friend from Bothwell must settle that with his colleague from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I thought it was to add to the deficit.

Mr. FOSTER. No, there are some things that must be done, deficit or no deficit; and we must do justice to Prince Edward Island and have these borings in some way or other.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am glad this return with respect to the steamer "Stanley" is asked for, as it will show the importance of the work which that steamer is doing in a very efficient manner between Georgetown and Pictou. A great deal of stress has been laid upon the necessity of sending the "Stanley" to other places to test the practicability of her running from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine, or from Cape Tormentine to Summerside, or from the West Point to Richibucto. I agree very much with the remarks made by the hon. junior member for Prince that the steamer "Stanley" is too expensive a boat, and has cost this country too much, to undertake such hazardous experiments. In the first place, she is not properly constructed for shallow water, and would not be suitable to ply between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine. If the Government thought well to experiment in this matter, of course it would be much better to get a powerful tug with less draught of water. In the summer time such a boat might make the passage between the capes successfully; but I very much doubt whether any other boat could be found to cross at the capes so efficiently as the "Stanley" has done up to this time between Pictou and Georgetown. The hon. senior member for Prince says that the ice packs where the "Stanley" crosses. That shows me how very little he knows about the matter. The ice packs between Pictou Island and the Island of Prince Edward in the narrow Straits of Northumberland; but farther below, owing to the wider expanse of the gulf, the "Stanley" can make her

passage across at nearly all seasons. During the past winter she could have run steadily all winter, with the exception of about ten days, in the depth of winter, when she was laid up for the cleaning of her boiler, and so forth, and when there was very little freight moving. She does her work well, she is ably managed and well manned. When this return comes down, I think the amount of freight she carries will be shown to be very large. I have no doubt she is a very great accommodation to the merchants of Prince Edward Island in getting their shipments made and their early spring goods in. Attempts have been heretofore made to get the "Stanley" to run between Pictou and Charlottetown, but I think it will be found on examination that this steamer received more damage in the attempt to run to Charlottetown a year or two ago, owing to the importunities of interested parties, than she has ever received on her Pictou-Georgetown route. I might as well get up and argue in favour of the steamship "Northumberland" carrying her freight from Point Duchene to Charlottetown. The steamer "Stanley" at present carries a very large amount of freight and passengers by the Pictou-Georgetown route; and the number of days that intervene between the time she is able to go on the Pictou-Charlottetown route and the time the summer boats commence to run, is so trifling, that I would urge the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to continue to run the "Stanley" on the Georgetown-Pictou route as soon as the proper season arrives in the fall of the year, and to advertise that she would run on that route until the spring boats are put on again. A great deal of unnecessary annoyance is given to passengers as well as in the carrying of freight, by the uncertainty that sometimes prevails owing to interested parties wishing to have the steamer taken off the regular route in order to run to Charlottetown. The hon. senior member for Prince thinks the capes route is a better one than the route between Pictou and Georgetown. Well, I have no objection to the Government experimenting on that or any other route: but I think it would be a very hazardous undertaking to take the steamship "Stanley" off a route on which she is giving great public satisfaction, to put her on a route that has not yet been proved to be good. The hon. member accuses the members from King's of being in favour of the Georgetown-Pictou route from motives of local interest. The matter may have that appearance, but for my part I look upon that route as the only one that has so far proved to be practicable; and until some other route is proved to be practicable, I will continue to support that route. I would like the hon. gentleman to amend his motion by adding the following:—

And the amounts received for freight and passengers carried by the said steamer from Pictou to Charlottetown in the spring of 1894 and the spring of 1895 respectively.

That is, the freight she has carried after she has left the Pictou and Georgetown route to go to Charlottetown.

Mr. WELSH. As far as the "Stanley" is concerned, she is a very fine boat, and well managed, and I think the Government has done right in keeping her on the route between Georgetown and Pictou. I have had a good deal of experience crossing that gulf for over fifty years, and I know that at present the only feasible place to run the "Stanley" is on the route between Georgetown and Pictou. There has been some agitation going on in Prince Edward Island for a southern railroad from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour. If the railway were completed, and a little improvement done to Murray Harbour, by removing the bar, there would be sufficient water for that boat to run from Murray Harbour to Pictou. This would shorten the distance nearly one-half. But as that is looking a long way ahead, the Government are quite right in keeping the "Stanley" employed between Georgetown and Pictou. She is a splendid boat, and a credit to the country. As regards changing the route of the "Stanley" and making her ply between any other ports than Pictou and Georgetown, that would be nonsense. For instance, between Capes Tormentine and Traverse, there is no harbour. The Government have built a harbour at Cape Tormentine, which is a considerable distance in the winter from running ice, but on the island side there is no harbour, and I doubt very much if there ever will be a harbour there for a boat like the "Stanley." Even now, the water at Cape Tormentine pier is not sufficiently deep for the "Stanley." Again, Summerside harbour has not enough water, nor has even Shediac. But certainly, as my hon. friend from King's County (Mr. Macdonald) has said, I have no objection to the Government making experiments by running a boat drawing less water between Shediac and Summerside, or any other ports. But they will find a difficulty even in trying that experiment, because a boat of less power than the "Stanley" and less draught of water would not be able to force her way through the ice. The "Stanley" draws seventeen feet of water when she encounters heavy ice, and it would be absurd to take the "Stanley" away from her present route, and try her on any other route between the island and the main land. The senior member for Prince (Mr. Perry) has said that there is a good road between West Point and Richibucto. There is no harbour there fit for such a boat as the "Stanley." Again, at times, the West Point and Richibucto route, according to the wind, would be open, and at other times the eastern part of the island would

be open. The north-west winds drive the ice, and fills the gulf between West Point and Richibucto, or it clears the ice from the route between Pictou and Georgetown, but a nor'easter again fills up between Pictou and Georgetown and clears the western end of the island. It would be very difficult for me to give an opinion on any of those experiments. I think the "Stanley" has performed almost all that the most sanguine expected she would do. I think she has done wonders, and I believe that most of the detention we have suffered on the island in the carrying of mails has been due to Mr. Wood's railway. He built a road from Sackville down to Tormentine, which is a very serviceable one when kept clear. But we had some heavy storms last winter, and were detained some ten or twelve days because that railway was not running. It was buried under the snow. I have crossed there for over fifty years, and I have never seen the day when the mails, carried by sleigh and horse, were ever detained on the road. Now, we have a railway, and we have to wait a certain number of days while Mr. Wood is shovelling it out. This railway cost a lot of money—over $7,000 a mile in subsidies, and I believe that Mr. Wood gets paid also for carrying the mails, and it is certainly monstrous that our mails should be detained five or ten days while the railway is being shovelled out. Mr. Wood, when his road ceases running, should forward the mail by horses or some other means. Let the blame be put on the right shoulders. As for the "Stanley," I can say nothing but good of her. The Minister of Finance and I had something to do with her construction. I think he will find that my suggestions and estimates have always come out correct, and in planning the "Stanley" I take a little credit to myself. I assisted the Government engineer, and the Government in planning her, and I am proud to say she is a success, and has done more than, I think, the most sanguine people ever expected. Notwithstanding that, under the terms of confederation, the Government are bound to keep up winter communication. They have not done so. They have not carried out the agreement, and we have, consequently, an account against them to a pretty healthy amount. A few years ago a deputation came up here—a good Conservative deputation; one of its members is in the Government, I believe. They claimed some $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 from the Dominion for non-fulfilment of the terms of confederation. The Government refused to grant the claim, and the island sent a deputation to Her Majesty's Government, to plead for redress. It cost the colony a large sum of money to send those delegates over, and all they accomplished was to obtain a recommendation from the Home Government to the Dominion Government to deal generously with the colony. As yet, however, we have had no settlement, but I have always noticed that when a Conservative from Prince Edward Island asks anything from the Conservative Government of the Dominion, he does not get anything for the colony, but gets a good position for himself. One of the delegates was appointed Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island; the next one was appointed judge of county court; and the last one of all was made a member of the Government, but the island has not got a cent. These people will be well rewarded by the island. I have never seen these gentlemen going through the island backing any political candidate who was not defeated. I have given the Government, for a number of years, some very good suggestions about the winter crossing, and if I can give them any suggestions again I shall be happy to do so for the good of the Dominion. I agree with the hon. member for King's that it would be bad policy to order the "Stanley" from Georgetown to Charlottetown before the captain thought it was proper and feasible. I quite agree with him in that, and with the junior member for Prince County (Mr. Yeo). I do not know whether the Government will bring down in the Estimates a sum for the Southern railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, and thus shorten considerably the mail route, but as I look forward to represent that section of the country, I shall take care that their interests are attended to.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I did not intend to take part in this discussion, but some of the remarks of the hon. member who last addressed the House perhaps require a little correction on my part. The hon. gentleman said that the trouble with Prince Edward Island mails during last winter was all due to the mismanagement of the road of which I, fortunately or unfortunately, happen to be president, the road running from Sackville to Cape Tormentine. The hon. gentleman said that after the severe snowstorms we had last winter, the road was left not shovelled out for some five or ten days, and that it was owing to this that the Prince Edward Island mails were detained. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not take pains to ascertain the facts before making his statement. There was no case during last winter—and we never, within my recollection, had a more severe winter or one in which there was more difficulty in contending with the snow upon the road—when the road was closed for more than three days at one time. That is to say, there was one occasion when, during a severe storm, it was three days from the time the train left Sackville until it reached Cape Tormentine. That was the greatest detention of the season. And, if I am correctly informed, the Prince Edward Island Railway was snowed up during the same

time. Besides that, if the hon. gentleman had known the facts, he would know that there was only one day during that time, the last day when it was possible for the ice-boats to cross between the capes. So that, as a matter of fact, the detention of the Prince Edward Island mail through delay on the road from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, was only one day. I would not be the least afraid that the statements of the hon. gentleman would receive any credence or have any injurious effect in the locality where the road is situated, for every one there knows the facts, knows that every effort which any company could possibly be expected to make is made to keep the road open and to keep the trains running regularly in the winter time, especially when we are carrying the Prince Edward Island mails; and I believe that, up to last winter, there has never been a case when the mails have not been delivered with perfect regularity. The present winter was unprecedented in the maritime provinces, at least within my recollection, for the heavy storms that occurred; yet there was only the one occasion of which I speak when there was a delay of three days between the time of the train leaving Sackville and reaching Cape Tormentine. Now, with regard to the general question which hon. gentlemen have been discussing—the propriety of making an experiment with the steamer "Stanley" between the capes—I must say that the result of such observation as I have been able to make and such information as I have been able to gain lead me to believe that such experiment with the steamer "Stanley" or some other suitable steamer would yield good results. The navigation of the straits in winter time, of course is, to a large extent, experimental. The results of the experiments that have already been tried have established a few facts. The steamer "Stanley," if I am correctly informed—and I have made careful inquiries of those who are competent to express an opinion on the subject—is capable of making her way through any floating ice that is ever found in the Straits of Northumberland. She is also capable of making her way through the ice which is usually formed in the bays and along the coasts either on the mainland or on the Prince Edward Island side. The condition of things which renders it impossible for the "Stanley" to cross is caused by the ice jams which sometimes form some miles in extent—heavy floating ice closely packed, through which it is impossible for the "Stanley" or any other steamer to make her way. On the present route there is a point, I think, somewhere near Pictou harbour, though I do not know the place exactly—those who have crossed tell me it is called the Bight—where the ice packs form. When the "Stanley" gets in one of these packs or jams it is impossible for her to make her way out again. Now, if the facts I refer to are true, and the "Stanley" can cross at any time provided the ice is movable, provided there is any open space at all in which she can move backward or forward, and that she can make her way through any board ice which forms there, I am satisfied she can make daily crossings between Cape Tormentine and some point in the neighbourhood of Cape Traverse on Prince Edward Island. During the last two or three years, when my attention has been more particularly drawn to this subject, I have made most careful inquiries from those best acquainted with the locality, and their statements go to show that in that part of the straits these solid ice jams never form. I have made it a point myself to visit the cape repeatedly during the last two winters, and have observed the condition of things there, and I have never, even in the most severe weather, seen the straits completely closed with ice. In the narrow portion where the ice has to pass through between the capes where the whole width of the straits is only seven miles, the ice is sometimes closely packed, but immediately below, not a mile below, there is always open water to be seen, the ice floating about in it. It does appear to me that this experiment is worth trying. I am not prepared to say, I think perhaps it is not for any member of this House to say, whether the steamer "Stanley" is the most suitable boat for that purpose. But I really think, from the experiments which have already been tried, from the facts which we have with regard to the condition of things between the capes, that the experiment should be tried with some suitable boat. But I must say, from the information which I have been able to gather during the last two years, and from my own observation of the condition of things there, that I believe this experiment would prove successful, and would give the people of Prince Edward Island during the winter time uninterrupted mail communication every day in the winter season, unless, of course, it might be an exceptional day in a very severe storm, when travelling was impossible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman intimates that the unfortunate delays which took place in delivering the mails between the mainland and Prince Edward Island last year, were not owing to the want of proper accommodation on the railway that he controls, and, of course, I have no evidence at my hand to contradict his statement. All I desire to say is, that the people of the island were informed by the authorities there, when they were some eight or ten days without a mail at all, that the main reason of it was that the hon. gentleman's railway was all closed up with snow, and that he would not shovel it out, or did not shovel it out, and to that cause they were

to attribute, to a large extent, the non-delivery of our mails, and the great inconvenience which the commercial public underwent by reason of that non-delivery. Now the hon. gentleman advocates the experiment of placing the "Stanley" on the route between Capes Tormentine and Traverse in winter. I regret that I cannot concur in that advice. The "Stanley," as my hon. colleague has explained to the House, is a most excellent boat, which cost a great deal of money, some $150,000, and it would be an unjustifiable experiment on the part of the Government to risk a boat costing that sum of money in that dangerous navigation such as we know exists between those two capes. Now, Sir, some years ago the Government came down here and proposed to the House to make a connection between the island and the mainland at this narrow point, and instead of constructing contemporaneously public wharfs on both sides, and showing they were in earnest in this experiment, they let a contract and spent $250,000 in constructing a public wharf at the end of my hon. friend's railway on the New Brunswick side. There it has remained ever since. Last summer it was largely eaten up with worms, and a very large expenditure was incurred, some thousands of dollars I think, up to the end of the year, in repairing it; how much after the end of the year, I do not know, but I am putting a question upon the Order paper to find out. But while they have spent this quarter of a million of money in building a public wharf, ostensibly——

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I think my hon. friend must be mistaken about that. It was only some small repairs put in.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hold in my hand the Public Accounts, and if the hon. gentleman will turn to page 18 (Roman numerals) he will find among sundry works charged to the Dominion of Canada, "Cape Tormentine Harbour, $236,860." And if he will turn to the receipts and expenditure for the year, he will see that in the financial year ending June 30, 1894, there were $5,636 spent upon repairs for that very work. The hon. gentleman cannot contradict the facts.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Was it for repairs, or was it for finishing the work?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It says on Cape Tormentine Harbour.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). It does not say repairs?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was it for?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not know just now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman say he does not know?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). My recollection is that the work was not finished in the previous year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will please draw a distinction between the balance sheet of the Dominion of Canada where the amount is charged to capital expenditure, $236,869, and the current expenditure of the year, which he will find in the other place to which I referred him, of $5,636. The hon. gentleman knows that the statement I make, that the wharf was largely eaten up by sea worms, is correct, and it had to be repaired. I am not complaining of the repairs, because the work, if it had to be done, had to be kept in repair. What I am complaining about is the manner in which that quarter of a million of money was spent. That wharf never should have been built there, and never would have been built there, not a single man in this House would have dared to vote a dollar for its construction, excepting that it was proposed to be built in order to carry out the terms of union with Prince Edward Island, and to keep up communication between the mainland and the island. Nobody would have proposed to build a wharf costing a quarter of a million of money at the end of a private railway owned by the hon. member for Westmoreland. The thing would be too much of an outrage altogether. But it was built, nevertheless, ostensibly as part of the communication between the island and the mainland; but there never was any wharf built on the island side, and it has remained there simply as a part of the hon. gentleman's railway, and for the benefit of that railway alone. That is the simple truth about that matter. Now, I think myself that the hon. Minister would be well advised, owing to the many statements made by the residents in that locality, if he would try the experiment of putting a good strong steam tug there in winter. A great many men whose opinion I value have expressed the belief that that route can be kept open longer in winter, in the month of February, than it can between Georgetown and Pictou. But while I would be sorry to see the "Stanley" put there as an experiment—I think it would be unjustifiable to risk such a valuable vessel in such a dangerous place—I thing the Government would be justified, in fact I think under the circumstances they are bound to place a good strong tug boat there, and test whether it is practicable or not, and if it is not practicable, then let it be done away with.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). You could not do it if you had not the wharf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You can surely try the experiment whether a tug boat can run there in winter without a wharf. If there is a wharf there she must be run to that given point, must she not? If she cannot touch the wharf, she is no good at all, and you can make a harbour in the border ice equally attainable as a wharf would be, and the experiment therefore could be tried with a good strong tug boat. If it succeeds,

well and good, building a wharf might then be justified afterwards. If it fails, what then ? Does the hon. gentleman propose to ask this House to spend another quarter of a million building a wharf before we know whether a communication can be kept open ? Surely not. Like my colleague here, I never like to ask for the expenditure of any money in Prince Edward Island unless there is a reasonable assurance that it will be done in the public interest and for the public benefit. I do not believe in wild-cat schemes. Now, the Minister of Finance spoke about the good faith which the Government had kept with the people of the island in the initial steps they have taken towards forming a conclusion as to whether a tunnel should be built or not ; and the hon. gentleman asks us to believe that they were really and sincerely in earnest last year when they sent down some contractors there to spend the summer, who never bored a single hole. They had no competent man in charge. If they were in earnest, why did they discharge the only man that was ever competent to do the civil engineering there, Mr. Palmer, who, in the previous year, had bored eight or nine holes, and who, if they had left him there, would have finished the work ? The hon. gentleman would long since have been in a condition to make up his mind. I am very much afraid that if this present Government remains in power, the construction of the Prince Edward Island tunnel, and the introduction of free trade will be somewhat coterminous. I think the hon. Minister the Secretary of State in his statements up in Ontario, placed the proper time for the introduction of the free trade system into this Dominion, at about five centuries hence.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That had reference to your party getting into power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Although one year had elapsed since that time, leaving only 499 years, I am very strongly inclined to think that the Prince Edward Island tunnel, and the introduction of free trade by hon. gentlemen opposite will be coterminous. The fact is, the work which the Government are doing down there, or are pretending to do, is a laughing stock, and a burlesque. Public money is being spent there in pretending to sink holes in the straits. This has been going on two or three years. One year, eight holes were sunk, the next year not one, and this year, I believe, the Minister of Public Works has intimated that contractors are going to work again. I should like to ask whether the Government have a competent man to supervise the work, or is another year to be dawdled through, and, at the end, the work to be in the same position as now. I think hon. gentlemen opposite would be well advised so far as the "Stanley" is concerned in leaving it largely to the experience of the mariner in command to decide the places between which she shall run. Although there are times when, between Georgetown and Pictou it is impossible for a crossing to take place from day to day, still, I have never been able to convince myself that there are any other ports equally as available as these ports. But, beyond giving the Government proper credit, to which, I think, they are entitled, for having constructed the "Stanley," and I like to give them credit when they are entitled to it, I do not think they have taken any steps whatever to implement the terms of union between the island and the Dominion. If the hon. gentleman had not spoken before I did, I should have liked to have asked him to state whether the Government are prepared to yield to the island any part of the claims she has made on account of non-fulfilment of the terms of union. No doubt the island will expect now more than at any previous period, to obtain a favourable answer, because the hon. gentleman has signified the interest he takes in that part of the Dominion by introducing into his councils a gentleman who does not represent the people, it is true, although he has tried many times to do so, but who holds a seat in the Senate, and one, also, at the Privy Council. I have no doubt that that gentleman now, having weight in the councils of the nation, will press the claims of the island as he pressed them before ; and I hope the hon. leader of the Government will be able to give some assurance that the claims of the island will receive that treatment which they deserve. If the Government are not able to concede the whole claims made by the island, I trust they will be able to allow a part ; the hon. gentleman has been as silent as a sphinx to-day, nevertheless, we trust that our claims will receive recognition at the hands of the Government. It is still open to the hon. gentleman to intimate whether the claims of the island have lately been considered by the Government, whether the Government have made up their minds to acknowledge them, and, if so, to what extent, and as elections are coming off in the near future, it is desirable that this information should be obtained, so that the electors may be able to pass an opinion on the decision arrived at by the Government.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. MULOCK moved for :

Copies of all despatches, letters or other communications that have passed between the Imperial and Canadian Governments since the 1st of July, 1892, in regard to the scheduling of Canadian cattle by Great Britain or the removal of such scheduling.

He said: I would remind the Government that this motion, when it speaks of all communications in the past between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, covers, in my view, any communication between any officer of the Canadian Government, such, for example, as the High Commissioner, and the Imperial authorities.

Mr. FOSTER. It might not be possible to bring down every communication that has passed between the Government and the High Commissioner in London. Confidential communications often pass between them, and, of course, we must be the judges as to the papers to be brought down; but everything pertinent, and which can possibly be brought down, will be submitted.

Mr. MULOCK. Part of the correspondence took place between the High Commissioner and the Imperial authorities. Some correspondence took place, no doubt, between His Excellency and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. But the correspondence between the High Commissioner and the Imperial authorities I regard as commnuications between the Canadian Government and the Imperial authorities, the High Commissioner being an agent of the Dominion Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; if the communications are pertinent, they will be brought down. Communications between our Government and the British Government are carried on governmentally, and copies of the despatches are sent, also to the High Commissioner, and often he, being on the spot, acts on behalf of the Government in pressing the views which have been expressed in the despatches forwarded by this Government.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be the practice, but I have seen in the newspapers that some correspondence took place between the High Commissioner and the Imperial authorities. That correspondence I wish included in the return.

Mr. FOSTER. All of that, I dare say, will be included.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

Mr. MARA (for Mr. Corbould) moved for:

1. Copy of the instructions to Mr. Justice Drake, 1894, relative to the inquiry into the management of the British Columbia Penitentiary. 2. Copy of evidence given before the Royal Commission held before Mr. Justice Drake, in 1894, relative to the management of the British Columbia Penitentiary. 3. Copy of the report of Mr. Justice Drake thereon.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MARA (for Mr. Corbould) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence with the Department of Justice relative to the reinstatement of James Fitzsimmons, as Deputy Warden of the British Columbia Penitentiary.

He said: In moving these two resolutions, I express the wish of the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Corbould), which I may say is also endorsed by every other member from British Columbia, that no unnecessary delay will occur in the bringing down of these papers.

Mr. FOSTER. They will be brought down at once.

Motion agreed to.

GRATUITY TO MRS. DR. ALLEN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Orders in Council, letters or documents having reference to the application of Janet Conger Allen, widow of the late Dr. Allen, for the usual gratuity of two months' salary payable on the decease of any public servant while in office.

He said: Respecting the motion, I may say that I understand that the circumstances of the case are somewhat these. The Controller of Customs, I believe, recommended this in the usual course, and it seems to have been refused, or I understand that it has been refused, on the score that Mrs. Allen was not at the time living with her husband. Well, I think we need hardly enter into a discussion of the domestic relations of the parties, and my impression is that these gratuities in the case of officers dying in the service have been heretofore granted as a matter of course. I do not remember at the moment any similar application being refused, and I think that that being the case, Mrs. Allen should hardly have been put to a disadvantage by reason of the fact that the late lamented Dr. Allen and herself did not entirely agree. However, perhaps the Controller of Customs knows something further about the matter and can make a statement now.

Mr. WALLACE. The two months' gratuity which the law provides shall be paid, was paid to the daughter of Dr. Allen and not to his widow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been paid?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was misinformed on the point.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you still wish the papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the papers had better be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENT TO THE DOMINION BY THE PROVINCES.

Mr. FRIOR moved for:

Return of all moneys paid into the Dominion treasury by the several provinces of the Dominion and the North-west Territory, showing the amounts paid by each province, under their proper headings, from 1st July, 1884, to 1st July, 1894. Also, a return of all expenditures made by the Dominion Government in the above several provinces and the North-west Territory during the same period, under their different proper headings, exclusive of any expenditures on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway.

He said: I may say that last year I applied for a somewhat similar return, but I found that it did not give sufficient details to be of any use. I trust that the Minister of Finance will see that this return, if it is allowed by the House, will be brought down in as short a period as possible so that it may be of some use during the present session.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears to me that most of the departments will have something to do in preparing the return, so that it may take a little longer than if it belonged to one department. I will try to expedite it all I possibly can.

Motion agreed to.

THE SUPERANNUATION LIST.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the names of the several parties superannuated from the 31st December, 1894, to the first day of April, 1895, the amount of superannuation allowance granted to each, the number of years' service, their age at retirement, and the number of years added to their time of service, if any.

Mr. FOSTER. I presume that my hon. friend will see that the papers he calls for will be included in the one already ordered by a motion passed. He will find, I think, that the return with regard to superannuations which I laid on the Table the other day will give him the information he asks for.

Mr. McMULLEN. The report laid on the Table of the House only covers up to the 31st December, 1894, whereas this resolution asks for the present month.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

1. A copy of the appeal of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, in reference to the abolition of their schools. 2. A copy of the case submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, together with a copy of the decision of the court. 3. A copy of the appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, as well as a copy of the case and of the decision in reference thereto. 4. A copy of all petitions on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, in support of their claim. 5. A copy of the appeal case before the Honourable the Privy Council for Canada. 6. A copy of all Orders in Council in reference to the same. 7. A copy of the remedial order. 8. A copy of all official correspondence in reference to the same.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Statement showing the date the Government ice-boats commenced running between Cape Traverse, P.E.I., and Cape Tormentine, how many trips made, how many passengers crossed both ways, how many mail bags carried across. The amount of revenue therefrom, and the expenditure in connection with the said service up to 15th April, 1895.—(Mr. Perry.)

1. Copies of all petitions praying for the disallowance of the Manitoba Act, 57 Victoria, chap. 28 (1894), intituled "An Act to amend the Public School Act;" 2. Copies of any Orders in Council in relation to such petitions.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

1. Copies of all petitions, letters and documents protesting against the Ordinance of the North-west Territories, No. 22, sanctioned at Regina on the 31st December, 1892; 2. Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and documents forwarded to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, in relation to the said Ordinance and to the amendment thereof.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

Copies of all petitions, memorials, correspondence and other documents in relation to the claim made against the Government by Mr. L. T. Puizé, of Frazerville, in the county of Temiscouata.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Choquette.)

Copies of all correspondence with the Department of Railways or with any member of the Government in reference to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company and the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company, from the 1st January, 1887, up to date, and with respect to subsidies and contracts granted to these companies respectively.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Copies of all Orders in Council granting or promising aid to the Hudson Bay Railway Company, and all reports and correspondence in connection with the same.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of any applications by or on behalf of Mr. Charlebois for payment or for reference to arbitration of his claim for extras for work or materials in connection with the erection of the "Langevin Block;" also copies of all letters, telegrams and other communications between the Government or any department, member or officer of the Government and Mr. Charlebois or any person on his behalf, and of all Orders in Council, reports and recommendations of any member or officer of the Government in reference to any such application or in reference to any such claim.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 29th April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House, that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of

C. A. Geoffrion, Esq., for the Electoral District of Verchères.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

C. A. Geoffrion, Esq., for the Electoral District of Verchères, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. McIsaac.

ACT RESPECTING THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 25) further to amend the Act respecting the House of Commons. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I ask leave to introduce is for the purpose of restoring to the House the control over its own proceedings which by recent legislation it has, I think, substantially lost. It will be remembered that originally a writ could not be issued to fill a vacancy in the House of Commons without the authority of the House itself. That was the original rule and law regulating parliamentary proceedings, and it was based on the well understood doctrine that the House of Commons was the best judge and had the absolute and sole control over its own proceedings, and guarded its own privileges and dignity. I find that it was in 1770 that the Act was first passed permitting the Speaker of the House during recess between the sessions of Parliament in case of a vacancy occurring by death, to issue his warrant, and the recital of the Act was: That many inconveniences have happened and much disorder has been occasioned for want of more speedy elections of members to the House of Commons in the room of such who have died during the recess of Parliament. Now, that was the first time that Parliament delegated to a Speaker the right to issue a warrant for the issue of a writ. That was subsequently amended in 1784, and the law of 1784 is practically the law to this day with some slight changes. By that amendment the Speaker was authorized to issue his warrant in the events mentioned in the Acts, provided,—and that proviso, I think, emphasizes the importance that Parliament attaches to controlling its own affairs—that if under the procedure a warrant could not issue before the meeting of the House, then the Speaker had no authority to issue his warrant. I may explain that Mr. Speaker, by reminding the House that before the warrant issued the Speaker had to place a notice in the Official "Gazette" stating that he had been informed of the death of a member, or the elevation of a member to the Peerage, and what is meant is, that if the time for that publication had not elapsed, the Speaker was not authorized to issue his warrant. Now, Sir, some time ago this House delegated to the Speaker the same power that is to be found in England without the limitation which probably is not necessary here, and it also went further for some reason that I am not able to understand, and it authorized the Speaker in case of a vacancy occurring during the sitting of the House to issue his warrant without the authority or command of the House. I propose, Sir, to deprive you of that power. When the House is sitting, the House itself is the proper body to take care of its own privileges, and it is only when the House is not sitting, I think, the Speaker as the mouthpiece of the House ought to have the authority to issue a warrant. Then, Sir, I propose to leave with you the power to issue your warrant during the recess. Much abuse has grown out of what I think was not originally contemplated with reference to the issue of the writ. Your warrant, I believe, has always been issued promptly; but it lies in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, sometimes for weeks, sometimes for months, and sometimes for nearly a year; and why? Because under the provisions of the Elections Act the Governor in Council is empowered to fix the day of nomination and to appoint the returning officer. Now, I think that was intended at the time to apply to the general elections, and to the fixing of one day for the holding of them. We also know that by reason, as it was thought, of the partisanship, displayed by the local officials, this House thought proper to vest in the Governor in Council the power to appoint the returning officer. I am not proposing to interfere with that power more than to provide that if the Governor in Council, within a certain number of days after your warrant has reached the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—I have stated three days, but if that is not long enough or too long, the House can easily modify it—does not fix the time for holding the election, and name the returning officer, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall direct the writ to one of the sheriffs of the district, a part of which or the whole of which is in the electoral district; so that in the event of the Governor in Council not naming a day within the time specified, it will devolve upon the Clerk

of the Crown in Chancery to name a day and to direct the writ to the officer of the law who in England always acts as returning officer and who in Canada always acted as such until the question of local partisanship arose. Now, that this matter has a practical side appears very clearly from facts which we all know. I find that in 1888, Mr. Barron brought this question to the attention of the House, and gave a pretty full and complete statement of delays which had occurred in the issue of writs by reason of interference or the want of action on the part of the Government. Some of these instances it may be worth while to recall to the attention of the House. In Yarmouth, for instance, the judge certified the seat vacant on the 13th of August, 1887, but the writ did not issue until the 18th of November following. In Dorchester the return of the invalidity of the election was made in August, 1887, but the writ did not issue until the 21st of December following. Recently we have had other examples of a still more striking character. Sir John Macdonald died on the 6th of June, 1891, and for several days this House was draped in mourning out of respect for the leader whose death we all lamented; yet I remember perfectly well that at the end of that long session you, Sir, had to announce that you had never been officially informed of the death of Sir John Macdonald, and consequently had no authority to issue your warrant. You had no authority to place upon the journals of the House the fact that the leader of the House had died, although this Chamber had been at the time draped in mourning in honour of him, and although the body had lain in state in the Senate Chamber for several days; and it was not until the 19th of December, six months afterwards, that notification was given to you as Speaker, and you issued your warrant for a new election, and the election was held on the 11th of January, 1892. Then, the death of Mr. Hearn, the late member for Quebec West, was announced in this House on the 17th May, 1894, references being made to it by both the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition; and on the 16th of July, attention was drawn to the fact that no warrant had yet been issued for a new election. I remember that I was very much surprised at the time. I do not desire to reflect upon you, Mr. Speaker, but I remember you saying that although you had heard of his death, you had no official statement of it which could be recorded on the journals. The consequence was that no warrant issued till more than two months after his death, and the writ did not issue for nearly a year after, and the election was not held until April, 1895. These facts show the necessity of the House looking after its own proceedings. We all trusted to your doing it, instead of doing it ourselves, as we ought to have done. Now, this is not a party question. We are all equally interested in protecting the privileges and the dignity of this House; both sides ought to join in doing that. I do not wish to cast any blame upon the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, because whatever party occupies that position, this power is likely to be used or abused for the promotion of party interests. What we are bound to do as representatives of the people is to see that this House takes care of its privileges, and my desire in introducing this measure is that we should have restored to us the power we have inadvertently lost. It appears to me clear that the Speaker should have authority to issue his warrant when the House is in session; but it appears to me equally clear that he should have authority to do so when the House is not in session, without being subject to control or interference from any outside authority, as he is practically now, by the power of the Governor in Council to fix the day of nomination and to appoint the returning officer.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEIGNIORY OF SOREL TENANTS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Bruneau) asked, What are the names of the tenants of lands belonging to the Dominion Government in the Seigniory of Sorel?

Mr. DALY. The names are Léon Leduc, Marcel Proulx, Chevalier Labelle, Edward W. Kittson, E. A. D. Morgan, Alfred Knight, Hon. J. B. Guévremont, Narcisse Lavalée, Corporation of Sorel, François Labelle, Alex. Laforest, J. P. Senecal, Bernard Gravel, Robert Nelson, William Saxton and Pierre Cournoyer.

MR. F. SHIELDS—POSTMASTER OF MILTON, N.S.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. Has Mr. Shields been removed, or has he resigned from the office of postmaster at Milton, Queen's County? 2. Has his successor been appointed? Who is he, and when does his appointment take effect? 3. Why has the issuing and paying of money orders at the post office in Milton, Queen's County, N.S., been stopped?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Shields has been removed from the postmastership of Milton, Queen's County. Mr. Ira Freeman has been appointed in his place. His appointment will take effect as soon as his bond is received. The issuing and paying of money orders at the post office in Milton, Queen's County, N.S., was stopped on account of irregularities on the part of the late postmaster.

PORT DE BERT, N.S., POSTMASTER.

Mr. FORBES asked, Whether the Government has received a petition for the appointment of a postmaster from the inhabitants of Port De Bert, Queen's County, and do the Government intend to make any appointment in reply to such petition ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A petition has been received and the matter is now under inquiry.

TRANSATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Langelier) asked, Whether the Government have granted a contract for a more rapid transatlantic postal service ; if so, to whom, and on what conditions was such contract awarded, and have the first steps been taken in execution of the contract, and what steps ?

Mr. IVES. There has been no new contract or arrangement.

METAPEDIA AND CAPLAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a contract for carrying the mails from Metapedia to Caplan, in the county of Bonaventure, to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, now in active and constant operation since June, 1894.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The matter is still under the consideration of the Government.

CLARK AND PAISLEY—CUSTOMS OFFICIALS.

Mr. DENISON asked, 1. Whether Messrs. Clarke and Paisley are, or were employed in the Custom-house, Toronto ? 2. If so, at what date did they enter the service ? 3. What are their respective ages ? 4. Have they passed the necessary examination as provided by the Civil Service Act ?

Mr. WALLACE. There is a man named Joseph L. Clarke employed at the Custom-house, Toronto. No person by the name of Paisley is, or has been, employed at the Toronto Custom-house. Mr. Clark has been employed since the 27th November, 1893. He is forty-six years of age. He has passed the preliminary Civil Service examination.

MR. EDWARD GUILBAULT.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Bruneau) asked, Whether Mr. Edward Guilbault is employed by the Public Works Department ? If so, what is his position ? Where, and how long, has he been employed ? What is his salary, and where is his office ?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Edward Guilbault is employed by the Public Works Department in Montreal as clerk of works, and as such has charge of the different public buildings in that city, and the repairs and other works that require to be made to them. He was first appointed at $75 per month on the 1st of August, 1892, and since then his pay has been increased to $3 per day. His office is in the Montreal Post Office.

RED GRANITE.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, What proportion, if any, of the manufactured stone, valued at $32,578, stated in the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1893-94 to have been imported from Great Britain, consisted of red granite monuments or red granite in any form ?

Mr. WALLACE. Collectors are not required to return to the department, statements of the distinctive classes of manufactured stone recorded under that heading in the classification of imports. The department has no record of red granite monuments or red granite in any form as distinguished from granite or freestone, dressed, or manufactures of stone, N.E.S., and cannot supply this information.

GRANITE AND FREESTONE.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, What proportion, if any, of the 391 tons of "granite and freestone, dressed, and all other building stone except marble," stated in the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1893-94 to have been imported from Great Britain, consisted of red granite from Scotland ?

Mr. WALLACE. Collectors are not required to return to the department, statements of the distinctive classes of manufactured stone recorded under that heading in the classification of imports. The department has no record of the importation of granite and freestone, dressed, and all other building stone except marble, imported from Scotland. All imports of this nature are included under the general heading of imports from Great Britain.

JAMES ANDERSON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND asked, (a) Whether one James Anderson, of Sutton, is in the service of the Government ? (b) If so, what are his duties ? (c) How long has he been in such service ? (d) How much has he been paid for such service ? (e) What is the rate of his remuneration ?

Mr. DALY. One James Anderson, of Sutton, is not in the service of the Government.

CANAL IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Sir Richard Cartwright) asked, 1. What amount will be

required to complete the improvements now in course of being made on the several canals of the Dominion? 2. Do the Government intend to deepen the canals and channel of the St. Lawrence to any greater extent than is requisite to complete improvements now in progress?

Mr. HAGGART. In order to complete the St. Lawrence system of navigation, it will require as nearly as possible, $6,000,000. It is not the intention of the Government to deepen the canal to any greater extent than what is requisite to complete the present improvement.

RAW SUGAR IMPORTS.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. What was the total quantity of raw sugar imported into Canada during the year 1894 under 14 standard? 2. What was the total quantity in 1895, to date, under 16 standard? 3. Was all the raw sugar imported in these years refined in Canada?

Mr. WALLACE. The total quantity of raw sugar imported into Canada, duty free, under fourteen Dutch standard, for the nine months ending 28th March, 1894, was 221,218,780 lbs.; from that time until June 30th, 1894, under number sixteen Dutch standard, 82,751,029 lbs. Total, including both grades, 303,789,809 lbs. The total quantity of sugar under sixteen Dutch standard imported during the nine months of 1894-95 is 220,712,442 lbs. I cannot say whether this raw sugar was refined in Canada. As the tariff admits such sugar free without any proviso as to how it shall subsequently be dealt with, the customs has no further supervision over it.

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Mr. FRASER asked, When will the St. Peter's Canal be open for navigation?

Mr. HAGGART. The wooden floor and lock gates of St. Peter's Canal are eaten away by the sea worms to such an extent that it became imperative to renew them. To accomplish this work it is necessary to unwater the canal, to do which, dams had to be built at each end of the lock to keep out the water of the Atlantic and Bras d'Or lakes. Tenders were invited for the work, and the contract was awarded to Mr. Sylvester O'Donoghue, whose tender was the lowest. He went to work framing the lock gates, built the dams, and provided pumps with which to unwater the locks, but after several attempts to pump it out, he gave notice that he could not succeed and abandoned it. The necessary steps under the contract were taken to carry the work to completion by day's labour, at the contractor's expense. A re-letting would have caused a great loss of time, and, consequent longer obstruction to navigation. Mr. Thomas Monro, one of the department's ablest hydraulic engineers, has gone down to St. Peter's to advise with Mr. McCarthy, the engineer in charge of the work, as to the best method of overcoming the leaks which have given the contractor so much trouble, and it is expected that the works will be carried out without delay, but, at the present state of the work, it is not possible to give a date on which the canal will be opened for traffic, but the hon. gentleman may be assured that there will be no unnecessary delay.

ARTHUR H. McBRIDE.

Mr. MARA (for Mr. Corbould) asked, Was Arthur H. McBride, late warden of the British Columbia penitentiary, retired from office without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary service? If so retired, is it the intention of the Government to reinstate him?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. McBride was retired from the office of warden, but not without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary's service. It is not the intention to reinstate him.

WILLIAM A. CAREY.

Mr. MARA (for Mr. Corbould) asked, Was Wm. A. Carey, late accountant of the British Columbia penitentiary, retired from office without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary service? If so retired, is it the intention of the Government to reinstate him?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Carey was retired from the office of accountant, but not without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary service. It is not the intention to reinstate him.

VOTERS' LISTS—OUTSIDE PRINTING.

Mr. CASEY asked, What amount was paid for the printing of each voters' list, and part of list, printed outside of the Printing Bureau?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The following is the list asked for by the hon. gentleman:—Toronto Centre, $333.60; Toronto West, $886.71; Toronto East, $616.29; York West, $801.25; York East, $497.58; York North, $282.55; St. Antoine, $366.63; St. Anne's, $346.20; St. Mary's, $233.43—that being the cost of printing part of the list, the rest being printed in the Bureau; St. James', $323.28; Hochelaga, $264.62—the same remark applies to this as to St. Mary's; Maisonneuve, $420.57; St. Lawrence, $194—the same remark applies to this as to St. Mary's. This printing is done at the usual rate of 3 cents per name and 50 cents per heading.

Mr. CASEY. Per heading means?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Heading for each polling subdivision.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that all the printing of voters' lists done outside ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

AGRICULTURE—INSPECTING PHYSICIAN.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What is the name of the inspecting physician, Agriculture Department, recently appointed in place of W. S. Harding, recently superannuated ? What was his former residence ? Where does he now reside, and why has the salary been raised from $1,200 to $1,400 ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Dr. J. E. March was appointed in the place of Dr. W. S. Harding, superannuated. His former residence was St. John, N.B. His present residence is the same. The salary has not been raised. Dr. Harding received $1,200 a year, with an allowance of $600 a year for boat service, in all, $1,800. Dr. March is paid $1,400 a year including boat service.

REPORT.

Auditor General for the year ending 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Foster).

PRINTING BUREAU—REPORTS, BILLS, ETC.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. leader of the House inform us when the other reports will be brought down—for instance, the report of the Department of Railways ? I do not wish to intrude upon the attention of the House, but I may point out, with regard to the Marine and Fisheries report that it is generally brought down at a time so late in the session that it is practically useless to those members who wish to devote attention to it to gain information for the criticism of the estimates. And surely the Railways report ought to be down by this time ; I cannot understand what is keeping it back. Here we are practically at the beginning of May, and the reports which it is absolutely necessary for members to study before they can criticize the estimates, and which ought to have been in our hands before, are not yet before us. This is the beginning of the third week of the session. Ordinarily Parliament should have met in February, and the reports should have been ready then.

Mr. HAGGART. The Railways report will be down to-morrow or next day.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I had a statement with regard to all these reports, but I do not seem to have the paper by me. With reference to the Marine and Fisheries report, my hon. friend knows that the statistics are brought down to the 31st of December instead of to the 30th of June, as in the case of most of the departments.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That excuse is brought forward every year.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is a fact. My hon. friend knows that. The same is true of the Post Office report. I have a report from the Queen's Printer that, on the whole, the printing is further ahead this year than it was last year at this time. I think I can promise that all reports will be in the hands of members in a very short time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member will see that the explanation, while it might have been a good one in the month of February or March, is by no means a good one now.

Mr. FOSTER. It takes a good deal of time to tabulate these figures. The hon. gentleman knows that they do not all come in on the 31st December.

Mr. MULOCK. Speaking of the matter of printing, it seems to me that there is unnecessary delay in the printing the proceedings of this House. Take, for instance, the Public Bills and Orders. A large number of Bills have been introduced, and though a week has elapsed in some cases, there is scarcely any of the printing done, so far as the Order paper shows. The first Bill on the paper is not printed. The second, I think, is printed in English.

Some hon. MEMBERS. English and French.

Mr. MULOCK. I see ; that is printed in English and French. None of the other Bills are printed until we come to item No. 7, which is marked as printed in French. Now, I am aware that item No. 4 on the paper represents a Bill of only a page or so in length. If the Queen's Printer is to regulate the proceedings of the House by the order in which the Bills are printed, I think it is time we should know it. The Government had better see that these Bills are brought down printed in the proper order. How is it that one Bill is printed and another not printed ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have nothing to do with that.

Mr. MULOCK. Who has to do with it ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Clerk of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not admit the right of the Queen's Printer to order the proceedings of the House——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is a fair thing to say of the Queen's Printer.

Mr. MULOCK. That is going to be the result of this way of doing things.

Mr. FOSTER. The Queen's Printer is an honourable man, and I am sure he would not do such a thing as that suggested by the

hon. gentleman. The Clerk of the House has this matter in charge, and no doubt he is carrying on the work as rapidly as possible. I would not make any imputations against the Queen's Printer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think it is quite unfair to charge the Queen's Printer, who is not here to answer, with delaying the work in his charge. I spoke to him with regard to the printing for the session, and he tells me that the work is done immediately he gets the Bills from the House; and I have no doubt that he represents the case as it is. He assured me that not a moment's delay would be allowed.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no imputation against the Queen's Printer.

Mr. FOSTER. It was stated across the floor of the House that the Queen's Printer had no right to print one Bill and delay another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not an imputation against the Queen's Printer. It may be the result of the system. Is there a system followed by the Queen's Printer? Is there a system by which the work is brought out regularly? This is a question in which the House is interested, and we ought to be informed. My impression is that no system is followed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, what I resented on behalf of the Queen's Printer was what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) perhaps did not intend to say, namely, that the Queen's Printer was arrogating to himself the right to say in what order the proceedings of Parliament should be printed. The Queen's Printer does not arrogate to himself any such right or privilege, but prints the proceedings in the order in which they are received from the Clerk.

Mr. MULOCK. What I intended to say was this: the Bills are not reported in the Order paper as being printed in the order in which they stand on the paper. I am not blaming or criticizing any officer. The practical result of this is going to be that the right of members will be interfered with by the irregularity or lack of system on the part of some official outside the House. That I object to.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may be that the Law Clerk is not able to get the Bills out in order. All Bills have to go through the hands of that officer, and there may be some delay occasioned in that way. I know that such is the case with a Bill introduced in my behalf. The Law Clerk has written to me calling my attention to an omission in the Bill. It is, of course, important that Bills should be printed as introduced, and there should be no favouritism shown in priority of printing.

Mr. FOSTER.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS—DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Statement showing the several dates in the years 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895, when the Public Accounts, the Trade and Navigation Returns, and the Report of the Auditor General, were ready for distribution to members of the Senate and the House of Commons.

He said: I desire to say, in connection with this motion, that there is an order of the House relating to the issuing of these departmental reports, which seems to have been, to a considerable extent, disregarded by the Government, especially in the present year. That order was issued in the year 1887, and is to be found in the first volume of the "Hansard" of that year, page 295. It was issued on the 5th day of May, and the order with regard to the preparation of blue-books and departmental reports, is as follows:

That the rule now in force requiring the withholding of blue-books and departmental reports till the assembling of Parliament results in the suppression, often for periods of many months, of information relating to public affairs which the public interests require should be promptly made public.

That the blue-books and departmental reports for each fiscal or calendar year should in future be made public as soon as practicable after the same are prepared, and that no unnecessary delay should be permitted to interfere with the issuing of the same.

That the Finance Department cause to be inserted in the "Canada Gazette" at the close of each month a statement of the revenue and expenditure for the month, and also for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year, distinguishing between expenditure upon capital account and expenditure on account of consolidated fund, and giving statement of gross debt and net debt.

That the Customs Department cause to be inserted in the "Canada Gazette" at the close of each month a statement of exports, of imports, of immigration and of navigation for the month, and also for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year.

That the Department of Railways cause to be inserted in the "Canada Gazette" each week a statement showing the gross and net earnings of each of the Government railways for the preceding week, and also for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year.

Now, after the passage of this resolution in 1887, the departmental reports were issued with a tolerable degree of promptitude and in tolerably good season for several years; and the requirements of the House with regard to the monthly statements in the "Canada Gazette," I believe, have been pretty fairly met since the time this resolution was adopted. We have had monthly statements of the expenditure, monthly statements of the receipts, monthly statements of the condition of the debt, &c. But the spirit of this resolution with regard to departmental reports has not been observed, and notably in respect to issuing these re-

ports of the last fiscal year. We received the Public Accounts at least seven months after the close of the fiscal year; we received the Trade and Navigation Returns nine months and a half after the close of the fiscal year, and they were not issued and placed in the hands of members of this House until the assembling of Parliament this session. The Auditor General's Report, which is one of the most important of all the reports, has just been laid upon the Table to-day, in the third week of the session, and after ten months have elapsed since the close of the fiscal year. Now, this is an entire disregard on the part of the Government of the order of the House with relation to the issuing of these reports. It is unnecessary for the Government to set up the defence that this report could not have been issued sooner. They have had work performed in the Printing Bureau in the preparation of the voters' lists, which are now ready, and may not be required for months to come; the whole force of the department have been placed upon these lists, and scores of men have been brought in from outside to hasten their preparation, and the publication of the departmental reports has been allowed to stand aside during this time. Now, it is fair to presume that the intention of the Government when they entered upon the hastening of the publication of these lists, was to have an election; but if that were their intention, why should they withhold from the people the very information which was necessary for them to possess in order to be able to pass upon the conduct of the Government? Why should we not have had the Trade and Navigation Returns, a most essential report? Why should we not have had the information contained in the Auditor General's Report? Suppose we had gone to the country, and neither of these reports were issued, what sources of information would the public have had? What sources of information had the voters in this country to enable them to decide whether the Government were worthy of the confidence of the people or not? I hold that the Government in this respect has been remiss in its duty to the people, that we should have had these reports, that the fact that they are not issued till within almost two months of the commencement of another fiscal year, is a reflection upon the promptitude, upon the capacity of the Government, because it is a proof that they have failed to carry out the instructions of this House and the requirements of the law. I ask for these returns for the purpose of learning to what extent the Government have fallen short in their duty in this matter, in the issuing of three of the most important reports, the Public Accounts, the Trade and Navigation Returns, and the Auditor General's Report; I wish to know the date of the issuing of these various reports in each of the years since that order was passed in 1887. We may then be able to make a comparison between one year and another, and learn from this comparison to what extent the Government have fallen short of the discharge of their duty in this present year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the motion is passed, I would like to say a word in reference, not only to the returns indicated in the motion before the House, but to returns that have been ordered by the House. Now, last session there was a return ordered by the House, on the 10th April, to the following effect:—

A return showing the nature and number of the returns ordered by this House during the past three sessions and not yet brought down, together with the reason why they have not yet been brought down.

That return was passed on the 10th April last by this House, and up to present time it has not been brought down. On the 28th May, another return was ordered by this House, with all the form and all the dignity that the House could give in passing it, and yet the Government have not yet brought it down. You would not imagine, Mr. Speaker, that it was a long return, you would not imagine that it would entail very much hardship upon the department. It is as follows:—

A return giving a list of all the articles, with the value of each, and the total value of all, imported from the United States during the last fiscal year, for the use of the Government in the public service.

You would not imagine that the Government here would import so many things and such a variety of articles from the United States that it would be impossible to make a return of the amount of such goods imported, within a year afterwards. Now, I think this is trifling with the House, it is trifling with the dignity of the House. This is not the position a Government should occupy in their relation to the House. They have had time, ample time. Those motions did not entail a great amount of labour; if they did, there must have been a great amount of importations from the United States, and according to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, that would be a terrible offence to Canada. We would like to know exactly how much they have imported. When this House orders returns we would like to have them brought down, and I do not think the Government are treating, either their own supporters or the members on this side of the House, with courtesy, in withholding these returns. Constitutionally, I think you will agree with me that it is their duty, when a solemn order is made by the House, to obey that order. If they are not qualified to do it, or if they think it is good tactics for them to disobey the order of the House, I think the House should take notice of it, not only members on this side but members on the other side, because the

dignity of the House has been infringed upon.

Mr. McMULLEN. I waited for a few moments, entertaining the hope that the Minister of Finance would offer some explanation in reply to the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). However, the hon. gentleman does not appear disposed to make any response. With respect to the Auditor General's Report, which has been laid on the Table, I think the Government is clearly responsible for having delayed its presentation and thereby delayed business that properly comes before the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. Minister is quite aware that the duties of that committee are largely based upon the Auditor General's Report for the past year. The committee has not yet been called together, although we are in the third week of the session, and that most important committee, one of the most important as regards the public interest, has not been called upon to meet by the Minister of Finance. I think the reason is to be found in the fact that the Auditor General's Report forms the basis of the investigations held, and therefore it has not been laid on the Table. It is clear to my mind, notwithstanding statements made to the contrary, that during the early part of the year the Government were preparing for an election and not for a parliamentary session. This is clear from the fact that the blue-books and other returns are not yet ready for presentation to the House. No doubt the hon. gentleman had to visit Queen's in order to obtain an exchange of constituencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Your knowledge is imperfect.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman went to Queen's. Finding the condition of things were not very safe in King's, he had to be personally present to see if some other arrangement could be made so that he could leave that constituency, that had politically cradled him, and find another constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. What has that to do with the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman's attention was drawn away from making preparations to meet Parliament. Indeed, the Government did not at that time think of holding another session. This is a matter of vital importance to the House. It is not fair or courteous to members that the Finance Minister should in this way trifle with the House as regards the presentation of the Auditor General's Report. The hon. gentleman made a little fun in presenting the report by drawing attention to the fact that it is a report regarding which I had made inquiries. I desire to remind him that there are many other hon. members who bestow considerable study upon that blue-book as well as myself, and we find the more we study it the greater need there exists for observing evidences therein contained of extravagance. Hon. gentlemen opposite would do well to study it; outside the Minister of Finance and a few members on the Treasury benches, I question whether its pages are very carefully looked over by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is trifling with the House, it is not treating the House with the courtesy and dignity which are its due, to call Parliament together, and when members come here to attend to their important duties to find important papers such as the Auditor General's Report are not ready to lay on the Table of the House. The truth is, the Government had an idea of an election, not a session of Parliament, and it is well known that there were two rival factions in the Cabinet, one fighting for an election and another for a dissolution, the former being led by the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, who asked for explanations as to the personnel of the Cabinet, said the hon. gentleman was already full of information, obtained through the press. Hon. members are no doubt full of information, also obtained from the press, with respect to the struggle that went on in the Cabinet as to whether an election should be held or a session of Parliament. The faction that advocated a meeting of Parliament was victorious, and hon. members were commanded to attend here, and although this is the third week of our attendance, we have only to-day received the Auditor General's Report, which is one of the most important blue-books of the session. Hon. members would now like to know when the Minister of Finance is going to call together the Public Accounts Committee. Possibly he may take three weeks more before summoning the committee. Even after it has been called the Minister of Justice may adopt similar tactics to those pursued by him last year, when he raised all sorts of technical objections to the proceedings of the committee being conducted in such a manner as to reach the bottom of the inquiry being made, and time and again hon. members had to appeal to the House for further instructions in order to complete their investigations of public matters. If three weeks are allowed to elapse before the Public Accounts Committee is called together and the session is of an ordinary length, the work of the committee will not be more than half completed before the session will close. It is impossible that in order to frustrate the work of the committee, the presentation of the Auditor General's Report has been delayed three weeks. Is it because the Finance Minister wishes to prevent certain inquiries into expenditures during the past year that he has withheld this report, and now possibly may be tardy in calling together the Public Accounts Committee and allowing it to get to work? It looks very much as if it

would prove to be the case. We contend that this course is not in accordance with the ordinary usage of Parliament, and that this report should not have been kept back and the business of the Public Accounts Committee delayed for lack of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member who moved the order of the House for this information cited the Order of the House, I think, in 1887, in which certain information which up to that time had not been placed before the country in the interim, and so far as the reports of the department is concerned was not made public until they had first been presented to the House. Under this Order, the former were to be published monthly, and the latter given to the public immediately, without the formality of first laying them on the Table of the House. Now, with reference to these monthly statements. My hon. friend was good enough to say that the Order of the House in that respect had been fairly met. I ask my hon. friend whether or not that part of it has not been fully met? I think he must answer in the affirmative, that these monthly reports have been issued regularly and fully. The Order of the House has, therefore, been fully complied with, so far as that part is concerned.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not in all cases; there was a misleading statement one or two months ago regarding the surplus.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so. I think the quarrel there seemed to be that the department gave more information, and not less, than it was called upon to give. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) says that there has been a total disregard of the Order of the House with regard to the printing and making up of the departmental reports. I think his language is altogether too strong in that respect, and I do not think he will prove his charge, when the returns for which he asks have been brought down. Of course, there are years in which a larger amount of printing is done at the bureau than is done in other years, and necessarily, some portion of the work must be delayed. This has been one of these busy years at the bureau, when it became necessary to have the voters' lists printed. My hon. friend says that he thinks the Government must have had an election in their eye, and that, hence, they hurried on the printing of the voters' lists.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend said it was necessary to have the voters' lists issued, but I ask him if it would not have been better to have the voters' lists a little later and the departmental reports more promptly?

Mr. FOSTER. Whether the statement of my hon. friend is true or not that the Government had an election in their eye, I am quite sure that the Opposition had an election in their eye, and, judging from the variety and scope of their movements, they seem to have had it in both eyes; they were full of it, in fact. In times when Parliament is approaching the legal limit of its term, the voters' lists should be ready for any emergency that may occur, and, in this regard, I have no hesitation in saying that the lists were of more importance than even some of the departmental reports, and, consequently, prominence and despatch were given to their printing. An election might take place. It is impossible to guard against an election always not taking place without the departmental reports being brought down. My hon. friend seemed to think that the rule should be that no election should be fought until the departmental reports are ready for the country. That could not be always the case, because it is impossible to get these reports out for several months after the term for which they give the information has expired. An election might be brought on in that interval, and the reports could not possibly be placed before the country. I think my hon. friend will find that the departments have been reasonably diligent in getting their reports before the Printer, and I am quite sure that the Printer has used his best efforts in the work of his department in having them published as soon as he possibly could. The Report of the Auditor General is a very large volume. The Auditor General is an officer of the House. The Auditor General has his staff, and he uses it to the best of his ability, and with the greatest despatch, and he prepares his report, and it is printed, as he gets it before the Queen's Printer. The report is before the House now, and it is here, before the House could possibly have called for its use in investigating the Public Accounts, or in discussing the Estimates. My hon. friend says that the Public Accounts Committee should have been called together earlier, but I think he will find that that committee has not usually been called together any earlier than it will be this session. It would have been called together even earlier this year if hon. gentlemen opposite had not delayed two or three days in discursive and varied remarks on the debate in answer to the Address. So far as that committee is concerned, it has not been, and will not be, unduly delayed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You did not refer to the Orders of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend refers to Orders of the House which have been made, and to which the returns have not been brought down. I quite agree that returns ordered by the House should be brought down, and I will look into the complaint. One of the principal Orders was that which called for a list of articles imported from

the United States for the use of the Government. If any have been imported, they were imported by each of the departments, and the officers of the different departments would have to prepare the return, but I presume that what has really delayed that return was the search for articles imported from the United States for the use of the Government. They are, I imagine, so few, that it has taken a long time to hunt them up. So far as the Government is concerned, they have no desire to delay any of the Orders of the House, and I have given instructions to my department to prepare them with all possible diligence.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When will the Major General's Report be brought down, and where is the Major General now ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know when his report will be brought down, and I must confess to a total ignorance of the present whereabouts of the Major General.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Finance has made a very ingenious presentation of the case from his own side, and he makes use of the fact that I admitted that the monthly reports have been fairly made, and condemns me for not having given to the Government unqualified praise for having done the duty laid upon them in that respect. I qualified my remarks because on one or two occasions the information given in these monthly reports has been misleading, as was shown during the debate upon the Address. The hon. gentleman tells us, also, that the preparation of the voters' lists was a matter of more importance than the issuing of departmental reports. Solomon says, that for every purpose there is time and a season, and the issuing of the voters' lists is highly important under certain circumstances ; highly important at the proper season, and highly important when elections are about to be held ; but it is not of sufficient importance to cause the setting aside of the publication of the departmental reports under present circumstances. These reports to which I have referred should have been issued by the first day of January. There was no probability, there was no possibility, that an election would be brought on before that date, and if the Government had properly attended to its duties under the direction given by the Order of the House in 1887, the information contained in the three reports to which my resolution refers would have been in the hands of the members of this House, and in the possession of the country, by the time six months had expired from the close of the financial year, that is to say, by the 1st of January this year. The fact that the Government, in place of discharging its duty in this regard, was preparing the voters' lists, and was apparently about to ask the country to bestow that confidence in it which it refused to give to the country, in making known what its policy and what its conduct had been, was something that should hardly meet with the approval of this House. I deny the assertion made by the Minister of Finance that the issuing of the voters' lists at the time they were being prepared was of more consequence than the preparation of the departmental reports. If this House was to meet on the 18th day of April, it made no difference whether the voters' lists were ready then or at the end of the financial year on the 30th of June, but it did make a material difference to the country and to this House whether or not the departmental reports to which I refer were ready when the House met. This is special pleading on the part of the Minister of Finance. It was a matter of more importance under the circumstances to perform the regular duties of the Government and to let stand aside something that was not pressing, than to do that which was not of pressing importance and to leave that done which was essential to be placed before the public men of this country because it is information as to the condition of public affairs and as to the manner in which the Government managed its duties, which can be obtained only from those reports. I contend, Sir, that the Government are worthy of the condemnation of this House because they have failed in their duty in this respect, and have made use of powers in a way not consonant with the public interest. We have had the Government printing office worked to its fullest capacity to print these lists, and some of them have been printed at outside printing offices. The work has been rushed through with such headlong haste that I believe the lists will be found to contain many errors ; and this necessary departmental work has had to wait until the Government decided not to hold an election, and realized that the work of preparing the voters' lists was useless, or could have been postponed. When this return is brought down, I think we shall find that these reports have in previous years been issued earlier on the average than they have been this year ; and the inference we are justified in drawing from that is that the Government have not exercised this year the same diligence as in previous years.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Last session I obtained Orders of the House for three or four returns, but as yet not a single one of them has been brought down. If the Government do not intend to give us the information we are entitled to, I think they had better refuse to grant the Orders and then we shall know just what to do. Several times I went to the committee room through which the returns were to come, and I was told repeatedly that they were not there. It would be better

for the Government to refuse to grant the orders than to grant them first, and then throw impediments in the way of our getting the information.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems rather singular that the House should be called together for the despatch of business when the Government are not prepared to make the proper returns and render an account of their stewardship, as they are bound to do. They appear not to have known their own minds. They have done those things which they ought not to have done, and they appear to have left undone those things which they ought to have done.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no health in them.

Mr. MULOCK. And there is no health in them—I accept the amendment. They have prepared voters' lists which were not wanted, and left unprepared the public returns which were wanted. Now, we want to know what is the matter with the Government.

Mr. BENNETT. They are all right.

Mr. MULOCK. They think they are, when they assemble Parliament and bring us to sit here day after day with no business to discharge. What an exhibition before the country! A Government prepares for an election when it is not ready, and calls Parliament together when it is not ready. We may well ask, have we got a Government at all?

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS RETURNS—WEST KOOTENAY.

Mr. MARA moved for:

Return showing the amounts paid in Customs duties at Waneta, Nelson, Kaslo and the Boundary, Kootenay River, from 1890 to 1894 inclusive, giving the amount paid yearly at each outport.

He said: My object in moving for this return is to call the attention of the Government to the claims of that portion of the Kootenay district known as West Kootenay to be made a port of entry, instead of being tacked on, as it is at present, to New Westminster. In looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns for last year, I find that $168,150 is credited to New Westminster. Of this I am satisfied that over one-half, probably three-fifths, has been paid by West Kootenay; but not only does that district not receive credit for this large sum which it contributes annually to the revenue, but the merchants and customs officials there are subject to the annoyance and inconvenience of having their Collector of Customs living in a town five hundred miles distant. For several years past I have urged the Government to make Nelson a port of entry, and the reasons which I advanced in 1890 and 1891 hold good today. The town is situated at the foot of Kootenay Lake, it is the terminus of a railway which connects with several transcontinental lines, it has two banks, and the Provincial Government have offices there; it is, in fact, what would be called in Ontario a county town. In view of its many claims, I hope the Government will lose no time in making Nelson a port of entry for the West Kootenay district. Whatever reasons the Government may have had in the past for not doing so no longer exist.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman add to his motion the names of the Customs-house officers and the salary paid to each. That will save giving notice for another resolution.

Mr. MARA. I have no objection to the amendment, although I cannot see what bearing it has on the motion I have made. I simply wish to show the Government and the House the large amount of customs duties collected at these outports. The amount, I am satisfied, is large in proportion to the salaries, and my hon. friend from Wellington cannot make a point on that. However, if he wishes the amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. WALLACE. The Government have no objection to bring down the returns asked for at once. The attention of the Government has been called by the hon. gentleman to the importance of that district, and we have also had the importance of it brought to our attention from other sources, so that I found it necessary, during the early part of the year, to send a special officer out there, not only to regulate the various ports of entry for the collection of revenue, but also to prevent smuggling, which, I was informed, was carried on in that portion of British Columbia. The revenue received during the last year has been exceedingly large, showing the importance of that mining district, and I have received reports during the past two or three days showing a very large increase in business there, and showing that mining prospects there are developing to a greater extent than ever before. It is contemplated by the Government to make Nelson a port of entry instead of continuing it as an outport of New Westminster, and those other places will be outports of Port Nelson.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ANTICOSTI ISLAND.

Mr. FORBES moved for:

Return giving the names of the owners of Anticosti Island, and showing what coasting, fishing and other privileges appertaining to said island belong exclusively to the owners thereof.

He said: I ask for this return because it is reported by cable from London that a French syndicate is trying to

purchase the island. This island is situated in the midst of the Gulf fisheries, and is of great importance to the bank fisheries both as a baiting station and as having excellent fishing grounds within its limits. If it passes out of the control of Canada to a French syndicate, who, I am told, are acting directly on behalf of the French Government, that may be of serious consequence and frought with danger to our provincial fishermen. Within the limits of the island there are splendid shoals, on which cod and other deep sea fish gather for feeding purposes. I would ask the Government to bear in mind that it is claimed that certain coasting, fishing and other privileges belong especially to the owners of this island. It would be well, before any further steps are taken in the negotiations going on, for the Government to inquire into the matter, and ascertain the value of the island and desirability of its being retained by Canada for the benefit of our fishermen. I trust that when the papers are brought down, we will be able to prove that the island is of such importance, especially to those engaged in the fisheries, that our Government ought to retain control of it, as if it passes to the control of a foreign nation the bounty system to all fish exported therefrom and now in force in St. Pierre may be brought into practice to the injury of our fishermen. It may be made a French colony practically and French fishing vessels may make it their headquarters under the Canadian flag drawing a French bounty and thus have an undue advantage over other Canadian fishermen.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the motion, but I cannot promise my hon. friend all the information he asks for. I do not know that I can promise any of it. I do not know that we have any means of finding out or knowing who the owners of the island of Anticosti are. I do not think there are any coasting, fishing, or other privileges appertaining to the said island that belong exclusively to any one there more than they would on the mainland. Altogether we have very little information with regard to this island. Commander Wakeham is here, who knows the history of the island well, and what information we can get will be brought down.

Mr. FORBES. It is generally conceded that the fishing and coasting privileges appertaining to the island are the same as these appertaining to the mainland, but I am informed by the agents of the liquidators in London who are managing the island, that they have special privileges which were granted by treaty or other concession when the grant was made. I do not think they use them to the injury of the fishermen, but it would be well not to let these privileges fall into the hands of a foreign power.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. LAURIER. I believe there is something in what my hon. friend has said. The present owners of this island claim that they are vested with all the powers originally vested in the owners by the French Government. If I am correctly informed, this island was ceded by the French Government, and the owners claim not only rights which exist at present, but the feudal rights which existed at the time the cession was made. Under the feudal law in Lower Canada, in former years, the seignior claimed valuable concessions as to fishing, etc., but my impression is that those rights were extinguished by the settlement of the seigniorial tenure. Whether that be the case or not, I have reason to believe that the present owners claim they are entitled to the same privileges as were granted to the first owners.

Mr. FRASER. I trust the Government will lose no delay. I understood that the island was owned by some English capitalists in London. I met a gentleman who was engaged there for a part of the year in canning, and he informed me that it was owned in London, but there should be no doubt about the rights of that island, so far as the fishing interests of the Lower Provinces are concerned. I trust the Government will not lose any time in getting all information possible.

Motion agreed to.

MILTON, N.S., POSTMASTER.

Mr. FORBES moved for :

Copies of all correspondence relating to the resignation or removal of the postmaster at Milton, Queen's County, and of the appointment of a successor in the office to Mr. Francis Shields, the present acting postmaster.

He said : I had intended, in moving this resolution, to make some remarks with regard to the removal of this officer and to ask why it was that the delay has occurred in appointing a man to manage the money order department in the town of Milton ; but the hon. Minister, in his answer to the question I asked has given the reason for that delay. The hon. gentleman stated that the delay was due to the fact that the appointee to the office had not yet filed bonds satisfactory to the department. I am surprised to hear that, inasmuch as the new appointee is a man of good character and standing in the community and, I trust, will make a most worthy officer. It is a pity that the citizens of the town are deprived of the privilege of getting their money orders cashed or of getting money orders for transmission elsewhere. I do not want to call in question the motives of the Government, but it is alleged in the locality that there are other reasons for the delay than that stated, reasons which are beneficial to the party of the Government only, and relating to the late holder of the office. The motion may be dropped if it is desired.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no objection to bringing down all the papers which are not of a confidential nature relating to the matter referred to. As for the information which the hon. gentleman hinted he had received, I must tell him that it is altogether different from that which I gain from the reports of the department. In my reply to the question of the hon. gentleman, I have already given the reasons why the postmaster at Milton was dismissed.

Motion agreed to.

LIVERPOOL, N.S., HARBOUR.

Mr. FORBES moved for :

Copies of the engineer's surveys and reports made during the last three years on the harbour and river at Liverpool, Nova Scotia, and of the best means of improving the same and of deepening the channel or entrance to said river, together with any plans and estimates prepared in reference thereto, and of all correspondence to any or from any member of the Government referring to said harbour or river and survey.

He said : I move for this return for the reason that I believe that within the last twelve or fifteen months a special engineer was sent to examine the harbour of Liverpool and report on the best means of overcoming the obstruction to the entrance of the river, called the bar. The report was very carefully made by the engineer, I understand—I have not seen it, but I am so informed by the officers of the department. I think this would be a necessary document for the House to have in its possession and it would be advantageous for the people of the county of Queen's to be made acquainted with its contents. I would like to know if the Government intend to act upon the report of the engineer, but I shall have the privilege of asking with regard to that on a future occasion. It is known to the Minister of Public Works that for some years past there has been great need of dredges on the south shore of Nova Scotia. Some years ago the dredge under the control of the Public Works Department was lost, wrecked in some way, I believe. The department proceeded to get another. I believe they bought a hull, but that also was lost. Since then tenders have been called for a new dredge, which has been under construction for some years ; but we cannot expect it to be finished until after the general elections, although I am glad to know that my repeated efforts in that behalf that this dredge should be provided as promptly as possible are heeded by the Government. It is most necessary that the careful attention of the Government should be given to the harbour of Liverpool. I hope that the report, when it is brought down, will show that this work can be done efficiently and cheaply, and that the Government will carry out what the engineer proposes. I do not think that the Minister will object to lay before the House, and thus before the public generally, what plans are proposed with regard to this harbour. There may be points upon which the citizens of the place can assist the Government by suggestions based upon their local knowledge.

Mr. OUIMET. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the survey of the harbour of Liverpool has been made, and an inquiry made as to the best means of improving the facilities of entering the port. The engineer has made his report, which is now before the department, and which will be produced at an early day for the information of the hon. gentleman. I may tell the hon. gentleman that, as a result of that inquiry, the chief engineer of the department made a report on the 17th January, 1894, stating that a deep water wharf at Liverpool would cost $50,000, and the re-opening of the channel by dredging about $8,000. I am glad to be able to in- from the hon. gentleman that the new dredge for the Maritime Provinces will be ready in the course of the summer.

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, N.S.

Mr. FORBES moved for :

Return giving the names of the various manufacturing or industrial establishments in the counties of Queen's and Shelburne, Nova Scotia, as mentioned in the last census returns, together with the names of the owners thereof and employers therein.

He said : A motion for an order similar to this was passed by this House as far back as the 25th of April last. On the 29th May, as I got no satisfaction, and no return was brought down, I had the honour of writing to the chief statistician, who, in a letter of May 30th, acknowledged the reception of my letter, saying he had transmitted it to the Deputy Minister of the department, as an official answer was required thereto, the letter being of an official character. I got a most official letter, dated June 1st, 1894, from the secretary of the Department of Agriculture, in which :

He begged to inform me that my letter was submitted to the Minister of Agriculture, and Mr. Johnson's report in connection with the same; and that he is desirous of informing me that the Minister of Agriculture refers me to the Minister of Finance, and that he will personally see me respecting the same.

Well, I had the honour of calling upon the Minister of Finance, and having an interview with him, on the 1st June, and he stated to me that he was mistaken in informing me that this return was ready, that he had understood from Mr. Johnson, the chief statistician, that it was ready ; but he found now that Mr. Johnson referred to some other return, and that as the finances of the Government for this purpose were

exhausted, he would be unable to prepare it for me. That was nearly a year ago, and since that time the Government have been sitting at the receipt of custom, and have received a considerable amount of money, have received a sufficient sum to farm out lists of voters to be printed in other offices than that of the Government, and I do not understand why the return cannot be brought down. I do not know whether the Government are making any excuse in reference to the Order which I am asking for to-day; but I trust that in future the Government will see its way clear to finance enough money to bring down this return. We want to know where these manufactures are, we want to know who these bloated manufacturers might be that live in our country. We have searched for them in various ways and tried to get information, but we have found it impossible even to discover the factories themselves, nor can we get the slightest information from the statistician of the department, or the Ministers of the Crown in the House. I do not hesitate to say that we shall be able, if we get these returns, to find these factories in some shape or condition, in some place or other, within the limits of the country, if they have not emigrated. It is in order that people may know where these institutions are, and who are employed in them, and the amount of capital invested in them, that I beg to make this inquiry. It is nearly a year since the Government have had the Order of the House, and the only excuse I have heard them make is the want of finances.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that the Government desire to furnish every information that is of a proper nature, that is asked for. I have no doubt that the information which was asked for by the hon. gentleman last year would have been brought down had it not been for the circumstance which he himself has mentioned, namely, that the vote out of which the cost of preparing these returns is taken, became exhausted. As the hon. gentleman knows, it is considerable work to collect these statistics, as they are given in the census, and, consequently, it costs quite a large sum of money to do so. As to the manufacturing industries to which he has referred, and their nature, it is a subject which has been frequently discussed in the House, and made a great deal of in the country; but, after all, while not desiring to open up a wide discussion of the question, I have only to say to the hon. gentleman, and to others who have also discussed the same subject, that it is a technical attack upon the census, and is not one in which there is half as much, or a tenth as much as the hon. gentleman would make out. There must be some classification of individuals and of industries which exist in the country, and I have to say to the hon. gentleman that, although the Canadian census classified those callings as industries the classification is not nearly as wide and not nearly as inclusive as is the classification in the English census, or in the American census. It is true that many of these industries included in the census are not industries requiring the employment of a large number of people, but, all the same, they are industries employing a certain number of people; and I am sure that neither the hon. gentleman himself, nor any other hon. gentleman would ask that these should be excluded altogether from the census. As to the return, I shall see that the information is brought down as quickly as possible. But I would ask the hon. gentleman to amend the language of his motion in what, I think, is simply an inadvertance. He asks for a return giving the names of those employed in the industry. The enumerators take the names of the parties as they reside at their houses, but they do not take the names of those who are employed in each industry. We can give the number of those who are employed in the industries, but not the names.

Mr. FORBES. Certainly, that should be remembered.

Mr. FRASER. I would suggest, while the Minister is about it, that he bring down an Order I got over a year ago for the same purpose. Now, the bringing down of my order could not be a matter of finances, because a child in an infant school could do it in an hour; but if the finances do not permit, I will be pleased to pay the bill myself, because it would not be very extravagant on my part. It cannot cost much to give all the industries in my county. Let me say in connection with this, that I think there should be a method by which, when all these returns are brought down, the member who gets the motion of the House granting it, should be notified. We do not know whether we are going to get it or not, and there should be some system by which the member who obtained the motion of the House, should be notified. The returns are said to be laid on the Table of the House, but I do not find them there, and cannot get them. I know that, technically, they are laid upon the Table, but I think we should be notified where we could get them, and in that way there would not be the same difficulty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will try to have the return brought down the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think if the hon. gentleman will get out these returns which have been promised to the House, and which have been ordered by the House, he will find that the census cannot be explained just in the way that he has indicated, and which has also been mention-

ed by these gentlemen who have charge of this particular branch of the Department of Agriculture. There are, I think, if I remember rightly, 800 industrial institutions reported for the city of London. There is a very large amount of capital invested, and one would suppose, from the character of the returns, that that capital had all been directed towards these particular industries, since a protective system of taxation has been adopted. The hon. gentleman, and those who are seated upon the Treasury benches, as well as the hon. gentlemen who are supporting them in this House, and others out of the House, have maintained that a great impetus has been given to industrial enterprises in this country by this system of protective taxation. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we should have some other than the generalized statement which we find in the census returns brought down to us. If we had the information in detail, it would go very far to dissipate the contention which has, from time to time, been put forward by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Why, Sir, I believe it will be found that every seamstress who has obtained employment from some merchant tailor, or some dressmaker, for work to be done at her own house, is represented as a manufacturing establishment, an industrial enterprise. In one instance I was told of a party who was engaged in sharpening saws, who was permitted to go into a little deserted tenement where he carried on his sharpening operations, his outfit consisting of two or three files and a vice, and he is put down as a manufacturing industry owing its existence to the National Policy; and the cost of the deserted tenement, and the lien, too, are portions of the capital that are invested in this enterprise. Now, it is important to know just how far the census, in the various towns and cities of Canada have been made up in this kind of way, and when we get the returns in detail from a few centres of business, we will be able to judge more fairly, and the hon. gentlemen themselves will have an opportunity of being disillusionized with regard to the importance of their protective policy as a means of stimulating industry in this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman, who, I think, is himself suffering from a mild and pleasant delusion. The system which was adopted in connection with the census, so far as classification of those industries is concerned, is the same that was adopted in the previous census, and consequently for purposes of comparison the hon. gentleman's argument does not affect the census. In the next place, I wish to say to the hon. gentleman, as his statement has gone to the House and the country, that the increase shown in the number of employees engaged in the industries has not taken place in the smaller industries to which the hon. gentleman has referred, but the increase has taken place most materially and almost wholly in industries which have an output above $2,000, and the greater part of the increase in industries where the output is more than $10,000. If the hon. gentleman will analyse the census, he will find I am correct.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the cost of the dwelling house is taken as part of the capital, the hon. gentleman may make the amount $2,000, as the whole amount of capital is frequently a sewing-machine.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to challenge the statement made by the Secretary of State, that the Canadian census follows strictly the lines followed in the English census. Will the Secretary of State declare to the House that in the English census an establishment containing one operative is entered as a manufacturing industry?

Mr. MONTAGUE. An establishment containing one boy, who does nothing more than split kindling wood, is called a manufacturing industry in the census of other countries.

Mr. McMULLEN. Not in that sense.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am prepared to lay the English census before the House, and to show that the Secretary of State cannot establish what he has stated, for such an entry is not made in that sense. The entry is not made on the same line as the hon. gentleman has stated. With respect to returns ordered, there are many places for which returns have been ordered regarding the number of manufacturing establishments, and the information not supplied. We have the number supposed to exist in my own town, and it is found impossible to hunt up even one-half the number, and I have no doubt the same statement would apply to other places of which hon. members have spoken. But I can easily understand that the Government were unable to find money to pay for the preparation and printing of returns if the facts would not redound to the credit of the Administration. Under other circumstances, they could have obtained the money by Governor General's warrant, but it was not deemed desirable that the country should be thoroughly posted as to those infant industries, so the Governor General's warrant was not called for.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the Secretary of State be kind enough, without an Order of the House, to bring down the information asked for last year in regard to industries in the town of Wingham? In the census I find that we have manufacturing industries there. Although I have been

there 53 years, I have been unable to find half the number mentioned, and I want the Government to come to my rescue.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will give the hon. member the same answer I gave the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), that I shall be very glad to bring down the information desired.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1896, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, April, 1895.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the Message and the Estimates be referred to a Committee of the Whole House in Supply.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to inquire if the Estimates laid on the Table are now ready for use of members of Parliament ? The Minister of Finance laid on the Table of the House to-day the Auditor General's Report, but that report is not yet available to members.

Mr. FOSTER. The Estimates are ready, and the Auditor General's Report is also ready. Copies will be ready for members at supper time.

Motion agreed to.

MONEYS PAID TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing all sums of money paid to any member of Parliament, while a member of this House, outside of his sessional indemnity and mileage, from the 1st of January, 1879, to 1st of January, 1895, and to whom and for what service or purpose paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my hon. friend if he would have any objection to amending the motion by putting "1873" in place of "1879" ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection. I hope that the Minister of Finance will see that the return is brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes ; that goes as a matter of course.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing the gross amount of money on deposit in each of the Dominion savings banks, including Post Office savings banks, on the first day of April, 1895.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I desire to call the attention of my hon. friend to this fact. As regards the Post Office Savings Banks, the gross amount of money on deposit in each cannot be supplied for the 1st of April, 1895, but it can be given for the 30th June, 1894, the last date upon which the ledgers were balanced. I will bring down whatever information we have up to the last date.

Motion agreed to.

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING INTO CANADA.

Mr. MULOCK moved for :

Copies of all letters, telegrams or other communications since the 1st of January, 1893, made or sent by Donald McCauley or any Government agent or any other person in the Alberta district, to the Government or to any member, officer or employee of the Government, and of all letters, telegrams, or other communications, since said date, sent by the Government, or any member or officer of the Government, to Donald McCauley or any Government agent or other person in the Alberta district, concerning the entry of cattle into Canada from Montana.

He said : I have received advice which may or may not be correct—I am not testifying as to its correctness at this moment—to the effect that there is certain commingling of herds. Canadian cattle finding their way across to Montana and being rounded up, separated from the American herd, and brought in again to Canada in that way. It might be called smuggling, perhaps, and in that case cattle are not subject to quarantine regulations or to inspection. I have received certain particulars telling me in one case of a number of cattle said to have been brought in during the last year in that way. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, I am not now pledging myself to the correctness or otherwise of the information. I understand that Mr. McCauley is, amongst others, in the service of the Government, and I merely use his name as that of a person who would probably be in communication with the department on this matter. I am told that Mr. McCauley has made a report either to the Government direct or to his immediate superior officer, and in that case I presume it would find its way into the hands of the Government here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The records of the Department of Agriculture have been looked into and no such person as Mr. McCauley appears on the correspondence register, and I am also informed that there has been no correspondence with any person since Jan-

uary 1st, 1893, concerning the entry of cattle from Montana.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is, I suppose, not playing upon words when he uses the words "entry." Technically the word "entry" might be regarded as the legitimate entry of cattle through the Custom-house. I use the word in the largest possible sense referring to cattle coming into Canada, and I think if the hon. gentleman will look in the departments he will find records, unless some officer has been derelict in his duty. Perhaps the hon. gentleman only looked in the Customs Department under the term "entry." I have a very specific communication upon the subject, which I think is accurate, though of course I cannot say at this moment. It may be necessary for me to ask the House at a later period to bring witnesses to investigate the matter if no returns have been made. So perhaps the hon. gentleman will let the order go, and if after this explanation it is found that there are no records, perhaps he can make a statement in answer to the order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was not objecting at all to the order.

Motion agreed to.

ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RAILWAY—SUBSIDIES.

Mr. BERGERON moved for :

Return showing the amount of moneys given as subsidies to the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.

He said : My object in making this motion is simply to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that this railway, which runs from a point in the county of Huntingdon, I believe, down to Valleyfield, has not for a long time been operated in such a way as to accommodate the people of that district, who by their petitions aided the company in obtaining subsidies from the Government. At the time the subsidies were granted this railway was said to be for the public advantage of Canada and for the advantage of the people of the district through which the railway passed ; but at the present time it is of no value to those people whatever. It is a very well built road, but it has been simply operated as a part of the New York Central system for the carrying of passengers between New York and Montreal via the Canada Atlantic Railway, and the trains have always passed through the parishes in my county without stopping. Now, I am told an arrangement has been made by the New York Central with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway by which a connection is made with the Grand Trunk in Huntingdon and with the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. Constant, from which point passengers are carried into the Windsor station at Montreal. So that this line does not serve the people between Huntingdon and Valleyfield ; and those people, on whose behalf I make this motion, contend that whenever we grant subsidies for railways, they are granted because the railways are to be not only for the benefit of Canada, but for the benefit of the locality through which they are constructed.

Mr. HAGGART. The only information in the department which I can furnish is the amount of the subsidy which was granted to this railway. I believe it was $85,000 ; but the mileage being over-estimated, only $65,000 was applied, and the rest has lapsed. This subsidy, I suppose, was given to this railway for the reason that it would help to develop that particular section of the country, and the hon. gentleman states that it is now being used entirely as a through line, and that its trains do not stop at all in his county. It is entirely out of the power of the Government to remedy that. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could suggest some remedy in the form of an amendment to the Railway Act, which would provide that the railways to which Government subsidies are granted should forever afterwards be obliged to a certain extent to accommodate the people of the district through which they run, and be under the control of the Department of Railways in some way. At present we have no control over them.

Mr. LAURIER. This is another case which shows the necessity of putting some limitation or restriction upon the lavish manner in which we have been supplying money to railway companies. It is the second case which has come before the House this session, of railways which we have subsidized, turning out to be of no benefit to the public whatever.

Mr. EDGAR. Surely the Minister of Railways cannot contend that it was not in the power of the Government when they made this grant under Order in Council to attach conditions to it which would have compelled this railway company, if they expected to receive the grant, to give the public proper service. That is where I think the Government have been at fault in their dealings with a great many of these railway subsidies. Nothing could be more pitiful than the Minister of Railways, though controlling a majority in this House, getting up and telling one of his own supporters that the Government are absolutely powerless and can do nothing to help those people, after having given $65,000 of public money to this railway. I believe the Government are responsible for having omitted to protect the public when making these grants.

Motion agreed to.

TARIFF STATEMENT.

Mr. EDGAR moved for :

Statement showing : 1. The several items on which duties have been increased by the Canadian tariff, from 1878, up to this date. 2. The date of the increase. 3. The amount of the increase on each item, whether specific or ad valorem. 4. The total amount of the duties which have been paid into the public treasury by reason of such increase.

He said : This motion is on very much the same line as the one carried the other day on motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). He moved for statements showing the reductions in the Canadian tariff, while I move for a statement showing the increases. The only difference between the two is that the reply to this motion is much simpler, as it does not require any elaborate calculation, as in the case of reductions, to show what would have been paid if those reductions had not been made. We have simply to show what the increased payments have been under these increased rates ; and I am sure, after what the hon. leader of the House has told us to-day about the earnest desire of the Government to deal fairly with all the orders of the House and bring down the returns with great promptitude, that they will take occasion to justify that statement by allowing this return to be brought down at least as promptly as the return moved for by the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. WALLACE. The only objection that could be made to the motion is that it involves an enormous amount of work.

Mr. EDGAR. That is what I thought.

Mr. WALLACE. I have a report from the department which says that it would take three expert clerks three months to prepare this return, that the officers of that branch are now working over-time, and that they would have to lay aside their regular work to prepare this return.

Mr. EDGAR. Can the hon. gentleman estimate how long it will take to show the reductions made which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) moved for ?

Mr. WALLACE. The reductions are very large in amount. On sugar it is many million dollars, and on teas the same.

Mr. EDGAR. I am sure that this return is one of very great importance, and that if it does cost a little money the money will be very well spent. I do not advocate extravagance, but I think here is a case where information of great importance to the people should be obtained, even if it takes two or three extra hands to get it ready.

Mr. FOSTER. I would point out another objection. That is, when the hon. gentleman does get the return, he cannot, by any manner of means, have information which would be satisfactory to himself or any one else, as regards the total amount of the duties which have been paid in to the public treasury by reason of such increase. If the hon. gentleman can show any possible way by which he can get a definite, satisfactory answer to that question, he will do more than I possibly can. You can tell what the duties have aggregated on cheese or coffee, or hardware, but it is impossible to tell what duties have accrued on the different items in a list of over a thousand articles by reason of an increase of one per cent, or a dollar a ton. The many variations both in values and quantities make that impossible. If the hon. gentleman will read the Budget speech of my predecessor in the regime of Mr. Mackenzie, he will see that my predecessor found it impossible to declare to the House what was the exact effect of any addition he made to the duties. The first three items can be easily given, and the information is definite, but the last item is one which will be of no earthly use as a comparison or as a means of exact information.

Mr. LAURIER. This is an objection which, if there is anything in it, should have been taken on a former occasion. The motion of my hon. friend is similar to one which was carried a few days ago, except that in his motion, the word "increase" is used, whereas, in the former motion, the word "decrease" appears. If the hon. gentleman will refer back to the motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) he will find that it calls for a statement showing the several items on which the duties had been reduced from 1879 up to this date. The present motion asks for the increases, instead of the reductions. Instead of asking for the dates of the reductions, he asks for the dates of the increases. Instead of asking for the amount of the reduction on each item, he asks for the amount of the increase. Instead of asking for the total amount of duties which would have been paid into the public treasury if such reduction had not been made, taking as a basis the quantities imported each year since the reduction of such duties, he asks for the total amount of the duties which have been paid into the public treasury by reason of such increase. The motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse was carried without objection the other day. It was very plain why this motion was carried. It was to furnish a campaign document intended for campaign purposes, which would show the reductions made by a paternal Government ; but when we ask for the counterpart, when the Government is asked to show not only the reductions, but the increases, and the consequences of the increases, my hon. friend says that is going to complicate matters, and give a great amount of work. Well, the amount

of work will be the employment of three clerks for three months, and I hope the country can yet afford to stand that expense. If we have a deficit of five million dollars or six million dollars, this additional expenditure will not increase it very much, and it will not be too much to give for the information.

Mr. WALLACE. With regard to the motion to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I stated in the House at the time that it would not be possible to furnish the information asked for by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). I quoted the fourth item of his motion, asking for the total amount of duties which would have been paid into the public treasury had the duties been maintained, taking as a basis the quantities imported this year since the abolition of such duties. And I said that in the revision of the tariff last year we had made, in many cases, an entirely different classification, so that it would not be possible to give all the information asked for.

Mr. LAURIER. The motion carried all the same.

Mr. EDGAR. I have looked up the reference, and I find that this remark of the hon. gentleman was not made on the motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse concerning the reductions in the tariff, but was made in reply to another motion, asking for a return of the items upon which the duties had been totally abolished.

Mr. WALLACE. The same principle applies.

Mr. EDGAR. But the hon. gentleman did not apply it to this motion.

Mr. WALLACE. I did. I remember quite distinctly saying that the same objection would apply to the other.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, "Hansard" does not say so. All we find in "Hansard" is the suggestion by the hon. gentleman that the amount of the reduction on the abolition of duties be included.

Mr. WALLACE. I said in addition to that, that the same objection would apply to this motion as to the other.

Mr. EDGAR. I did not hear it, and the "Hansard" reporters did not hear it. However, in order that there may be no difficulty in getting information, I would be quite willing to leave out item four, and take only the first, second and third paragraphs of the motion. I can move for item four at another time, if, on looking into the matter, we find there is less difficulty than the hon. gentleman imagines.

Mr. FOSTER. No use getting it if it is no use.

Mr. EDGAR. No. With the permission of the House, I would ask that the fourth paragraph be struck out.

Mr. MULOCK. If the rejection of the fourth paragraph is to result in there being no return at all, it is better to have it dropped. But the return will be incomplete without it. We are told by the Government that the work involved in preparing a list of the increases of duties and the gross amount collected from the people by reason of these increases, will be so onerous that it will take the available staff three months to prepare it. According to the Controller of Customs, it will take three expert clerks three months to add up the amount extracted by this system from the people. That is an important, a significant admission. We have it for the first time now. Heretofore, it has been customary for hon. gentlemen to go on the platform and tell the people that they had lowered the tariff, that they had prepared such a beneficent tariff that no matter what it might be on the statute-book, it resulted in cheapening all the necessaries of life. Now we have the Controller of Customs telling us that the increases are so enormous in detail and in the aggregate, that they have not sufficient staff in the department to add up the figures in the next three months, so as to inform the people what these increases amount to. That information is, consequently, to be withheld from the people. We are to have a statement showing the reductions, but it is not possible for the Government to show the total amount of increases. They find no difficulty whatever in making a statement of the reductions, because these are so comparatively infinitesimal that the Government could not offer any reasonable excuse for refusing to give them; but when they are asked to show the other side and furnish a return which will discredit the statements they made during the late political campaign, they have not got sufficient staff to compile that information.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think both of these motions ought to be amended. The one before us should be amended now, and a supplementary return moved for with regard to the other. We should have a return showing the increases and the decreases in the tariff between 1873 and 1878 as well. It would add considerably to the cost of the return to get the increases during that period, but the decreases would cost nothing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with the Secretary of State that there should be an amendment in that direction and that it will require more force on the staff. There are more Cabinet Ministers than there used to be, and some of them might be employed to work

out this problem. It would at least have the advantage of keeping them at home. I don't know that the Controller ought to seek refuge in Uncle Sam's domains, at critical periods in the history of the country, leaving the country to get on as best it may. I would give that hon. gentleman more work in order to keep him busy and keep him at home and out of mischief, rather than allow him to go to the United States. I don't want Ministers going to Washington for every little thing that turns up, even to avoid an election campaign. I would suggest that not only should the return cover the cases where the change was made from specific to ad valorem, but also those in which the duties were changed back from ad valorem to specific. We saw a good deal of that last session. I examined into the matter pretty closely during the recess, and I found that nearly all the items that were changed from specific to ad valorem were changed back from ad valorem to specific in the committee. Another irregular thing is that there were six more items in the Bill as finally passed than were in it as passed by the commiteee. I do not know whether the Controller found the extra ones in Washington or not, but certainly I can find no record of them in "Hansard."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

BONAVENTURE—COMPULSORY PILOTAGE.

Mr. FAUVEL moved for:

Copies of all correspondence of the pilot examiners of the county of Bonaventure with the Department of Marine and Fisheries since 1890, and petitions to the said department from the inhabitants of the said county regarding compulsory pilotage.

He said: In support of this motion I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the facts. We have a new Minister of Marine and Fisheries, having been deprived of the services of the one who formerly held office. I am not in favour of compulsory pilotage throughout the country. I think we should open our ports to the mercantile navies of the world, and do away with compulsory pilotage, in order to attract navigation to our ports. But the grievance I have to bring before the House is this: The county of Bonaventure where I reside, lies between two provinces, New Brunswick on one side, Quebec on the other. In the province of New Brunswick they have compulsory pilotage, and on the north side of the Baie des Chaleurs there is no compulsory pilotage. An Order in Council was adopted appointing three examiners of pilots in my county, and they have adopted some laws and formulated some rules which have been sent forward to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, asking that, in order to encourage suitable men to adopt pilotage as a business in the county of Bonaventure, compulsory pilotage should be adopted for that county as it is on the other side of the Baie des Chaleurs in the province of New Brunswick. On the south shore there are the ports of Caraquet, Bathurst, Dalhousie and Campbellton, and the sum of $1 per foot is exacted for pilotage dues in those ports, whereas on vessels coming to load on the north shore, there is no compulsory pilotage, and those following the business of pilotage have no work to do, for vessels coming into those ports refuse to take pilots. Why should the Minister of Marine and Fisheries decree and an Order in Council be passed, that pilotage should be compulsory on one side of the bay and non-compulsory on the other? Some of my constituents feel this to be a grievance, and have petitioned that the same rule be applied on both sides of the Baie des Chaleurs. As a ship-owner, I am speaking against my own interests, but as an Englishman I want fair-play for all. I would ask that the Order in Council should be passed carrying out the recommendation of the board of examiners establishing compulsory pilotage for vessels of a certain tonnage. The only reason why there is a difference on the two sides of the bay is that local influence has been brought to bear by large ship-owners who do not wish to pay pilotage for their ships. But as a matter of justice, if it is compulsory on one side it ought to be compulsory on the other.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not clearly understand the hon. gentleman whether he insists upon compulsory pilotage in the harbours of Bonaventure or not, or whether his point is that he wants to have the same rule applied on both sides. The question of pilotage, I understand, has been dealt with a good deal from a local point of view in the public interest. Representations come from certain harbours, and if they strongly insist upon optional pilotage, and that seems to be in the public interests, optional pilotage is adopted. We have compulsory pilotage in the harbour of St. John, for instance. An investigation has lately been held there with a view to decide which is best in the public interest, compulsory or non-compulsory pilotage. A full investigation has been held and testimony taken on both sides, and the report is expected every day. So far as this motion is concerned, all that I can say is that the papers will be brought down and the subject will receive every consideration.

Motion agreed to.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON moved for:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and reports in regard to making Point Tupper the terminus of the Cape Breton Railway on the Strait of Canso, and with respect to the construction of a branch line of the Government railway to Hawkesbury.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman say what is the length of the proposed line talked of in his motion?

Mr. CAMERON. The proposed line is about half a mile.

Motion agreed to.

CATTLE TRANSPORT THROUGH U. S.

Mr. McMILLAN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and papers by or on behalf of the Dominion Government with the United States authorities, since the last session of Parliament, respecting permission to transport Canadian cattle over American territory for shipment to Great Britain from American ocean ports, and copies of any regulation respecting the same.

He said: The Government have received great credit in some quarters for making arrangements whereby Canadians can transport their cattle through American territory in bond to Portland, whence they may be shipped to Europe. I speak under correction if I am wrong, but I have been led to believe that it was the Grand Trunk Railway and not the Government that has been able to get this concession from the American Government. Now, I hold that the Government should take some steps to make further regulations whereby we may be allowed to send our cattle to Boston or to New York. When we have to send them to Portland, we are confined to one railway and to one shipping company that takes cattle from Portland to the old country. If we were allowed to take our cattle to Boston or New York, besides being allowed to take them through American territory during the winter when we cannot ship from Montreal, we would get the advantage of competition between different railway lines, as well as having the right to ship from American ports. Now, if I am correct in stating that it was through the Grand Trunk Railway that this arrangement was made, I must say that the Government of Canada have been very neglectful of the agricultural interests when they did not approach the American Government to get this arrangement made at an earlier date. Time and again hon. members have brought before this House the benefit it would be to Canadian farmers if we could get our cattle shipped in bond through the United States to American ports. If the Government have ever made an attempt in that direction and failed, it shows that it is high time that other people should take their places, because it shows that a railway company is doing better for the agricultural interests than the Government themselves. It is a striking commentary on the Government that makes such large expenditures of money in order to procure facilities whereby the people may take their manufactured goods out of this country to foreign countries. I have been very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, at hearing some statements that have been made. I am glad the hon. Minister of Finance is in his place, as I want him to hear what I have to say. I was never so much astonished as when I saw a statement he made before the Colonial Commissioners that we in Canada had been utterly unable to furnish British Columbia with the meat that they required, especially mutton. Let me say, that after visiting that country I could not understand the reason why the Minister made such a statement, because they had only to turn from Calgary across the Rocky Mountains, the cattle that go from Fort Macleod east, in order to supply British Columbia with all the beef, at least, that they require. The quantity of American mutton that goes into British Columbia is very small, indeed. But this Government are willing to sacrifice the farmers' interests in order to carry out a pet idea of theirs, and so they have been unwilling to approach the American Government in order to make such arrangements as would really benefit the Canadian farmers and the cattle interest of both the east and west without costing one cent of money. I do hope that the Government will take the question up and get further arrangements made whereby we can ship cattle from Boston or New York, which will give us not only a choice of routes, but competition between companies, both for carrying them through American territory and across the ocean.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is unquestionably an important matter, and I think the country will feel indebted to my hon. friend for moving for these papers. I expected that some hon. gentleman would rise to reply on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, but the Government do not appear at all disposed to say anything in explanation of their indifference with regard to providing facilities for the exportation of cattle from Canada. Any person who knows anything about the exportation of cattle must know that during the winter season the stock has got to take a long route by rail to Halifax, which unquestionably is a detriment to the animals which have to stand in the cars during that long journey. It is singular that the Government have not taken the necessary steps to secure from the Americans a relaxation of their quarantine regulations regarding cattle for export from Canada through the United States to England. For some years this arrangement has been in force, and the result is that our Canadian exporters have been subjected to very high rates of freight, rates in excess of those that have been charged from Portland and Boston, and some other American ports. The reason of this was that the whole export trade of this Dominion in cattle was virtually focussed at the port of Montreal. Exporters had no choice of route, because there was no competition. The steamship com-

panies, of course, had the right amongst themselves, whether they did it or not, to arrange as to prices and to space, and no doubt they took advantage of the circumstances to charge increased prices. It is certainly to be regretted that the Government have not seen it their duty to make an effort to secure facilities for the exportation of cattle by the ports mentioned by the hon. member who made this motion. What he says is quite correct. The Government have made arduous efforts in the way of securing facilities for the export of manufactured goods from this country. They have sent Mr. Larke to Australia at an annual salary of $3,000 per year, and his travelling expenses, in order to promote trade with that country. As it is now six o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and reports in the Railway Department, relating to the construction of a siding or flag station on the Intercolonial Railway, at or near the River Inhabitants, in the county of Inverness, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Statement showing the names, salary and position of all persons employed, in a non-permanent manner, in the Public Works Department, from 30th June, 1893, up to this date.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Statement showing the amount paid for work done during the last two years at the Military Riding School at the city of Montreal, the nature of such work, the names of the persons who performed it, and all correspondence in relation thereto.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Statement of all sums paid for repairs and work done at the Montreal city post office, within the last two years, the names of persons to whom such sums were paid, and all correspondence in relation to the performance of such work.—(Mr. Tarte.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 30th April, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to get some information from the hon. leader of the House on the subject of the negotiations pending between the Dominion and Newfoundland, which I asked a question or two about the other day. The hon. gentleman then informed me that it would not be in the public interest that the details of those negotiations should be made public; and he went on further to give the assurance that the terms would be submitted to this House simultaneously with their submission by the Newfoundland Government to the Newfoundland Legislature. Now, there are one or two points upon which I think we ought to have information which the hon. gentleman could give, and which it would be decidedly in the public interest should be given. One of these points the hon. gentleman may consider to come within the proviso he attached to his remarks the other day. That point is whether a demand was made by the Newfoundland Government that in case of union a bounty should be paid by the Dominion on fish exported from that province, and whether any term had been inserted in the provisional terms binding Canada in any way to pay such a bounty. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to state the details, but simply the fact. But there is a point very much more important than that on which I think this House and the country at large ought to be informed, and that speedily.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Thomas McGreevy, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Quebec West, introduced by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Fréchette.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I notice in the correspondence from Newfoundland, published in the Dominion newspapers of yesterday, that a semi-official statement has been published in Newfoundland to the effect that the Newfoundland delegates to Canada demanded that this bounty should be paid. The correspondence does not state to what extent the demand was complied with or whether it was complied with at all: but the inference is left from the reading of the despatches that it has been complied with, and the people of Newfoundland have had pressed upon them the fact of this concession as one of the reasons why they should enter confederation. But there is a point that seems to be vastly more important than this—a point going to the root of the whole negotiations.—that is, that it is not contemplated to submit the terms of union to the people of Newfoundland at all, but to carry them through the existing legislature there, who were not elected on the terms of union, and never had the question before them. If this is so, it is a most important point. The hon. gentleman may say that the terms of union do not contain anything relating to this point at all. That is what I want to know, because I think there ought to be a provision of that kind in them providing for the submission of the terms of union to the electorate, and the opinion of this House

should be expressed in no uncertain voice upon that point. We have already had one province legislated into this Dominion, unconstitutionally in a sense, constitutionally in another sense, but certainly against the will of the people. I think it is not the desire of any one in this House to have another Nova Scotia difficulty such as this Dominion had to contend with once before. The reasons given why the terms of union should not be submitted to the people of Newfoundland are the most childish, and they will not bear a moment's thought or consideration. One is that the people down there have no money to pay for an election. That seems childish and ridiculous in the extreme. But the next reason even beats that. It is something appalling to have it said that the people are not in a position, that they are unfit to pass judgment upon the point at all. I would read from the correspondence——

Mr. IVES. If my hon. friend will permit me, I would like to ask whether this speech is in order upon the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman proposes to conclude with a motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the objection is raised, I shall conclude with a motion. I did not wish to do more than call the attention of the Government to these two or three points, and I am only speaking long enough to make them intelligible. The correspondence from which I have obtained my information further says:

There is another consideration which renders it most undesirable that the question should be decided by the people at the polls. If the election is to be rushed through in three weeks, it is utterly impossible in that time to inform the people, especially in the outlying districts, of the nature and advantages of the terms offered, so as to enable them to pronounce an intelligent judgment in the matter. At present they are totally ignorant regarding the question, and saturated with the old ridiculous notions and prejudices. The bulk of them could not be got to understand the danger in which we are, and the consequences of failing to meet our liabilities on the 1st of July. They would vote, therefore, recklessly, and so precipitate ruin. The antis, who are for the most part irresponsible persons, know this, and calculate on winning by an appeal to their prejudices and passions. Such a great and important question, therefore, should not be submitted for decision to such a tribunal, who are utterly unprepared to judge it on its merits.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope I speak for every member of this House, on either side, when I say that there is not a man here who would not repudiate the suggestion contained in these remarks. If the people of Newfoundland are not to come into this Dominion of their own free will, after having had a fair and honest opportunity to pass judgment on the terms it will be an evil day for the Dominion of Canada. We cannot afford to repeat the experiment we once tried in Nova Scotia, which left a deep feeling in that province against Canada, which has not passed away to this day. The fires are smouldering there yet, and could be fanned into a flame in a moment. It would be a very serious thing for Canada if such an experiment should be repeated in the case of Newfoundland. I therefore hope that I may be able to hear from the hon. gentlemen that, with the knowledge they have of the full consequences which flowed from forcing Nova Scotia into the union against her will, provision has been made in the terms for the submission of those terms to the people of Newfoundland before the House there will have power to carry them into effect and bring about a union with Canada. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. I am somewhat surprised at my hon. friend. I did not think that he would, on newspaper rumours or writings, or correspondence or telegraphic despatches to the press, without one iota of official basis and not purporting to have any official basis, undertake to precipitate a discussion here with reference to the negotiations between Canada and Newfoundland; and thus, by obtaining some statement regarding such rumours and reports, hope to come a little closer, each day, I suppose, to what are the terms which have been discussed between the two countries and which have to be kept secret for the present by the Governments of both countries. There is not a word in what the hon. gentleman has read to show that the Government of Newfoundland or the delegates, who form the majority of the Newfoundland Government, have divulged one sentence of the negotiations between the two countries. There is not the least sign of that. It is all simply newspaper correspondence, telegraphic rumours, press despatches, not coming from any official source whatever, and not purporting to have any official authority. Out of this, the hon. gentleman has manufactured two grievances. One is by implication against the Canadian Government, that they have promised a bounty. Another is that they have allowed Newfoundland to be its own judge as to what position its Government should adopt with regard to the acceptance or submission of any terms which might be agreed upon, and he bases this grievance on the supposition, taken from the newspaper correspondence, that the Government of Newfoundland is going to take a certain course. There is not one iota of official information in what the hon. gentleman has quoted to show what the intention of the Newfoundland Government is, and what the hon. gentleman desires to find out is whether this Government, in discussing the terms, have assented to any such proposition as that embodied in the telegraphic despatches which the hon. gentleman has

read. Now, I must say, in the first place, what I said before, that it is not proper for the Government to give us, and must refuse to give to the House at present—and I do so with a full sense of the responsibility attaching to that declaration—anything with reference to the negotiations which have taken place between the delegates of the two Governments, or anything with reference to what terms were discussed and what were or were not agreed upon. I do not think my hon. friend will press that. I do not think it would promote the successful outcome of these negotiations, which we both desire, and I do not think I can give any categorical answer to my hon. friend. I do not think he has any right to ask, upon mere newspaper reports, that we should do so here before the Newfoundland Government is prepared to lay the terms before its legislature. I might say to my hon. friend that what we have agreed to do, is to lay simultaneously before both Houses the negotiations, and we shall adhere to that agreement.

Mr. LAURIER. The House and the country, I am sure, will regret the attitude taken by the Government on this occasion. I quite recognize the principle that details of the negotiations should not be laid on the Table at present. But there are certain broad principles which are supposed to underlie these negotiations, and when it is stated in one of the organs of the Government that the negotiations are to be concluded in a manner altogether foreign to what we are entitled to expect, it is the duty of my hon. friend and of every member of the House to ask whether or not these principles are to be adhered to or violated. I agree with my hon. friend that it is perhaps a misfortune to us that we should have to take information from the organs of the Government instead of from the Government themselves. The hon. gentleman says the details are not to be communicated to the House until the proper time, but he would not violate any secret of office or any principle if he would inform the House at present that no official negotiations are to become binding until the people of Newfoundland have been called upon to pronounce on the question. I do not say that the people of Canada should be called upon to give their opinion, because the people of Canada years ago determined to take Newfoundland into confederation as soon as Newfoundland was ready. That is a part and parcel of the treaty of confederation. Not so, however, with the people of Newfoundland, and certainly I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman will not say that on no consideration will he be a party to any agreement which would force Newfoundland against her will into confederation. Much as I believe confederation would be desirable, I would object to the people of Newfoundland being forced into it as the people of Nova Scotia were. It would be in the interests of both parties to say at once that there is nothing to be feared in that respect, but that the popular will must be ascertained before sanction is given to any negotiations between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I confess I am astonished at the position taken by the hon. gentleman, because while we have not asked him to state to the House what are the terms contained in the offer of the Government, we have asked him whether certain statements which have been sent abroad by the newspaper press representing the Administration are true.

Mr. FOSTER. And when you have your answer to that, you will have something of the terms.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sufficient for the days is the evil thereof. If there was anything of interest to the people at large, anything which we think highly improper or unconstitutional and that further requires elucidation, of course this House would be derelict in its duty if it failed to inquire of the Administration what course the Administration was taking. I admit the Administration is the proper organ of Parliament for the purpose of carrying on these negotiations, but I contend the Administration is after all but the organ of Parliament. It is subordinate to Parliament; it is responsible to Parliament for the manner in which it discharges the duties constitutionally imposed upon it. If to-day there was any report that the Government of England, in its negotiations, intended ceding away to some foreign state an important portion of the Empire, does any one suppose that the rule which requires Parliament not to intervene in the negotiation of a treaty would apply in such a case as that? Would it stop Parliament from making inquiry as to whether the Government would be likely to take a course permanently detrimental to the Empire? Nobody would maintain such a proposition. The questions put by my hon. friend are perfectly apposite questions on the present occasion and should be answered. The hon. Minister of Finance gives us an answer which shows the views of the Government upon this question. He in fact says, that whether the people of Newfoundland are to be consulted or not is a question which concerns Newfoundland, and that it is a question for Newfoundland to determine. Sir, I deny that proposition: I maintain that this House is interested in that question, that this House is interested in knowing, whether the Government that are negotiating on behalf of Newfoundland are taking a course without the approval of the inhabitants of Newfoundland. If Newfoundland comes in as a discontented province, does any one pretend to say that it would not seriously affect the future of the union? Therefore, Sir, we are not less in-

terested in this matter than Newfoundland is. Those who desire the annexation of Newfoundland—and I suppose that every member of this House is willing that Newfoundland shall be admitted upon certain conditions, upon conditions that have already been foreshadowed upon this side of the House—are not willing that Newfoundland shall be dragged into union by force or fraud or importunity or purchase, or in any other way contrary to the will of the people. That being so, we say that the hon. gentleman ought to inform us whether it is proposed to take Newfoundland in against the wishes of the great majority of the people. There is another important question my hon. friend has put. The attention of the Government is called to the fact that it is proposed, on behalf of Newfoundland, to pay for all time to come a large amount as fishery bounties to the people of Newfoundland to enable them successfully to enter into competition with the fishermen of France. If that is so have we not the right to know it ?

Mr. FOSTER. You will know it in due time.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says we shall know it in due time. If the Government is to commit treason against the people of this country, are we to wait until that treason is effected before we speak ? I say, no. If the Government are making an onerous bargain, one that would be adverse to the interests of the people of this country —a people already burdened and scarcely able to keep their heads above water, as the hon. gentleman knows, as the state of the hon. gentleman's treasury at this monent discloses—if that is so, is it not evident that this House has long been derelict in its duty in allowing the Government to assume absolute control of its affairs and to grant or withhold such information as may seem to it proper ? Sir, the Government of this country has passed into the hands of men who are not capable of conducting the country's affairs. The hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches are not qualified for the duties of Ministers of the Crown, and this House would be derelict in its duty if it did not watch the proceedings of these gentlemen at every step to see that the interests of the party whom the Administration represents and undertakes, unsuccessfully, to lead, and the interests of the country are not being betrayed in the negotiations being carried on at this moment. I say that the House is entitled to the information which my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has asked for from the Administration.

Mr. WELDON. I think that the conduct of the Administration will compare favourably with the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) on this occasion. No more proper answer than that given by the Minister could have been given. The Ministry who undertake, on behalf of Canada, the negotiations with Newfoundland must take the responsibility for those negotiations, and afterwards must answer to this House. They are not bound to communicate at this time the information demanded by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). There is no hon. member in this House who knows that better than the hon. member for Bothwell, whose studies make him familiar with parliamentary law and practice. There is not one of the two hundred and odd members who sit here from whom such expressions come with such impropriety as from that hon. gentleman. One would suppose, to hear the hon. gentleman, that this Parliament and this country were bound hand and foot by the negotiations already entered into. Does the hon. member not know that every statement made, every proposition agreed to, every undertaking given by the Ministers of the Crown in Canada which may lead, at a future day, to confederation with Newfoundland, is subject to the ratification of this Parliament ? Where, Mr. Speaker, is the danger ; where is the cause for alarm ? I should not have thought it necessary for the hon. gentleman to take the people of Newfoundland under his protection. But the point he raises can be discussed in its own time when this House is asked to ratify the terms of union. If he finds that the people of Newfoundland have not been protected by the Administration and Legislature of Newfoundland, if her Ministers who have represented her are unequal to their work and do undertake to bring the province into confederation without a popular vote, the hon. gentleman, if he will bide his time, will have an opportunity in this House to make his objection. But if he undertakes to protect the people of Newfoundland from their own Administration, if he seeks to take them under his wing at this time, he has no means of knowing but that his kindness will be wasted. I listened with surprise to the statement of the hon. gentleman for Queen's that the repeal feeling in Nova Scotia, after 28 years of union, still existed. The hon. gentleman says that the embers of discontent are still there. Mr. Speaker, they are as dead as the ashes as Julius Caesar. That was proven eight or nine years ago when Mr. Fielding appealed to the province on the cry of repeal, and managed to get a majority by a snap vote. But the next year, when the province was roused, he got his answer, and he crawled away into a hole and admitted that the repeal feeling was dead. I live half the year in the province of Nova Scotia, and I claim to speak with as much authority, though I claim no more authority, than the hon. gentleman from Queen's. From my knowledge of the case I flatly but respectfully contradict his statement and say thankfully that the repeal sentiment is hopelessly dead in Nova Scotia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may or may not be true—of that I cannot speak—

that the repeal sentiment in Nova Scotia is dead as Julius Caesar, but I do know that funeral obsequies of that sentiment cost Canada a great many millions of dollars in the past and may cost her a great many millions of dollars in the future. Now, Sir, I beg to point out that my hon. friend has not asked for information as to details, at any rate he expressly intimated that he was prepared to accept the explanation of the Government on the one point which might be called a point of detail—although a point of grave importance. But there remains the question of principle, upon which this House has had ample experience and full warning, and if the Government is going to disregard the example which was set us by the unfortunate case of Nova Scotia a good many years ago, that is quite another matter. Sir, we had our warning in that case of the extremely evil results that always follow from dragging a free people into confederation by a catch vote of their Parliament without referring the question to the people. So far as the provinces of Ontario and Quebec were concerned, the matter was kept before them, as I well remember, for several years. The amplest discussion took place in Parliament and in the press. Speaking for my own province, I believe I am literally correct in saying that not one single petition, not one single manifestation of popular disapproval was made from Ontario against confederation. Had there been any expression of disapproval, we should have felt it our duty, I believe, to consult the people of Ontario. In the case of Nova Scotia we know that there were these expressions of disapproval. I believe that the greatest and most numerously signed petitions ever presented to the Crown by any colony were those from Nova Scotia against confederation laid before the British House of Commons and presented to Her Majesty by the late Joseph Howe. In this case, the danger is greater still. I believe I am right in saying that the proposition for union with Canada was presented to the people of Newfoundland—yes, my friend beside me tells me that this question was before the people of Newfoundland years ago—and decided in the negative. Under such circumstances it is in the highest degree important that it should be distinctly and clearly understood, and that no time should be lost in letting it be understood by the legislature of Newfoundland, that the opinion of this legislature is that the people should be consulted. I say that my hon. friend, in doing as he has done, has discharged his duty to Canada and his duty to Newfoundland as well. I spoke of the mischiefs which arise upon a Parliament being manipulated, or the possibility of a Parliament being manipulated and thereby bringing about a union against the wishes of the people, as exemplified in our own case. There is a more important case than that, and one more widely known, in English history. There is a far greater example of the effect of neglecting the wishes of the people and deliberately purchasing—as we know to our cost, they can be purchased upon occasion—the representatives of the people in order to bring about a political union which the people did not approve. What is the ultimate cause of the great question agitating England to-day, but the result of the proceedings of Lord Castlereigh a hundred years ago in dishonestly bringing about a union between Great Britain and Ireland, to which the majority of the people, Protestant and Catholic alike, were well known to be opposed? We do not want to have another spectacle such as that in the British Empire, least of all do we want to have it in Canada; and therefore I say my hon. friend is in his right, that he is quite justified in what he says and that he shows he understands and appreciates the true bearings of this question, when he takes the earliest opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the fact that it is rumoured, and, we fear unfortunately on too good grounds, that this arrangement is to be put through without consulting the people of Newfoundland, and asking us to take warning by the results of our own failure and of the evils which have followed a similar disregard of popular rights in the still larger sphere of the mother country.

Mr. FLINT. Were it not for the few remarks that fell from the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), I would not venture to make any observations at this time. But I must say that as a matter of fact the observations which fell from the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), were literally correct. It is not a question solely for the people of Newfoundland, but it is a question, so far as we are concerned, entirely for the people of Canada as to whether Newfoundland shall come into this union freely and constitutionally, or whether it shall come in under similar circumstances to those under which Nova Scotia was brought into this union. We are perfectly well aware of the means by which confederation might possibly be carried through the legislature of Newfoundland, means like those by which confederation was carried through the legislature of Nova Scotia, by means of bribery and corruption, by the promise of senatorships, and judgeships, and other offices which are in the gift of the Dominion Government. Had the wishes of the people of Nova Scotia been consulted at the time of union many hundreds of thousands of dollars would have been saved to the people of Canada, much heart-burning and ill-feeling would have been saved to the people of Nova Scotia, and a loyalty to the Government of Canada would have existed there which, I am happy to say, proud to say, does not exist in Nova Scotia, and cannot exist, until the generation which witnessed the infamous manner in which Nova Scotia was brought into this union, has en-

tirely passed away. I hope and trust, that if Newfoundland comes into this union, the cardinal principle, outside of all matters of detail, will be that she shall come in by the will and by the wish of the people. I consider that it would be the duty of this House, and especially the duty of the Liberal party in this House, to fight to the bitter end any attempt to ratify the terms of union in this Parliament, which were not previously ratified and sanctioned by the people of Newfoundland. Twenty-eight years have passed away since Nova Scotia entered the Canadian confederation, and my hon. friend says that the repeal sentiment is as dead as Julius Caesar. I admit that circumstances over which the people had no control, such as the accumulation of national responsibilities, the overwhelming influence of the British Empire, and the difficulties connected with a repeal of the union, together with the passing away of many of those who were interested in the question at the time, have, to a large degree, diminished the opposition to confederation with Canada. Let us glance over the history of those twenty-eight years, and let us consider the manner in which Nova Scotia was brought into the union, and the ill-feeling that resulted; do we wish that repeated in the case of Newfoundland? Should not the Dominion Government, if at any time Newfoundland makes a proposition for union, state that a fundamental principle upon which such a measure could be consummated, should be that the people of Newfoundland should first be consulted? I say it would be a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada to enter into a union with Newfoundland until the people were first consulted, and had freely accepted and endorsed the terms of union. This is a preliminary question, it is not a question of detail, it is a constitutional question, and I trust that hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will so express their minds, both in Parliament and out of it, as to give the Government to understand that no such scheme will be tolerated by Canada as the admission of Newfoundland without the consent of the people first being obtained.

Mr. EDGAR. Although this is not a question of detail, although it is a broad underlying principle of any negotiations, still, it appears that the Government have assumed the position that they will keep the House and country in ignorance of what they have done up to the present time. Well, Sir, let that be so; I say it is a good thing for the country that there has been a discussion today on this point; it is a good thing for the country that the leading men, at least on this side of the House, have risen from their places and given the Government a warning, and given the people of Newfoundland an encouragement, that we will resist any attempt to force them into a union as Nova Scotia was forced. That much, at any rate, has been accomplished, although the Government are, as on so many other occasions this session, keeping as dumb as oysters when information is asked from them. But there is another point which occurs to me, and which the people of this country should remember. There may be outside pressure upon Canada, and upon Newfoundland also, to consummate a union. The Imperial Government have got into great difficulty with Newfoundland, they have difficulties under the French treaty, they have the difficulty of the unfortunate financial condition of this island, and they, of course, have brought pressure, naturally enough, upon Newfoundland to come here and seek for confederation with Canada. I believe as firmly as I believe anything, in the advisability of rounding off confederation by bringing in Newfoundland, but, Sir, I want to do it on fair principles. If there has been any pressure from Downing Street, or anywhere else, to force this country or Newfoundland into a union, except what the people of the two countries may desire and constitutionally express such desire, I for one shall oppose a union under such circumstances. I dare say that English statesmen may think that they might repeat in the case of Newfoundland what was done in Nova Scotia. They may be urging that line of action: perhaps this Government does not know anything about it, if they are; but I would just warn them against dangers of that kind. No doubt, the Government are the proper authorities for the people of Newfoundland to approach in opening up these negotiations, but are they altogether equipped for that purpose? Have we not seen, in connection with these very negotiations, an extraordinary statement in the newspapers—a letter from the Secretary of the Privy Council asking one of the fathers of confederation where he could find the papers of the Quebec Conference relating to Newfoundland? It appears the Government have not got the very basis of negotiation in their possession. They have allowed to disappear from the archives the whole of the papers connected with the negotiations with Newfoundland in 1864; and, Sir, this Government is evidently not too well equipped and should not refuse to listen to advice from this side of the House in that matter, and I hope they will not refuse.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps this would be a fitting occasion to receive the ministerial explanations which were promised a few days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. The subject has been so long deferred, at the request of the hon. gentleman, that I had quite forgotten it. However, it will give me great pleasure

briefly to state to the House what has taken place. Shortly after the death of the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, I think the day after the receipt of the news of his death, His Excellency the Governor General called upon the Hon. Mr. Bowell, who had been acting Prime Minister in the absence of Sir John Thompson, and after consultation with him, asked him to undertake the duty of forming a Government, and to that the Hon. Mr. Bowell acceded. His first step was to consult with his former colleagues, those who had held office under the late Premier; and the result of his consultation with them was that they all, without exception, signified to him their willingness to co-operate with him in every way—with one exception, which I may mention now, that of the hon. Minister of Militia, Mr. Patterson, who had before then expressed his desire to be relieved of the duties of the office as soon as possible, and who reiterated his request at the time; but through the persuasion of the Hon. Mr. Bowell, he consented to retain his position. The vacancy caused by the death of Sir John Thompson was filled by the appointment of Sir Hibbert Tupper, who was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and who took the portfolio of Minister of Justice. The vacant seat in the Cabinet was filled by Mr. Dickey, member for Cumberland, who became a member of the Government and took the position of Secretary of State. On account of the position of Prince Edward Island, lying off from the mainland, somewhat isolated, it was thought well to have the advantage of the presence of a gentleman from that province in the councils of the country, and Sir Mackenzie Bowell was fortunate in securing the services of Senator Ferguson, who became a Minister without portfolio. Sir John Carling having intimated his desire to retire from the Ministry, he holding a position without portfolio, his request was acceded to, and the hon. member for Haldimand was asked to take a seat in the Cabinet, for the time being without portfolio, in place of Sir John Carling. Afterwards some changes were made. The hon. Secretary of State in the former Ministry took the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the position of Minister of Militia, which became vacant shortly afterwards by the retirement of Mr. Patterson, who again preferred the request he had made before to be allowed to retire, and whose resignation was accepted with regret by the Premier, was filled by the appointment of Mr. Dickey, who had first been appointed Secretary of State, and then the Hon. Mr. Montague was invited to take the position of Secretary of State. I think these explanations cover all the principal changes so far as I recollect them, and so far as I have been authorized to present them to the House. If there are any other questions the hon. gentleman desires to ask, I am prepared to answer them.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there would be any object whatever gained by asking the hon. gentleman for more information. This session the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are not anxious to give information. When a few days ago it became my duty to ask for these explanations, to which by right we are entitled in this House, the hon. gentleman told us that we were chock full of information already. The hon. gentleman has evidently just spoken in the same frame of mind; and it is manifest, from the manner in which he made his explanations, that if he had to speak at all he could not add anything to the treasury of knowledge we already possess in that line. The statement the hon. gentleman made was as bare, dry and non-committal as he could well make it; to make it less bare, less dry, and less non-committal the hon. gentleman would have required not to speak at all. I quite admit that the country was chock full of information on this subject, that we were well loaded up by the ministerial press; but after the character given to the ministerial press by the Minister of Justice, whom I regret very much not to see in his seat to-day, and by the Minister of Finance himself, it will not be a matter of surprise if we did not rely with implicit confidence on the information then supplied to us, and if we harboured the suspicion that while being loaded by the press, we had been loaded the wrong way. And what was a suspicion has become a certainty. From the statement given by the hon. Minister of Finance, it is clear and evident that what we were somewhat suspicious of before was correct, that as regards the formation of the Government the country was deceived in one most important particular, and in one most important respect, because the information now given by the hon. gentleman shows a very wide divergence from that given to the country at the time. The hon. gentleman has told the House to-day that His Excellency applied first to Mr. Bowell, now Sir Mackenzie Bowell, to assume the duty of forming an Administration. With this Her Majesty's Opposition has no objection at all to offer. Mr. Bowell had always been an important member of the Administration, in fact he was at the time of Sir John Thompson's death the oldest member, and I believe the only remaining colleague of Sir John Macdonald at the time of the formation of the Administration in 1878. That under such circumstances, he being one of the leading members of the party in power, His Excellency should apply to Mr. Bowell to form an Administration, was not unnatural. But what was told us by the press? That was not the statement given in the official organs. It was that another hon. gentleman, whom nobody expected to be called by His Excellency, had been called to form an Administration—the Hon. Frank Smith. Sir John Thompson died on 12th December; on the following day Mr. Bowell was called

to form the Administration. On the following day the following despatch from Ottawa, which was evidently authorized and inspired, appeared in the ministerial newspapers :

Ottawa, December 14.—It has transpired to-day that previous to the calling of Hon. Mr. Bowell last night to form a ministry, His Excellency the Governor General sent for Sir Frank Smith and consulted with him as to the task of the formation of the new government. Sir Frank, while highly appreciating the honour, informed His Excellency that he had no ambition in that direction, and suggested that he should call on Hon. Mackenzie Bowell as the most suitable person to be entrusted with the task. In conversation with the "Gazette" correspondent to-night, Sir Frank Smith said :—"Yes, it is quite true that His Excellency did me the honour of consulting me with the forming of the new ministry, but I told him at once that I was not a candidate for the office of Premier, as it would not suit me. I then suggested that he should send for the acting Premier, Mr. Bowell. We had a long talk, but of course I don't feel at liberty to repeat what transpired. I think," continued Sir Frank, after a pause, "that I could not have given His Excellency better advice. I have known Mr. Bowell for a great many years, and although he has been a strong Orangeman and very earnest and outspoken in his views and opinions, as he has a perfect right to be, yet I have never known him to say an offensive word about Catholics, or to do anything which they could regard as offensive. I look upon him as an honest and fair-minded man, and I think the country will be quite safe in his hands."

From the statement given by the leader of the House to-day it appears that this was a most fallacious and mendacious paper. I am not surprised that it proved to have been false. It was perfectly incredible, as stated in the official organs of the Government, that His Excellency should have called on Sir Frank Smith to form an Administration. I do not intend to speak disrespectfully of Sir Frank Smith. I am glad to know, and I admit it, that Sir Frank is a man of ability in his own sphere—in his own sphere, I say, but politics or statesmanship or parliamentary government is not his own sphere. Sir Frank Smith has been a successful business man ; but I am not aware that he has ever given any special attention to politics. If Sir Frank Smith had known the elementary principles—I will not say the elementary principles, but the elementary proprieties of parliamentary government, he would not have gone blabbering as he did to newspaper reporters. If he had been officially consulted, which was not the case according to the statement of the hon. Premier made in the Senate and repeated by the leader of the House, he should have known that he should not disclose what passed between His Excellency and himself, without having first obtained His Excellency's assent. It is quite possible and indeed quite probable and it might happen that Sir Frank Smith had not been consulted, but had had a confidential conversation with His Excellency, a private interview; but to go as he did and exhibit his own self-sufficient importance was, to say the least of it, nothing short of an impertinent vulgarity. But, Mr. Speaker, in that impertinence there was design. It was done evidently to do service for the Conservative party. The design is found in the last words of the interview of Sir Frank Smith. It evidently dawned upon the minds of the wise men who surrounded Sir Mackenzie Bowell after he had been called to office—I say that it evidently became manifest to the wise men who surrounded him—that perhaps an impression might be entertained in some quarters that the orange colour was rather predominant in the formation of the new Cabinet. It is well known that Sir Mackenzie Bowell has been all his life an active member of the Orange order, a Past Grand Master.

An hon. MEMBER. Grand Sovereign.

Mr. LAURIER. It is well known that Sir Mackenzie Bowell has been all his life an active member of the Orange Order, and the Order was already well represented—not exactly in the Cabinet, but very close to the Cabinet—in the person of the present Grand Master, and evidently it was thought that so much orange colour in the new Cabinet made it offensive to some eyes, and it was supposed that it would be very, very clever, indeed, if it were given to the world that a prominent Roman Catholic had been called by His Excellency, and that that Roman Catholic, instead of accepting the honour for himself had given his certificate to the Past Orange Grand Master. It was thought it would be very clever, indeed, if it were made to look as if a little mixture of green was adjuncted to so much orange colour. Well, Sir, I do not object ; nobody, I am sure, objects, that Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Frank Smith should parade before the public their mutual admiration. But it becomes intolerably objectionable when these gentlemen attempt to cover their little political manoeuvres behind the name of His Excellency the Governor General. The Conservative party has been too long in the past in the habit of taking advantage even of the ordinary proprieties of parliamentary life to foster party ends and party purposes ; but when it comes to this, that falsehoods are invented, circulated, and published, and that the name of His Excellency is connected with these falsehoods, then, I say, it is high time that these proceedings should be branded, as they ought to be branded, with all the opprobrium which they deserve. I am sorry, for my part, Sir, that upon this occasion, the Minister of Justice is not in his seat. I have waited for some time because I thought that these explanations should not well take place in his absence. He is not here, and, therefore, I will not say a word of what I intended to say were he present. As to the other Cabinet changes to which

the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) referred, I have not much to say, because they are simply little family arrangements which concern gentlemen opposite, and as to which we have no observations to offer. I will only say this. It appears that my hon. friend the Secretary of State now occupies a situation which it had been supposed was reserved for one of the three gentlemen who have long been waiting, and patiently waiting, at the door of the Council chamber. If rumour is to be credited—I do not know as to that, for I may be wrongly informed, or I may be rightly informed—but, if rumour is to be credited, we are told that there was a rivalry between these three gentlemen as to which of them should enter the Cabinet first. But while they were disputing at the door, there happened what sometimes may happen under such circumstances: there stealthily came from behind another gentleman, the member for Haldimand, who, with one single jump, cleared over the heads of the Solicitor General, the Controller of Customs, and the Controller of Inland Revenue, and landed safe, and on his two feet, right in the Council chamber. This is, to say the least of it, an acrobatic feat which shows in that somewhat corpulent gentleman great agility and suppleness of limbs.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the order of the day is called, I would like to draw the attention of the Government, and especially of the French members of the Cabinet to the fact that the debates have not yet been published in French. After two weeks of session, and considering that the English version has already reached its one hundred and thirtieth column, we feel that we are not treated as we should be, because we have not yet received the French version.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, diverting again to the explanations which we have received from the leader of the House, I think it can scarcely be denied that these explanations——

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) to the fact that a motion for the adjournment of the House having been negatived, and no intervening proceeding having taken place, there cannot be any other motion for adjournment. Let me point out what the rule is with regard to this matter :

In case of ministerial changes, explanations are generally allowed to be made in both Houses when Orders of the Day are called by the Speaker. When the Premier or member leading the Government in the House makes such explanations, it is usual to permit the leader of the Opposition to make some remarks on points arising out of the former speech. In fact, considerable latitude is allowed by the indulgence of the House on such occasions in the Canadian Commons. In the English Commons, it is irregular to permit any debate, after the ministerial statement has been made, unless some question is formally proposed to the House, and the same practice obtains in the Lords—a motion for the adjournment being made when a debate is expected.

Of course, if the House desires to hear hon. gentlemen continue this debate, I cannot prevent it, but I wish to point out what the rule is with regard to it.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I can appeal, I believe, to your own memory : for the twenty years that I have sat in Parliament, this debate has always been carried on upon the Orders of the Day being called. This has been done time and again, and we are simply following a practice which has been universal.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not made any observation with regard to the speech of the leader of the Opposition. It is quite in order, I think, under our practice, but a general discussion seems to me to be entirely out of order on a matter of this kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has gone on very frequently, Mr. Speaker. Your own recollection, as well as mine, will recall to your mind that considerable discussion on the question of ministerial explanations has been allowed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no objection at all, if the House desires it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not dispute your ruling, more particularly as I suppose it will be very easy for my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) to make any remarks he has to make as we are going into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. I just point to the practice, and I simply ask your ruling on this, Mr. Speaker, so that we can be guided by it in the future. If you wish that we should stop here, we shall do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. My opinion—I only express my own opinion—is that after the leader of the House has given the ministerial explanations, it is quite in accordance with our practice that the leader of the Opposition should offer such observations as he chooses with regard to them, but if the debate is to be continued, it seems to me that the House must concur, practically unanimously, in the continuance of the debate, provided no motion can be made ; and, as I have already pointed out, a motion for the adjournment of the House having been negatived, and no intermediate proceedings having taken place, another motion for adjournment cannot be made at this stage.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the leader of the House have an opportunity to explain his explanations ? He has not been able to make them clear. He has overlooked a

portion of the explanations which he should have given.

Mr. COCHRANE. If he did he would not be able to get it into your head.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is no skim milk in it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nor any brains either.

Mr. EDGAR. In accordance with your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I shall not offer any observations just now, because I do not care to do so at the sufferance of the House. I will take an early opportunity to speak upon the subject again.

SUPPLY—MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EDGAR. Before that motion is carried, I would like to say a word or two about the position of the Government. Certain explanations have been given as to the formation of the present Cabinet, which only appear to me to illustrate and emphasize the fact that the omissions from the present Cabinet are much more striking and conspicuous than the appointments which have been made to it. If I may be permitted, and I hope I can do so without offence, I would like to say that during the past few years, when so many changes have taken place in Cabinets, there has always been a fear among the members who sit to your left that they might be deprived at any moment of the services of an able and impartial speaker by his translation to a ministerial position of greater political activity; but, somehow or other, the Government have omitted to strengthen themselves in this way in the very province where, I think, they required strengthening the most.

There was a change in the Ministry, slurred over hastily in the explanations we have just heard, to which I would like to draw attention; I mean the omission from this Cabinet of the hon. member for London (Sir John Carling). The hon. gentleman has had a remarkable career in his time—a prominent career. He was a member of the Canadian Parliament ten years before confederation. The hon. First Minister of to-day was not a member of Parliament until confederation. The hon. member for London is, however, five years younger than the hon. First Minister; and while Sir John Macdonald ruled in Ontario the hon. member for London was his right hand man for that province. When Sir John Abbott formed his Government, he continued the hon. member for London in his office of Minister of Agriculture. Sir John Thompson deprived him of that position, but kept him in the Cabinet. It is hard to tell why the hon. member deserved that treatment, because in the meantime he had boldly resigned his seat in the Senate, and had contested the City of London, and caused himself to be elected, or at least returned, for that constituency. Now, the Experimental Farm was his hobby, and he was fond of his position; but that was taken away from him, and all that he received in place of it, so far as we know, was the barren honour of a third-class knighthood. But, Sir, he resented that treatment; he resented it in a very marked manner, because I find that although he occupied a seat in this House during the years 1893 and 1894, he, a Cabinet Minister, never once, according to "Hansard," opened his mouth during all that time within the walls of this Chamber. If that was not sulking in his tent, I do not know what was. However, it was reserved for his junior, a long way, in political experience, the present Prime Minister, to deal him the final blow, when he formed a Cabinet in which the hon. member for London had no lot nor part. How well he might quote these words about his colleagues:

'Tis all very well to dissemble their love,
But why did they kick me downstairs?

Mr. FOSTER. Is that original?

Mr. EDGAR. The application is original, because all this time the hon. gentlemen were expressing the highest esteem and affection for their colleague, and admiration for his political experience and the work he had done in London, especially; but still they kicked him downstairs.

Another vacancy has recently been created in the ranks of the old guard. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Patterson), who I am sorry to see is not here, gave up his position. His colleagues also professed, and still profess, a great regard for him; but they put him on the shelf, and they propose, it is said, to reward him with the position of Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, of all places. Why, Sir, what sort of a welcome might a member of this Cabinet expect in Manitoba just now, considering the strained relations existing between Ottawa and Winnipeg? The hon. member for London can complain of being kicked downstairs, and, I think, the hon. member for West Huron has very just ground to complain that he is being kicked upstairs. Well, this gilded plum has fallen into the capacious lap of the hon. member for Haldimand. It is a high compliment to that hon. gentleman that although so comparatively young in politics and of short political experience compared with many others, he has been taken and placed over the heads of some sixty or seventy Conservative members in these two Houses of Parliament. It is a high honour to that gentleman, but what about the Controllers? Can it be that they are not in the line of promotion? Must they always, like the Peri, stand disconsolate outside of the gate of Eden? However, there are

some compensating advantages in that position. One of the Controllers, at any rate, has felt himself entirely at liberty to seek consolation for his disappointment and relieve the bitterness of his heart by strong public condemnation of the policy of the Cabinet. And all the while, with commendable regularity, he is drawing his salary as a member of that Administration.

Then there is the Solicitor General. Is he, too, out of the line of promotion? Why, in England, when there is a vacancy in the office of the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, as a matter of *invariable custom*, gets the position. The Attorney General there is the same as the Minister of Justice here; but when the office of Minister of Justice became vacant, there was no promotion for the Solicitor General. I am the more surprised too, after the remarkable display of erudition by that hon. gentleman the other day, which we must all have noticed, when, in answering a question connected with the Department of Justice, he was so hypercritical, so remarkably skilled in the use of the English language that he had to confound the humble individual who is addressing you by refusing to accept the vernacular English which I used in asking the question. I had asked if a certain officer had been suspended or dismissed. The hon. Solicitor General said no, he was neither dismissed nor suspended, but he had been, by direction of the late Minister of Justice, relieved of his duties as deputy-warden pending inquiry. He was not suspended, however. I hope hon. gentlemen on this side will take note of that, and take their vocabulary from the Solicitor General, and do not forget to dot their i's and cross their t's when putting a notice on the paper. That is what the hon. gentleman said about the word "suspended," but what about the dismissal? He said the official was not dismissed. Yet this is what happened to that official, according to the same answer: "He was afterwards, by minute of His Excellency in Council of the 24th October last, retired from office without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary service." He was retired from office by Order in Council, but he was not suspended or dismissed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is his pay going on?

Mr. EDGAR. I do not know about that. Perhaps the Solicitor General will explain. What a slight was cast by the appointment of the hon. member for Haldimand upon all these stalwart Tories of Toronto who have been, again and again, and yet again, following their leaders, like a flock of sheep, into the party fold. I am talking of the electors, of course, yet all these electors must bow to the wisdom of the decision of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, even though he decided that all the military glory which reflects so much lustre on the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), and the high financial standing of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), and the ponderous legal light of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) must count for nothing, but must all pale their ineffectual fires before the beams of the rising sun of the member for Haldimand.

Again, Sir, what has become of the claim of my hon. friend, the gallant member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale)? What has become of the still more long-standing and well-understood claims of the distinguished surgeon-general from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin)? Sir, what has become of the claim to the appointment of Minister of Agriculture, so well understood, so often expressed, by the other front row statesman over there, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)? Then we turn to the Senate, where it was expected that that old warhorse from Niagara, Senator McCallum, would have had promotion at last into the Cabinet. Why, to my certain knowledge that hon. gentleman has for the last thirty years carried on a hard fight in Niagara, and at great expenditure of substance too. And is this the reward of all his efforts? Then there is another senator, the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Sanford), who seems to be overlooked in this arrangement. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman has engaged in personal election contests himself, but he has certainly received the credit of being very liberal in supplying the sinews of war to others who have engaged in those contests. We should also remember this, that he must have suffered a great deal of anguish of heart when he tore himself away from all his old political friends, the Liberals, in Hamilton just before he was appointed to the Senate. There is this, however, to be said about him, that if he does not get promotion to the Cabinet, it is pretty well understood that he might be prevailed upon to accept whatever modest share on the next Queen's Birthday honours may fall to his portion.

Now, there is the new Minister of Militia (Mr. Dickey). I am sorry he is not here, but we all know that, like the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), he has shown occasional fits of independence in this House. But now his days of kicking are over. He is harnessed to the plough, and he must keep in the traces. He must pull straight in the furrow or get turned out to grass again, and I predict that though he will kick and squirm a good deal this session, he will take his medicine like a man, and we will find him at the end of the session in the position he now occupies. Such is the soothing effect of office.

Now, I am very sorry indeed that the Minister of Justice is not in his place to-day. Still I really thing that the circumstances connected with his position are of such very great public interest that I will refer to them. That has been called, in some of the news-

papers, a bolt from the blue; perhaps it may be more correctly described as a bolt from the Bleus. Now, so far, I have been referring only to actual Cabinet changes, but not to mere Cabinet tricks, where the performer is bound hand and foot in a Cabinet, and in that Cabinet makes a great deal of noise for the benefit of the public, and, shortly afterwards, is found in the same Cabinet, bound as tight as he was before. Towards the end of last March, the ministerial press announced the resignation of the Minister of Justice. The Ottawa "Citizen," the home organ of the Government, announced it. The Montreal "Gazette," the Montreal organ of the Government, announced it. The Toronto "World," the junior organ of Toronto, and under the immediate direction of my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Maclean), announced it. The Toronto "Mail and Empire," the amalgamated, purified, sanctified, senior organ of the Government in Toronto, also announced it. And the St. John "Sun" also, I am told, and, I suppose, all the other Government papers that I did not see, followed suit.

The Montreal "Gazette," at the same time, lectured the hon. Minister of Justice in good round terms. It "deplored that he should suddenly choose to play the role of Lord Randolph Churchill, and throw up his cards." The correspondent of the Toronto "Mail and Empire" also referred to the matter in a similar way. Speaking of the resignation, he said:

> This, it is said, is not the first time he has threatened to step down and out when his ideas were not acted upon, and that there are in the Cabinet some who look with disfavour upon the appearance of dictation from the young Minister of Justice.

Then, the "Mail and Empire" went on to say:

> It happens that a bye-election will shortly take place in Antigonish——

And it was so far astray as to go on:

> —when an opportunity will be afforded for the entrance of a new man from that province to fill the vacancy.

So that they provided, entirely to their own satisfaction, not only for the Minister of Justice going out, but for some one else coming in.

Can there be a shadow of doubt in any one's mind that these attacks upon the Minister of Justice were inspired by those whom the "Mail and Empire" describes as "those in the Cabinet who look with disfavour upon the appearance of dictation from the young Minister of Justice"? If the Minister of Justice does not recognize the handiwork of his colleagues, every one else does. Now, this was by no means the only obituary notice which the Minister of Justice received at the hands of his friends. The Toronto "World," with great enterprise, published a cartoon which I hold in my hand. In it the Minister of Justice is represented with his head laid upon a pillow, a bandage marked, "sore" being bound about his head; and, towering above him is the stalwart form of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who is called "the man for the place." In the same cartoon is a letter, purporting to be signed by "Public Opinion":

> Dear Charley,——

I wonder whom they can mean by that?

> Dear Charley,—If your head still troubles you, and you do not feel like going back to the office at present, do not let it worry you; I have a man in view who can fill your place very nicely.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> PUBLIC OPINION.

And there is the man in view, a man in our view to-day, the hon. member for Albert, who came to the rescue of the Minister of Finance to-day just as if he was already the Minister of Justice.

Why, Sir, what happened? Just what his colleagues who turned the party sleuth-hounds of the press upon him knew would happen—he returned to office with great humility. Sir Mackenzie Bowell's triumph was complete and, to use the language of another cartoon in the same issue of the "World," "the cat came back." Naughty newspaper boys had been pelting it; the roofs where it had wandered were lonely and cold, and it came back meekly, glad to be allowed to lie down again behind the kitchen stove, and ready to purr gratefully whenever its masters might be good enough to stroke it, or give it a saucer of milk.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are wars and rumours of wars in the Cabinet, and about the Cabinet. If walls had tongues, as they are said to have ears, what a magnificent harvest of gossip the Ottawa newspaper correspondents would have if they walked through and appealed to the walls of the Cabinet chamber. The echoes of fierce disputes are there, as they are through the town. And I must say that the partisans of the different gladiators stick up staunchly for their men. For instance, the partisans of the hon. Minister of Public Works will not for a moment admit that in any of these fierce struggles for principle which sometimes go on in Cabinet councils, as we know, he was ever floored by the Minister of Railways. And, Sir, to borrow a simile from my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), everybody can see he has not got a "haggard" look upon his countenance. But, Sir, his supporters can point, at any rate, with triumph to the evidence of his skill and statesmanship when, a short time ago, he unloaded a horde of friends and relations to fatten and batten upon the Curran bridge at the expense of the Department of Railways, that very Curran bridge affair bringing disgrace upon the Minister of Railways as an

administrator. I do not wonder that the friends of the Minister of Public Works are proud of his achievement. Then, Sir, on the other hand the admirers of the Minister of Railways staunchly maintain that in disputes, arguments—could I say arguments ad hominem ?—that arise in the Cabinet councils, the Minister of Railways is ready and willing, to use a metaphor borrowed from the sporting newspapers, to handle his opponents without gloves. Now, Mr. Speaker, is this the Cabinet that is going to lead the Conservative party through the rugged crisis of a general election ? Why, Sir, without any disrespect to the hon. gentlemen, I would like to recall for a moment the names of some members of former Conservative Cabinets since confederation, whom we have had leading the Conservative party in this House and in this Parliament. Let me mention the names of a Cartier, of a Galt, of a Hincks, of a Macdonald, of a Macdougall, of a Tilley, of a Tupper, of a Howe, of a Campbell, of an Abbott and of a Thompson. And may I ask, Who fill their places to-day ? Comparisons are so odious that I will not make them on this occasion ; but, Sir, what more is this than a scratch team brought together under a second-class captain ? How can they expect to win against champions from all the provinces who, not only in this House, but in the provinces, have ranged themselves under a great and brilliant leader, and who, whenever the Government choose to bring on the elections are ready for the fray ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to say a few words on this important question. I would like to get the attention of the Minister of Railways for a moment. I always like the audience to look me in the face. I do not like to drive them into exile. I am, however, scarcely prepared to speak on this subject, because I have not had time to count the Ministers this session. They are getting so numerous, it takes a good while to do it. I do not know how many have salaries, and how many have portfolios, and how many are without portfolios. Some who have not portfolios are not in, and some who have portfolios are in. I think in some way or another, nearly all of them have emoluments in some form—I hope they have. Now it is a singular thing that the Government have ignored, in their explanations, one who has held a portfolio, or has had a seat in the Cabinet without portfolio for so many years, one who has been a strong prop and a strong stay to that party—I refer to Sir Frank Smith. They would parade him through the papers, and put his name in the mouth of His Excellency, but when they come to the House, they desert him and state that he was not in it, that he had never been consulted. It is all very well, he is only Irish, and apparently they have no feelings. You can kick them about as a football, and use them as you will, but when the explanations are given, he was not there at all. Why did they put his name into the mouth of the press of Ontario, and into the mouth of His Excellency, and never say a word about him in this House ? Is Sir Frank Smith a ball or a kite that they can play with ? Is it because of the peculiarity of his race that they can treat him as they please ? Now I notice that their friends held a convention in a very important constituency, in the county of Grey—you all know that is very important—it was not in the riding that I represent, which is the most important, I may tell you, but it was in the North Riding of Grey. They had a convention, and here is what the Liberal-Conservative Association declared :

> It was moved and seconded, that this association hereby express its thanks to the Hon. Sir Frank Smith for recommending the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell to the Governor General as Premier of Canada.

The people in the country are willing to thank him, but the Minister of Finance, in his explanations, does not name him. He slights him, ignores him, passes him by without a word, but is willing that their followers in the country shall put it on record at their conventions that Mackenzie Bowell now reigns through the grace of Sir Frank Smith. That is the position he occupies, but to-day they ignore him, and have not a word to say about him. Now as to the position in the Senate, as to the characteristic ability that has marked the members of the Cabinet in the Senate, as to those they have taken in and those they have left out, there is some consolation, as my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) says, to Senator Ferguson of Niagara. When the ribbons were passed round, he was not one of those entrusted with a department. But there was something to console him, because Senator Ferguson from Prince Edward Island was given a seat in the Cabinet without portfolio. If they could not give it to Senator Ferguson from Niagara, why, he would be a very unreasonable senator if he was not satisfied when they gave it to another senator of the same name. How absurd it is to suppose for a moment that he would feel unkindly at being thus passed over. Now the Minister of Railways looks more beaming this session than he did last session. He has had his way, to a certain extent, in the formation of the Cabinet, and it is just as well, I think, that the House should understand the reason—he has now a spring chicken in the Cabinet. He is very fond of chickens, and he smiles whenever that rooster crows. It was very painful for him to pass over the heads of all those who have given long and faithful services in the House, and to supplant the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Patterson) by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). They

all love the hon. member for Huron so much, every one of them, and in giving their explanations, how sorry they are to part with him, they express deep regret for his health. It is sad to think of it, a young man obliged by the state of his health to retire from the Cabinet. And to think that it was a spring chicken that crowded him out! And the man that they loved so much, that they prized so much, that they valued so highly for his able services to the Crown—he has gone out, and they are all so very sorry that he has gone. Now, there is another thing. Of all the old names, of all those who have fought for their country and their party in Nova Scotia, when we look over the districts, and look at the men, and look at the character and ability of those who have been here for a long time, we wonder that in the distribution of favours by the Cabinet, some of them are not recognized. Mr. Dickey was taken in. I would not say a word against Mr. Dickey: he has only been here a short time, while there are others from that province who have been here a long time. In an interview it was stated that he was a relation of the Tuppers, and that was one reason why he got into the Government. But the hon. gentleman disowned that allegation, and said he was only related to Lady Tupper—and that was one of the reasons, as it appears, why he was super-added over the heads of older statesmen in the country. But let me say a word as to the members for Toronto. Think of Toronto, with a population of 200,000, the centre of law and commerce, and everything else in the province of Ontario, represented by men of ability—a nice place for Ministers to go for an outing, for they are finely entertained by the city, but Toronto, ever since I have been in this House, has been as dumb as an oyster. It never speaks through its representatives; it is singular how Toronto, in all its career, has friends only on this side of the House, indeed, the only prestige it gets is from members sitting on this side. Of course, there are many members sitting in the House to-day who live in Toronto, and they obtained distinction in their different fields, but they do not seem to be in favour with this Government. It does seem singular how the great centres are passed over. There is the great centre of Montreal. That centre appears to be well satisfied if it gets a Minister in the outside service, it is satisfied with a Solicitor General; and a suburb of Toronto gets a representative in the outside service as Controller of Customs. The Controller, I understand, has constitutional questions on hand at the present time. I understand he has been consulting constitutional authorities; this is owing to certain movements that are contemplated; but I have not any fear of the Controller, so long as the salary holds out. The constitution will never break him, it will never cause him to be rash; there are five thousand golden reasons why he will not forego his position. After all, that is a nice commingling of Roman punch and Orange marmalade over there on the Treasury benches. The Government seems to be formed more on that principle than on any business principle—that is the business basis on which it is formed, and it is the basis on which the last two Governments were formed. This was never so apparent under Sir John Macdonald's administration. But I might as well tell some of their own friends this—get into one or other wigwam as quickly as possible. It does not matter about your parliamentary experience, but get into one of the wigwams, get the catch word or pass word, whatever the Controller or Solicitor General calls it, and it will be all right. Sometime, when I have leisure, I will prepare a speech and deliver it to the House, showing the number who have portfolios, the number who have not portfolios, and I will give a short sketch of their life and times. It will be very interesting reading, if I can only make it readable; it will only be my fault if it is not interesting, because the subject is an interesting one to follow.

Mr. CASEY. The so-called explanation which came from the Minister of Finance recalls to us the phrase used, I think, by Tallyrand, who said language was given to man for the purpose of concealing his thoughts. In this case, language seems to have been given to the Minister of Finance, not only for the purpose of concealing his thoughts, but also of concealing the facts that should have been explained by him on this occasion. The hon. gentleman passed over the consultation that must have taken place between His Excellency and Sir Frank Smith, and he also passed over a number of other important points. The hon. gentleman has not told the House how it was that Sir Mackenzie Bowell, rather than himself, was chosen to be the leader of the new Administration. No doubt, Sir Mackenzie was the senior member, in years, but I think I am stating what is constitutionally correct, when I say the position of Minister of Finance is a senior position in the Government to that of Minister of Commerce. Why was it that the leading member of those who survived was not called on to form the Administration? Perhaps some light may be thrown on this by a casual remark, a jocular remark of the late Sir John Thompson at the Board of Trade banquet in Toronto some years ago. Referring to the Finance Minister, who was beside him, he referred to him as "my friend Cassius." We are not all as well read in Shakespeare as we were when we were boys, and it may not be out of place to recall the words referred to in that illustration given by the late Sir John Thompson.

Antony and Caesar were talking about Cassius, and Caesar says to Antony, after referring to the cause :

Let me have men about me that are fat ;
Sleek-headed men, and such as sleep o'nights.

Let me interrupt Shakespeare for a moment, to suggest that it was from this point of view that His Excellency called in as an adviser, in a confidential manner, if not as constitutional adviser, Sir Frank Smith. Sir Frank filled the bill in that respect. Caesar goes on to say :

Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look ;
He thinks too much ; such men are dangerous.

Antony says :

Fear him not, Caesar, he's not dangerous ;
He is a noble Roman, and well given.

In that respect Sir Frank Smith would again have filled the bill, but Caesar it not satisfied. He says :

Would he were fatter. But I fear him not ;
Yet if my name were liable to fear,
I do not know the man I should avoid
So soon as that spare Cassius.

* * * * * * *

He loves no plays,
As thou dost, Anthony ; he hears no music ;
Seldom he smiles ; and smiles in such a sort
As if he mocked himself, and scorned his spirit
That could be moved to smile at anything.
Such men as he be never at heart's ease
Whiles they behold a greater than themselves,
And therefore are they very dangerous ?

It may be that His Excellency, or who ever suggested to His Excellency the choice between Mr. Bowell and the Finance Minister as the leader of the new Government, may have had Shakespeare in his mind, may have thought that the Finance Minister filled the role of Cassius better than he would have filled the role of Premier, that if he were chosen to lead the party, some future friend of a dead Caesar might say of that politically dead leader :

Look, in this place ran Cassius' dagger through.

However, it may be, we have Cassius in this House and the Premier in the other Chamber, and, in my opinion, any disadvantage from appointing the Finance Minister as Premier would have been largely balanced by the advantage of having the Premier on the floor of this House. We should not have the Premier in the Senate. Matters are constantly coming up in this House which require the master's eye, and which require information which only the master can give. He should be here in the face of those who alone can turn him out of power or maintain him in power, and not in the lotus eater's valley at the other end of this building, where it is always afternoon, they never sit in the evening. My hon. friends who have preceded me referred to the rejection of Sir John Carling from the Cabinet, and in that connection to the proper filling of the position of Minister of Agriculture. We certainly do miss the genial face of Sir John Carling from the Cabinet benches. We have missed him from his place in the House this session altogether, although he has been present in the city, and perhaps the reason of his absence is that he does not feel as heartily as formerly towards those who have given him the cold shoulder. If it were found necessary to omit Sir John Carling from the Cabinet, I think the change in the Ministry of Agriculture suggested by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that of giving the portfolio to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), would have been a good one. If we are to have a Minister of Agriculture who has the misfortune to be a protectionist and a Tory, we should at all events have one who has some knowledge of agriculture, such as we may expect from the member for East Grey. We think he would make a much better Minister of Agriculture than the Quebec lawyer who at present fills that position, with all respect to the hon. gentleman in question. Reference has been made also to the admission of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) into the Cabinet as Secretary of State, and my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) seems to be at a loss to know why he (Mr. Montague) was taken in. Well, Sir, it is not hard to see why the hon. member was taken in, first without a portfolio, and afterwards with a portfolio. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) ought to know that the present Secretary of State has the qualification of all others which is specially lacking amongst his colleagues, and that is that he can actually make a speech, and a stump speech at that. I do not say "speeches" for I have never heard from him more than one speech during one campaign, or more than one speech during a session of the House ; but at all events he can make a speech, and he can put some humour in it, and he can hold the attention of the House and elicit cheers and smiles and laughter, and sighs, perhaps, also, and that is a thing which no other member of the Cabinet seems qualified to do unless it be the Finance Minister himself. You may be sure, Sir, that in a Cabinet where speaking ability is so extremely conspicuous for its absence, the ability to make a good tea meeting, camp meeting, stump speech, is a qualification which will bring its full price. It has brought a good price in the case of the new Secretary of State. I do not see why my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was so obtuse as not to recognize that that was at least one reason why the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was admitted into the Cabinet. Another reason may be connected with his professional ability. The Minister of Finance complained that during the debate on the Address the leader of the Opposition had said nothing from which anybody could make up a prescription that he could get filled at a

political drug store. Now, Sir, we plead guilty to that indictment. It is not our business on this side of the House to make prescriptions which are to be filled at a political drug store. It is, however, quite different on the other side of the House. Their policy has been one of prescriptions to be filled at a political drug store for years back. What medicine has been more commonly shoved down the throats of the electors of this country, what medicine has been better advertised, beyond Williams' Pink Pills and Paine's Celery Compound, than the well-known "Foster's specifics." I hope I am not breaking the privileges of Parliament in using a name which happens to be similar to that of the Minister of Finance. But we have heard of "Foster's specifics" in the political world as a sure cure for all ills that might be remedied by tariff changes. There are specifics for the woollen trade, specifics for the cotton trade, specifics for the iron trade and others too numerous to mention. The Government may have retained the professional services of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) for the concoction of these specifics, and so he was admitted to full standing in the Cabinet. The position of the Controllers has been alluded to, and it has been alluded to in a jocular vein, and, indeed, it is rather hard to avoid alluding to their position in that vein, when we see them like so many good little boys sitting upon the door steps of their father's mansion waiting for the crumbs that fall from the Council chamber after luncheon, and waiting for the prospect of being admitted within the charmed precincts when they are fully grown up. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a serious side to it after all. The Controller of Customs, for example, wields all the power that used to be wielded by the Minister of Customs. He is one of the most important executive officers in this country. He is, besides this, at the head of an organization—I believe his proper title is, the Supreme Grand Sovereign of the Orange Society—which is at daggers drawn with the Administration of the day on the most recent point of its policy, and one of the most important points of its policy. Here is this gentleman constantly receiving resolutions from Orange lodges stating that they will resist by moral and material assistance the enforcement of the ministerial policy in the province of Manitoba, if it is enforced. Yet that hon. gentleman sits upon the door-steps and picks up the crumbs, swallows them, and digests them at his leisure. He might well consult constitutional authorities as to whether he can honestly sit as a member of the Government, even though not a member of the Cabinet, while his views are diametrically opposed to the opinions of his colleagues. But, whatever information he may get from constitutional authorities, the fact remains that it is a political and moral scandal for that gentleman to receive the salary of a member of a Government while he is known not to be in harmony with the most important feature of its recent political policy. It will be for him to explain his position to the Orange lodges to whom he owes his entry into public life, and any prominence he has since obtained in public life, and to explain to his constituents, to this House, and to the country at large, what reasons he can properly find for such a scandalous position as he now finds himself in. Sir, there is one other point on which, before I sit down, I wish to ask for ministerial explanations. It does not concern changes in the Cabinet, but it is a point upon which I wish to give the Government the earliest possible opportunity to explain themselves. It appears that rumours have got about that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has been asking for a senatorship. That hon. gentleman appears to have written to the Government to clear him from that imputation, and a letter is published, addressed to him, as follows :—

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, April 2, 1895.

A. McNeill, Esq., M.P.

My dear McNeill,—I have no doubt you have seen, as I have, notices in the papers that you had been or were to be offered a senatorship. I know of no man in the Commons whom I would rather see elevated to the honourable and responsible position of a senator than yourself ; but the rumour must have been set afloat by persons having some ulterior object in view, as no such offer has been made, nor has it been considered. Certainly, a senatorship was never asked for by you, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, such a step is precluded for the present by the fact that there are no vacancies that have not long since been promised.

Sincerely yours,
MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Now, Sir, there are ten senatorships vacant —for the divisions of Trent, Ontario; Rougemont, Quebec ; Sunbury, N.B. ; DeSalaberry, Quebec ; London, Ontario ; Bedford, Quebec ; Inkerman, Quebec ; two in New Brunswick, and one in Nova Scotia ; and we have here a letter published over the signature of Sir Mackenzie Bowell that all these vacancies have already been promised. This is a point on which, I think, we have a right to ask for ministerial explanations. As we have not the Premier in this House to ask about them, we must ask the hon. gentleman who represents the Government here, the hon. Minister of Finance, to tell us who the gentlemen are who carry about appointments of senatorships in their pockets. Are they members of this House of Commons ? Are they candidates in the ministerial interests in the different constituencies, who are promised that if they fail to be elected to this House, they will be shelved in the other ? Are they men who have contributed or are expected to contribute to party funds ? Who are these ten gentlemen who have been promised the

ten vacancies, and when are the appointments going to be made ?

Mr. LAURIER. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter to which I desire to call the attention of the hon. leader of the House. We are now called upon to vote to Her Majesty the supplies which, in the opinion of the Administration, will be required to carry on the public service ; and we have a right to expect that the hon. gentleman, before he proceeds with the Estimates, will declare whether or not these Estimates constitute the whole intended expenditure for the year. In former years, the Opposition have protested, though not sufficiently, I am sorry to say, against the practice of the Government of bringing down, in addition to the Estimates, resolutions involving the country in large expenditures, amounting sometimes to several millions of dollars. This is altogether a wrong practice. The hon. gentleman is aware, as I am, that the only constitutional method which can be pursued in this matter is for the hon. Minister of Finance, when he brings down his Budget, to lay before Parliament a statement of the whole expenditure which he intends to ask from Parliament during the session. As we are now going into Supply, I think it would be well for us to revert to the sound practice of hearing from the hon. gentleman whether the Estimates now brought down constitute the whole expenditure which is to be asked of Parliament. Not more than five or six weeks ago, we had it from the hon. Minister of Finance that the Government, by an Order in Council, passed only at that date, had pledged the credit of the Government to an expenditure of not less than $2,500,000 in the shape of a subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railway. Now, I do not at all hesitate to say that such an Order in Council, passed under such circumstances, is one of the most flagrant constitutional outrages that ever was perpetrated by any Government of any country. Why, Sir, a statute was passed only a few years ago, granting aid to that company towards the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, under certain terms which, up to the present time, have not been carried out ; and, in the face of the letter and spirit of that statute, the Government take upon themselves to pass an Order in Council altogether at variance with the terms then agreed to by Parliament, and promising an expenditure of not less than $2,500,000 for the same purpose. The Government have not dealt fairly with the House in that respect. When we asked for information with regard to that matter, the hon. gentleman did not give us the frank and clear answer which we had a right to expect from him, but he rather equivocated—he did not know what the terms of the Order in Council were. Strange to say, he apparently forgot all about this Order in Council, which was to grant so large an amount, and which must have been fresh in his memory. Now, are we to have this expenditure imposed upon the country or not ? This is the proper time to ask this question, when the hon. gentleman proposes that the House shall go into Committee of Supply. We are face to face with a very serious situation in this country. We have a deficit which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) expects to be not less than six millions of dollars. Even if his figures be controverted, we know that there is a very large deficit which we have to meet. Now, this is another reason why, without going any further, I call upon the hon. gentleman to tell us whether the whole of the expenditure which is to be brought down is contained in these Estimates. I do not speak of the Supplementary Estimates, which are supposed to be within a moderate sum and which the House will be prepared to vote under any circumstances. But apart from that, I would like to know whether or not we are going to have any more demands made upon us.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is asking me a question in advance of the time. I have already announced to the House, in answer to a question from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I propose to make the Budget speech on Friday. On that day I shall be prepared to state as frankly and fully as the hon. gentleman can wish what we propose to do, so far as expenditures are concerned, and to explain generally the financial condition of the country and what we propose to do in the future. At present I am not prepared to say what measures will or will not be brought down, which may involve some expenditure over and above what may be provided for in these Estimates. I am not called upon, I think, either to say at this date whether or not additional Estimates will be brought down. These are matters which pertain properly to the exposition of the Budget, and on that day they will be very fairly, and I think very fully, taken up. I am not indisposed, however, to say to my hon. friend, so far as these Estimates are concerned, that they contain all the Estimates that will be brought down for 1895-96. It has been the custom heretofore to bring down the main Estimates and follow them up with Supplementary Estimates for the services for the coming year. That, I hope, will not be followed this year. These Estimates include all the sums that will be provided for the different services mentioned for the year 1895-96. I am quite prepared to make that statement, although I am not called upon properly to do so before the exposition of the Budget. With reference to other matters that may hereafter engage the attention of the Government and which may, if the House thinks proper to pass them, involve expenditure, I am not prepared to state at this moment whether

any such will be brought down or not. The hon. gentleman was very strong in characterizing my course with reference to the Hudson Bay matter. He said that I equivocated. I did not. All my desire was to give full and complete information to the House. I quite understood the general tenor of the Order in Council which had been passed with reference to the Hudson Bay Railway. But there were some points I did not have in my mind, and I preferred to refresh my memory before giving an answer which might not be complete. The papers have been called for and will be brought down; and when they are, my hon. friend will find that he has gone too far in criticising the action of the Government as he has done. The Government has done nothing that any constitutional Government responsible to Parliament has not a perfect right to do. When the papers come down, my hon. friend will be in a position to judge better, and his criticism will, I am sure, be better tempered and more just than it has been to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust the hon. member will in that case give us the papers at the time he makes his financial statement.

Mr. FOSTER. They will come down, I think, to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For the rest, I think my hon. friend will be justified in accepting the explanation of the Finance Minister, which I understand to be this—and I repeat it because I desire there should be no misunderstanding. I understand that the hon. Minister of Finance, in the first place, does not intend to bring down any Supplementary Estimates for the service of 1895-96. That is a very proper thing on which I congratulate him heartily, and in which I renew, if it be of any value to him, the expression of my desire to support him against any assaults on the treasury, either from this side of the House or from that. As to the still more important statement which he has made, that also, I think, is a step in the right direction, and I trust that he will fully redeem the pledge he has now given, and will lay before us, when making his Budget speech, a full and frank statement, as he says, of all the liabilities which we will be called upon to incur. I am sure my hon. friend will receive that pledge with the satisfaction I do, and I trust we will not have the slightest occasion to criticise the way the hon. gentleman fulfils it. There is, however, another matter to which I may as well take the opportunity of calling the hon. gentleman's attention. Bearing in mind that this is the very last of April, it would be well—because I presume the hon. gentleman must be by this time perfectly well aware of the needs of the country—that he should bring down any Supplementary Estimates that may be required for the services of the current year now about to expire.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to get them down before the Budget.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That also is satisfactory. I may, however, take the opportunity of calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the Governor General's warrants. The total amount of these is not very large.

Mr. FOSTER. Very small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It ought to be small. The Governor General's warrants, in my opinion, were very gravely abused some years ago. I do not say that they were abused by the hon. gentleman, for I think he has been more correct in the issuing of them than were his predecessors, but they have been very gravely abused indeed, and it was becoming a perfect scandal that large sums of money, not voted by Parliament, were being expended under Governor General's warrants, in circumstances utterly in defiance both of the spirit and the letter of the law. On the present occasion the amount is not very large, but I noted one thing which seems to me to border, to say the least of it, on unconstitutionality. That is that two of those warrants were for sums of $80,000, or nearly $80,000, and the bulk of them were issued the day Parliament met. That may be technically within the law, but I doubt whether it was ever intended to defer the issuing of Governor General's warrants until the day Parliament met. If the urgency was such as to call for warrants, it would be better to obtain the authority from Parliament for granting such urgent supplies. As far as I remember two of these were dated 18th April.

Mr. FOSTER. One, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Two, I think. However, whether one or two, the principle is the same. The child is not a very large one, but at the same time I do not think the baby should have been there. It is far better, if emergencies do occur close to the meeting of Parliament, instead of using that special provision of the Governor General's warrants, to obtain—and the House is usually reasonable in such cases—the grant from the House. These warrants are intended to meet unforeseen expenses occurring when Parliament is not in session, but when you wait until two hours before Parliament meets—because I take it these were passed at the Council immediately preceding the meeting of Parliament—it would be far better not to use the Governor General's warrant for such purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The explanation of the Minister of Finance will, I think, be received with general satisfaction. If I understand it rightly, and I desire to be clear upon the point, we will be enabled to enter upon the discussion of the Budget with full

knowledge of all the appropriations which the Government propose to ask from Parliament for the services of the year 1895-96. That I understood from the hon. gentleman, and that certainly is very satisfactory. But I did not quite gather from the hon. gentleman that when making his financial statement he would assure Parliament that Parliament would not be asked to pledge the credit of the country to any liabilities further than those stated in the Budget speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not intend to say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We will be therefore in this position, that while the hon. gentleman will state to the House all the moneys that he intends asking for the services of the year 1895-96, it will still be open to him, consistently with his explanation to-day, to bring down, as has been done during the past years, within the last few days of the session, when everybody is weary and most of the members are going home, railway appropriations running up into millions. Now, Sir, I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to turn over a new leaf in that respect, and receive our congratulations on doing so, as he has done with regard to the bringing down of the Supplementary Estimates? So far as he has gone he has done well, and, as my hon. friend has said, will receive the support and approval of every member on this side of the House. But it is desirable, very desirable, that he should go further. It is intolerable that after this House has been in session two, or perhaps three or four months, the Government should come down with resolutions appropriating sums of money for this railway and that railway and pledging the credit of the country to an amount as, for instance, last session, of upwards of four million dollars. I remember that after I had remained here as long as my health permitted—after serving here for four months I was broken down in health and had to go home—I left without the slightest knowledge that the Government intended to bring down these resolutions. But, some time after that, down they came with a demand of three or four million dollars. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman has given any promise in that regard, and I would like to understand from him what his position is in the matter. The hon. gentleman knows that it will be impossible to carry on the discussion of the Estimates and pass them through the House with reasonable facility if it is felt that the Government are keeping back from the members knowledge of the fact that they intend at the last moment to ask the House to pledge the country for enormous sums for these railway subsidies. The hon. gentleman will see that, to be consistent, he must begin a reasonable course with regard to the subsidies, as he has done with regard to the Estimates. If he does not do so, it will be impossible for him to ask the gentlemen on this side of the House to give him those facilities for the voting of the supplies that he might otherwise be entitled to ask. I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask to go into supplies without giving an explanation upon that point. Now, passing from the question of the railway subsidies to private corporations, I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all the grants and votes which the Government intend to ask Parliament to give for the building of Government railways are to be found in the appropriations brought down. This will be a matter of surprise in some portions of the Dominion. I can speak particularly of Prince Edward Island. A gentleman who has received the proper certificate of fitness for the Senate, having been twice rejected by the people at the polls, has been taken——

Mr. FOSTER. It showed very bad taste on the part of the people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Twice rejected by enormous majorities—I believe there are few men in the maritime provinces against whom larger majorities have been recorded. But, Sir, this gentleman was taken into the Government, without portfolio. He deemed it his duty to hold public meetings in different parts of the province, at which meetings he was accompanied by a brother senator. He came there as a member of the Government and called large public meetings to discuss, among other things, the extension of the Prince Edward Island Railway by the construction of what is known as the Southern Railway. Resolutions were passed at these meetings calling upon the Government to build the road, and the people were led to believe—without any direct statement made by the member of the Government—that the Government would, at an early day, prepare plans for this purpose. The elections were then supposed to be coming on, and from one end of the country to the other through which the proposed railway passes meetings were held and the public mind was agitated and the people were led to believe that this road was to be built, and, mind you, at the earliest moment, Parliament was going to appropriate the money for this purpose. Well, Sir, every public man who did not give his full consent and approval to this proposal was denounced as an enemy of Prince Edward Island. Some of us waited very patiently to see how far the pre-election promises of these gentlemen would be implemented by the Government, of which Senator Ferguson was a member. And to-day, Sir, we have the Estimates brought down, and we are told that they are the total and represent all the appropriations that the Government intend to ask for for 1895-96, and not a word in it, not a dollar, for the Southern Railway in Prince

Edward Island, which, just before the election, was about to be constructed. I call the attention of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald)—who has received re-nomination for that county in the Conservative interest—to this interesting point. He put a notice on the Order paper the other day of a motion for a return of the petitions and papers in connection with the proposed railway, which the people were led to believe was to be built at once. The people suppose that the hon. gentleman has given notice after having had some private information as to what was to be done about these pre-election promises. I hope that when he comes to move his resolution he will offer some explanation why the Estimates for 1895-96 are solemnly silent with regard to the appropriation for the building of that road. Are the people of Prince Edward Island to be humbugged a second time? Just before the elections of 1887, the tunnel was promised us in a very vague and indirect way. But in the year 1891 we had positive and direct assurances given by the leader of the Government and by his first lieutenant, Sir Charles Tupper, that if the people of the island would support the Government they would have the tunnel built. All these promises vanished into thin air. The tunnel now is known to be a perfect farce, a political burlesque now completely played out. The tunnel scheme is not able to win them a single vote this year, and they know it. And so the new member of the Government holds public meetings throughout the whole section to be served by the Southern line, and, though he does not himself say that the railway is going to be built, he smiles upon the passage of resolutions asking the Government to build it, while his co-senator, with all his energy, expresses his conviction that the Government will build the road. But now we find that, so far from the promises then made being implemented, the Government are absolutely silent, and do not propose a vote of a single dollar for the construction of the Southern Railway in Prince Edward Island. The construction of that railway can be justified. A few years ago I called the attention of the Government to the singular fact that one-fifth of the island was without railway connection, and pointed out how I thought the accommodation could be provided at a very small cost. I pointed out, further, the admission, the clear, distinct and official admission made by Sir Charles Tupper—I think, in the year 1889, the year when he brought down the proposal of the additional grant of $20,000 a year to Prince Edward Island—that Prince Edward Island was entitled to a large additional sum of money for the construction of railways in lieu of it, and this was the reason why I thought the Government would take up fairly and honestly the construction of the road, and would give the people railway accommodation. Hon. gentlemen were then under the impression that the Dominion Government had paid for the construction of the railway in Prince Edward Island. That false impression has, I think, at last been dissipated. It is the case, Sir, that Prince Edward Island has paid for the construction of her own road, while other sections of the Dominion, Cape Breton and other adjoining places, have had similar roads built by the Government of the Dominion. It was also known that the very many millions of money which we have spent since Prince Edward Island came into the Dominion, in constructing railways in other parts, and the very many other millions we have spent in subsidizing railways in other parts of the Dominion, were expenditures from which Prince Edward Island got no benefit whatever; and it was reasonably argued, I was going to say, irresistibly argued, that under the circumstances the people there had a claim for the extension of railway accommodation. Instead of that, Sir, I find to-day that we are being humbugged again, humbugged upon the tunnel, humbugged upon the railway. The Governor in Council again passes an Order in Council facilitating the construction of more railways in the North-west, for instance, the Hudson Bay Railway, which, when undertaken, will cost many millions of dollars. But the promises which a member of the Government made in Prince Edward Island, or permitted to be made in his presence, and with his sanction, have not been implemented, and are not to be implemented. Sir, I hope the hon. member for King's County will be happy in the prospect, I hope he will convey assurances to the very many electors down in that county who have been watching, and waiting, and hoping, and praying for this railway extension—I hope he will be enabled to satisfy them that there are good reasons why it should not be given, and ask them to go on voting for the same Government that has humbugged them in the past and will continue to humbug them in the future.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) We have listened to a long harangue from the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) with respect to railway extension in Prince Edward Island, in which he tries to make this House believe that an hon. gentleman who has a seat in another branch of this Parliament, and who has a seat in the Cabinet of this country, has held meetings throughout the length and breadth of Prince Edward Island with a view to promoting railway extension, and to leading the people to believe that the railways were to be constructed by the Government. Now, Sir, I attended some of those meetings myself, and I can assure the House that I am not aware, and was not aware, until

I heard the hon. member's speech this afternoon, that the hon. gentleman to whom he referred, the Hon. Senator Ferguson, had called any of those meetings, or had advocated, or promised the construction of railways throughout the province. The people of the province of Prince Edward Island had a perfect right to call meetings whenever they saw fit, or for whatever purpose they saw fit; they had a right to call meetings for the purpose of promoting, or asking for railway extension wherever they thought it was required; and they had a perfect right to ask the Hon. Senator Ferguson or any other man to come forward and address the electors on the questions of the day, and to put the policy of the Government before them. I think, Sir, that if there is anybody to be censured with respect to the extension of what the hon. member for Queen's called the Southern Railway extension, I think it is the hon. member for Queen's himself; he accuses the Government of bringing this matter up before the elections for the purpose, as he says, of humbugging the electors. But, Sir, if there ever was a man who humbugged the electors on a question of this kind, it was the hon. member for Queen's. In 1891 he held a meeting in his own constituency, in a place called Caledonia, where he advocated an extension of the railway system to the southern section of the country, and promised the electors at that time that when he came to Parliament he would do his utmost to advocate the said railway, but from that time to this, the hon. member's mouth has never been opened with respect to that subject. So I say that if anybody is to be accused of humbugging the people with respect to railway extension, it is the hon. member for Queen's. There is, no doubt, quite a feeling in the province of Prince Edward Island with respect to railway extension, and I think there is a great deal to warrant them in looking for that railway. The hon. member for Queen's calls upon the Minister of Finance to proclaim at once what he is going to do in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He has told us.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Well, I think if there is anybody in this House who is pleased to find that there is not a dollar in the Estimates, so far as we have yet seen, to provide for railway extension in Prince Edward Island, it is the hon. member for Queen's. Sir, it matters little to him whether the people of Prince Edward Island have a right or claim to railway extension; he would very much rather not see an appropriation placed in the Estimates, because he knows very well that the policy of himself and his party is opposed to railway extension in any of the provinces. There is no man in this Parliament who has proclaimed more loudly his opposition to railway extension in the lower provinces, than the hon. member for Queen's. That hon. member and his party have heretofore raised their voices on all occasions against this railway extension. Now, I contend that the Government has a perfect right to grant railway extension where the interests of the country require it. We in Prince Edward Island claim that we have not participated in the benefit of the large expenditures that have been made in other provinces of the Dominion, consequently we think we have a claim on the Government of Canada for consideration, and that being the case, we have a perfect right to ask for an expenditure of this kind. It may be said that a claim of this kind should go to the local government in the way of an increase of subsidy; but the fact is that, while I should like to see railway extension in the island, I would be very sorry indeed to see an appropriation by this House to meet the claims of the province put into the hands of such an extravagant government as the Liberal Government of Prince Edward Island. When they came into power three or four years ago, they found the province with a very small debt indeed, but they have now rolled up the debt until it is enormous in its proportions; and besides, they have put on an enormous taxation such as had been heretofore unknown in Prince Edward Island. However, their conduct in this respect is only in keeping with Liberal administration in the other provinces of the Dominion.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Governor General's Secretary's Office $11,012.50

Mr. FOSTER. There are no changes in this estimate from last year. There is the same number of clerks. The increase of $150 is made up of statutory increases.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada $33,855

Mr. FOSTER. There are twenty statutory increases at $50 each, making $1,000, and one at $30. There is an additional first class clerk at $1,400, making $2,430. Then from that there is taken the difference between the salaries of Messieurs Bliss and De Lanaudiere, $400, and the salary of one third class clerk, which is dropped, leaving a net increase of $1,380.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to these particular small increases of $50 per annum, we know very little about the efficiency of the clerks, and I am not going to criticise them. But I am bound to say this, and it applies also to the other estimates in connection with the Civil Service, that we are at present expending about one million and a half for civil government, as it is called, which is very nearly double the amount it was found necessary to expend under this head sixteen years ago. There has been no pretense whatever made that the work of governing the country is double now what it was then, nevertheless our ex-

penditure has gradually grown until it is about double the expenditure of 1878. I can not believe that the work of the Privy Council office should require either an expenditure of $33,855, or a staff of thirty clerks. I do not remember at the moment the amount voted in 1878 for that particular department, but I recollect that $800,000 was asked for the services for which $1,449,000 is now required. In 1878 the expenditure for Civil Government amounted to the sum of $823,000, as against an expenditure to-day of $1,449,000. I would not have complained, nor would the country, of a moderate increase, but it is utterly and entirely disproportionate as compared with expenditures in previous years, and the Privy Council is one of those offices in which, with reasonable care, a very much smaller amount would have sufficed. When we consider the percentage which one million and a half bears to the sum total available, deducting fixed charges, hon. gentlemen will see that a charge of $1,449,000 is altogether a too high percentage on the total controllable expenditure. I place that amount, at the present moment, at between ten and twelve millions.

Mr. FOSTER. About twelve millions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of business, the Finance Minister must admit that on an expenditure of ten or twelve millions an outlay of one million and a half for Civil Government is too high a percentage, and one altogether out of proportion to the whole amount, and would be so considered in any business enterprise. I know businesses where a vastly larger sum than our controllable expenditure is handled at an expense not exceeding one-tenth of that incurred at the present time by the Government. This is a case in which from various causes the expenditure has grown, and the hon. Minister seems to be quite unable to devise any scheme for cutting it down. Looking over these items, I find no reduction is made in these various departments.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All the reductions are made on the contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The total decrease is $30,000, and very little of that occurs in the departments themselves, it being almost wholly under the head of Civil Government contingencies. We have seen contingencies cut down many a time, but when we have subsequently seen the Auditor General's Report, the amount expended, notwithstanding the efforts of the Finance Minister, has appeared to be much the same as usual. I am afraid something of the same kind may occur again.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not allow your fears to get uppermost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My fears are based on a tolerably lengthy experience of what has taken place in the past. The committee will observe that I am not speaking altogether without warrant. I find that the Queen's Privy Council for Canada cost about $14,000 in 1878, as against as nearly as possible, $34,000 to-day. The sum total was $18,000, but that included the salary of the President of the Council for nearly eight months, which reduced the actual amount to about $14,000. I put it to the Minister of Finance as a matter of business whether he thinks, if the Privy Council office could be properly managed in 1878 with $14,000, I am not justified in suggesting that $34,000 is too large a sum to ask for this year of grace 1895? I think in that, as well as in other matters connected with Civil Government, if the hon. gentleman is disposed to apply the pruning-knife, there is ample room for doing it, and although I do not want the service to be neglected, I cannot but think that if twelve clerks in 1878 were able to perform the work, thirty clerks is too large a number for the service during 1895-96.

Committee rose, and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Office of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada..... $33,855

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that there are some increases in this vote. I think it is just as well that I should now call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the enormous expense to which the country is annually subjected for our Civil Service. It appears from a report laid upon the Table of the House last year that we have about 4,300 permanent civil servants employed in this Dominion. There are from 880 to 900 in the city of Ottawa, with an average salary of $100 a month, and the average pay of the entire number of civil servants in the inside and outside service is about $813 a month. Now, considering the reductions that have taken place in the cost of the necessaries of life, I think that instead of increasing the salaries of civil servants by $50 a year, we should go in the other direction, and reduce them. In view of the cheapened prices of everything the civil servants have got to buy at the present moment, and considering also our crippled financial position, there is no reason why they should expect this annual increase in their salaries. The Minister of Finance has to meet a deficit of nearly $6,000,000, and instead of meeting it by increasing taxation, he should, in my opinion, seek to find

means to reduce expenses in every direction. The Minister of Finance says that these are statutory increases in this vote. If they are, I would suggest to him that he should bring down a bill to reverse the order of things, and, in place of increasing the salaries by $50 a year he should decrease them. I find that in this department one man gets $1,800; another, $1,600; another, $1,550; another, $1,400; another, $1,200; and so on down to $950. Putting all these together, they are very respectable allowances for these people, in view of the present condition of the country, and the cheapness of living, compared with what it was a few years ago. I wish to know whether the Minister of Finance intends to continue this system of giving annual increases of $50, or whether it is the intention of the Government to alter the condition of things, and allow men a reasonable salary to the extent of what their services are worth, and fix it at that. The duties performed by most of these clerks are merely of a routine character, and, after two or three months training, they can discharge these duties as well as if they had served six or seven years. They are duties that any third-class teacher in a common school, in most cases, after a few months training, could perform well. In some cases, technical qualifications are required in the civil service. I can well understand, but that must be so in comparatively few instances. I do not think the Minister will even contend that ordinary civil servants become so efficient by practice that they are entitled to an increase every year. Is it the intention of the Government to suggest to Parliament that these annual increases should be stopped?

Mr. FOSTER. It will be noticed in reference to the Privy Council office that the increases are almost entirely statutory.

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit that.

Mr. FOSTER. They are such as are authorized by law, and such as, for a series of years, while this Act has been in force, have been allowed. There is no doubt at all that a large part of the increase in the expense of the Civil Service is not because of an addition to the number of clerks, but rather from these annual increases, spread over such a large number of employees. We find that although quite a large number of clerks have been dispensed with, yet the total expense shows but a very slight decrease, and that is due to the fact that the reduction in the number of employees is nearly off-set by these statutory increases allowed to the different clerks. It has been the rule in the Civil Service to get these annual increases. It is authorized by law, and it is found to be in practice simply a rule to give an increase if a clerk has done his work fairly well, and has not been guilty of any dereliction of duty which would make it necessary to punish him by the refusal of an increase. In cases where the increase has been refused, it has been refused rather as a punishment than otherwise. Now, with reference to the higher class clerks, I do not think they are overpaid. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) has spoken of the decrease in the cost of living, but if the hon. gentleman will settle in Ottawa, I think he will find that the cost of living has not decreased in this city. Those clerks who have families to educate and to maintain find it very difficult work in nine cases out of ten to do so, and to have very much left over. What I want to impress upon the mind of my hon. friend is, that they are not growing rich on these salaries, but quite the reverse. The talent which the better class clerks—there are a very great many of them who are most excellent clerks—the talent which they give, if it had been for an equal number of years employed in other lines of life, would have brought them, in most cases, better salaries and better living than they get here. When we come to the class of clerks who do simply routine work like writing, my own personal opinion is that that branch of the service might very well be reformed—that instead of having a system of third-class clerks, commencing at $400, which is certainly not too high a minimum, and going up by yearly increases to $1,000, we might effect very large economies by adopting a system of writers under which young men and young women could be employed temporarily to do the work. They would have youth on their side, and, being temporarily employed, they would be anxious to please and do their work well. In that class of the service, the most efficient work we get is probably from the temporary help employed in that way; and for $400 to $600 we could get that work done just as well as it is done to-day by $1,000 clerks. That is my private opinion, and I hold it very strongly. When you come to the class of clerks who do technical work, or trusted work, and who have to employ a good deal of mental capacity and independent investigation, I do not think that our salaries, as a rule, range high. On the contrary, I think they are quite moderate. I do not think we could command that class of service for lower salaries. The Government has discussed this matter and is now giving some attention to it, though the opinion I have expressed has not been made the opinion of the Government, so far as I know, and I do not mean it to bind the Government; but it is my idea of one way in which the service might be rearranged to bring about economies without impairing the efficiency of the work done.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to challenge two or three statements made by the hon. Finance Minister. He says the salaries paid by the Government to the Civil Ser-

vice for the work performed are as low, if not lower, than the same persons would get if employed in other lines of life; conveying the idea that those people are making sacrifices to serve their country. I do not believe it. From a return laid on the Table of this House last year, I find that we had 4,408 civil servants altogether employed in the service of this Dominion, and our wages bill last year was $3,587,629.36, making the average salary paid to each of these people, $813.89. Now, I would ask the Finance Minister to name any other class in this country who receive an average salary of that amount. Do ministers of the Gospel get it? I think not. Do school teachers, or bank clerks, or wholesale or retail clerks get it? I think not. Then why is the country asked to increase the salaries of these people every year by $50 each?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon friend must be fair. He would lead the House to suppose that all these 4,408 clerks receive the $50 increase. They do not, by a very large proportion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that. A certain proportion of the number get a yearly increase of $50 until their salary reaches a certain point, after which they do not get any increase. But there is no reason why this system should be kept in force. The hon. Finance Minister says that it is done under a statutory arrangement. Well, if we have a system that militates against the interests of the people of this country, I think it is time that statute was amended to bring it more into harmony with the interests of the people. If we pay our civil servants as much as is paid to other men in ordinary lines of life, that is all they can reasonably expect. Their work is no harder and their hours are no longer, they get Saturday afternoon to play themselves; and, considering everything, I think we ought at once to change the statute that authorizes these increases. The Finance Minister says that living in Ottawa is expensive. I dare say it is. It may be a little more expensive than living in other places; but I have come to the conclusion that if a man is disposed to live carefully, he can live here just about as cheaply as in Toronto, Hamilton, or Montreal. The ordinary commodities that enter into every-day use can be got as cheaply here as anywhere else. If a man is disposed to keep up a mansion, there is no doubt that it will cost him considerable money; but a civil servant is not obliged to do that. I think the law with regard to these increases should be at once amended so that the people of the country will not any longer have to tolerate the enormous drain upon their resources, caused by these increases in the civil service.

Mr. FRASER. My criticism would rather be in the opposite direction. I believe that when you get a good man you should pay him; you cannot get a good man unless you do pay him. At the same time, a man should only get what he is worth. For example, the deputy head here receives $3,200. In the town from which I come there is an amalgamated company with a capital of $5,000,000, the manager of which does not get within $500 of that, and he does his work well. I do not know whether $3,200 is too much in the city of Ottawa, but I do know that $3,200 should get a first-class man. Granted that he is a first-class man, I submit that twenty-nine assistants in that small business are too many; and my criticism would be: get good men, have less of them, and let them work. I have no doubt that not one-half of those twenty-nine men do a solid day's work. For example, in the very works of which I speak, there are not more than ten to do the whole work of that company from the beginning to the end of the year, and they do it on salaries that do not amount to more than a third of those I have mentioned. The Government do not seem to understand that the business of the country should be managed like the business of ordinary men. The men working for the country should get good wages but they should also work. A great many are put into the Government offices to satisfy political friends of the Government. I venture to say that there are establishments in London which do a business of ten million to fifteen million a year, and where the salaries are not as large as those paid in the Privy Council. The business there cannot be anything like that done in the Railway Department. There are too many men employed there. I do not say that a good man should not get a fair wage, but he should work just as long and as well for the Government as he would for other people. In New Glasgow, the manager of the agency of the Bank of Nova Scotia, which does a large business there, only gets about $1,500 a year, and yet he has all the responsibility of a bank agent. I do not say that that is enough, but you would get the very best men for that. I think that all the civil servants should bear their share of the difficulty that we are now encountering. I think that this is no time to raise wages, when we have a decreasing revenue. Take up the papers and you will find them full of complaints of dull business. A man has a large staff of employees, and business is decreasing, and what does he do? He simply tells those men the condition of things.

Mr. BERGIN. What about lawyers' fees?

Mr. FRASER. The doctors will charge the same whether times are good or bad, and the hon. gentleman is not a competent witness on this occasion. I am not sure that the method proposed by the hon. Min-

ister is correct. In this country, we must follow the example set by England, and subject candidates to the most rigid examination before admitting them into the public service. And when they are in, let them feel secure; let them feel that they will not be removed when they do their work, and then we will have such officers as they have in England. Another detriment to the public service is the fact that when a man knows that he owes his position to his political connection or influence, you cannot get satisfactory work out of him. I think that $32,000 is too large a sum for this one office. I do not think that value is given for the amount, and I am quite satisfied that some of the employees do not give value for half the amount paid them. The hon. Minister could well decrease the number and have the work done just as well. I think this will apply to many other departments. I repeat, if we had here the system that prevails in England of subjecting candidates for the service to a very rigid examination, and not allowing the appointments to depend on the political influence of the candidate, we would have a much more efficient public service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister of Finance has told us what his views are with regard to Civil Service reform, and the scheme which the hon. gentleman has suggested is one which the former leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blake, brought before this House, and which the hon. gentleman and his friends opposed. That scheme to employ writers instead of third-class clerks in the same way that writers are employed in England. Now, the hon. gentleman has suggested that scheme as, in his opinion, a preferable system to the one which now exists. If the hon. gentleman contemplates a reform of that sort, he must also contemplate very considerable change in the service, and, in my opinion, a very considerable change might advantageously be made. But what I rose to ask the hon. gentleman was to discuss at this point, in connection with the suggestion he has made, what way he proposes to deal with the Civil Service as it now exists. There is, I am told, a very much larger number of persons in many of the departments than are called for, and a larger number than is required to do the work within reasonable hours. How does the hon. gentleman propose to reduce the numbers? Does he propose to superannuate those who are really supernumeraries in the public employment? Does he propose to give them a credit for a little period of time, and give them time to look out for other employments. Or does he propose to discharge them without remuneration or superannuation allowance? This is a very serious question. The hon. gentleman has a large deficit. In my opinion, he could increase the efficiency of the Civil Service by very careful revision of the service. How does the hon. gentleman propose to carry that system out? I think that, seeing the hon. gentleman has gone as far as he has in suggesting changes that will bring about improvement, he should tell us how he proposes to deal with the service as now constituted, in order that he may enter upon the path of improvement which he has indicated.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you want to have a discussion upon the matter?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, having gone that far in the first item, ought to tell us how he proposes to deal with those matters, because I understand that the Government contemplate placing a very considerable number of those now in the public service upon the superannuation list, and I do not think that that would be exactly what the public will be disposed to favour.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that we will make any progress, just at this particular stage, by having an academic discussion on this matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is practical, not academic. If we had the proposal before the House to abolish third-class clerks and put in writers in their place, the question would come up and be considered in all its details.

Mr. FOSTER. I took very good care to say that, while that was my own opinion, it was not a matter that the Government had decided upon. I have my own views with regard to how that might be accomplished, and, at the proper time, I shall be glad to discuss it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is the time.

Mr. FOSTER. No; there is no measure before the House. The hon. member will have an opportunity, I daresay, to discuss this question upon some measure, upon which, as he will admit, the discussion will be more germain than upon the Estimates, which are prepared according to the law as it is. I do not think it would be well for me to take up time in discussing what might be done in certain contingencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that, in addition to the measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, the hon. gentleman intends to propose a Civil Service reform Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say I did. But there is notice on the paper of legislation upon this subject, and these Bills will come before the House for discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not see that mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I would like to know to what clause of the Speech the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not speaking of a Government measure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman is not speaking of a Government measure, it seems to me he is trifling with the subject, knowing as we do, the usual fate of such Bills introduced by private members. But I want to call attention to another important point which ought to be explained to the House before this vote is passed. I called attention, before the House rose at six, to the enormous sum asked for the Privy Council service. I say, having had some experience in this matter as well as the hon. gentleman, that I cannot understand or conceive how $34,000 can be honestly wanted for the Privy Council office, nor do I understand how it can take thirty men to do the work that was done, and quite well done, a matter of fourteen or fifteen years ago, by less than half that number. It appears to me to be simply nonsense to tell this House that the work of the Privy Council office can equal that, for instance, of the Auditor General's Department. The Auditor General has a great amount of work to do, which results in the production of an enormous volume. He has to supervise the whole of the expenditure of this country, and, to examine all the vouchers, he must have a considerable staff. We find that, whereas the Auditor General's office requires the services of twenty-six men, the Privy Council requires the services of thirty. While the Auditor General asks for $27,000, the Privy Council asks for $34,000. Who is the President of the Privy Council at present?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Prime Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the leader of the House answers for him. I would like to ask what is the work done by the twenty-six men in this office, exclusive of door-keepers and messengers? I can understand that there might be reason for employing seven or eight of these clerks and two or three of the superior officers. But I cannot understand how these twenty-six men can keep themselves employed unless the Government have themselves adopted a complicated system of red-tape for the purpose of embarrassing business and hampering the departments. I cannot understand what the Privy Council can require these thirty people for, including door-keepers and messengers. As I said before, the Auditor General's Department requires only twenty-six men, and the work in that office must be much greater and more laborious. I should say that the work of the Finance Department, if properly done, ought to be double or treble as voluminous, as it is probably double or treble as important, as that of the Privy Council office. Going further down, I find the Customs Department has only thirty-two men. Why, the Department of Railways and Canals, a very important department, requires only thirty-two people. I do not see that there is any proportion at all preserved here. We ought to have reports of the wrok done by these departments. I do not attach a great deal of importance to the number of letters written myself, for most of them are of a purely formal character, and could be dashed off at a very rapid rate by a competent clerk or type-writer. But we ought to know what the work of the Privy Council is, to require the services of one deputy head, one chief clerk assistant, one Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, four first-class clerks, six second-class clerks and thirteen third-class clerks, besides door-keepers and messengers.

An hon. MEMBER. And private Secretary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the private secretary is not supposed to be attached to the Privy Council office. I will not say much about him, but then he is not counted among the thirty, although allowance for him is included in the vote. The Minister of Finance should be prepared to state to the House in what work these parties are employed. As I say, I cannot see how these twenty-six clerks can be kept busy, day in and day out, throughout the working portion of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not head of that department, and am not so familiar with its work as I am with that of my own department. But the hon. gentleman himself, if he thinks a moment, will have a better idea of this work probably than my hon. friend behind him (Mr. McMullen) who criticised it—making the statement that there did not seem to be work for a considerable number of men, that it was not like a department or business establishment. For instance, take an insurance society which is carrying on a large business, and take the work which centres at the head office. By looking into work of that kind you can get but a very little idea of the labour which is necessary in a department like this. My hon. friend said it was not a department. It may not be a department in one sense, but, at the same time, there is a vast accumulation of work. Just think for a moment that for every recommendation which for its carrying out requires the sanction of the Council, or the consideration of the Council, the papers have to be sent over, they have to be passed through the hands of the officers, they have to be copied. The work of all the different departments converges in this department and necessitates a large volume of clerical and routine work. I have here a statement of the work that is done. My hon. friend refers to 1878. At that time the permanent staff was thirteen, at present the permanent staff is about thirty. The number of entries registered in 1878 was 2,056;

in 1894 the number was 4,447—more than double. The number of Orders in Council passed in 1878 was 1,195, in 1894 it was 4,061; that is, 3½ times as many. The number of folios in Orders in Council in 1878 was 2,273, while in 1894 it was 16,974; about 5 times as many. The number of folios copied in 1878 was 11,000; in 1894 it was 115,406; about 10½ times as many as in 1878. The numbers of references to departments made in 1878 was 399, and in 1894 3,006; being 7½ times as many. The salaries for the thirteen permanent officers in 1878 amounted to $15,000, while in 1894 the salaries were $32,575. The permanent staff is a little more than double what it was, the salaries are just about double, but the work is about from four to ten and one-half times as great as it was in 1878. The amount of labour involved in copying all these Orders in Council, all the references that go back to the different departments, all the despatches and references that have to be sent to the provincial governments and the Home Government, contribute a great deal to the work to be done by this department. The work converges there. If we think of it for a moment, we will see that it is not a sinecure. And the work performed in the Privy Council differs from that of the other departments in this respect, that the Privy Council officers and clerks have to be there when the Council is at work, while in the other departments the officers have their regular hours of duty. When the Council work is heavy, as it is in eight months out of the twelve, these clerks have to be there just as long as the Council is there, and are there often from early in the morning until six o'clock, and sometimes later at night. They are obliged to work on holidays. The Government in 1894, being a working Government, in contrast to that of 1878, as is shown by the amount of references, Orders in Council, and the like of that, have to work on holidays; these men then have to come back and do work as well. I am inclined to think that in 1878 the hon. gentlemen opposite had a jolly good time, that they did not bother themselves about Council work, because the records of the department show that not a great deal of work was done, although one-half of the total amount of salaries was paid. If you take thirteen and divide it into $15,000, and take now 29 and divide it into $32,000, you will find that you paid your clerks more royally, and I am inclined to think you lived higher in those days, in the precincts of the Council, than we do to-day. The comparison is entirely against my hon. friend, and instead of no work being now done, there is a vast deal of work; and instead of there being no increase of work, the appreciation is very large. My hon. friends forget, it is so long ago since they occupied that chamber, the kind of work and the nature of the work, and the accumulation of work, which must take place if the Government are to do the business of the country. They forget, as well, that in all these respects the business of the country has greatly enlarged since 1878. The correspondence which takes place has very largely increased. I am inclined to think, from conversations I have had at various times with the deputy, and from some little investigation I made into the work, that this staff is not simply there for show, but that actual work is done, and that the clerks are kept at their work, and kept hard at work as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should be inclined to think, in listening to the hon. gentleman's figures, that he and his colleagues had been applying themselves to increase the amount of work in the circumlocution department with exceeding little profit to the people of the country. Now, I do not hold that it is the business of the Privy Council of Canada to be concerned with petty clerks' work. The Privy Council, in my judgment, ought to meet chiefly for the discussion of important questions, and not to debate every little trumpery appointment, every little trumpery detail which ought to be left to the judgment and placed at the discretion of the Minister; but now this is made the excuse for reams of correspondence, and references, and all the rest of it. If the hon. gentleman be correct, as I assume he is, in saying that 11,000 folios did the work of the Privy Council in 1878, and that 110,000 or 120,000 folios are required to do it now, I would say that the work was done ten times better in 1878 than it is now. I do not think it is a merit or a credit to the Government that you have multiplied all these references, that you have multiplied all this unnecessary work, and that you have charged us $33,000 for doing what was a great deal better done, and a thousand times more honestly done, in 1878, than is done by these hon. gentlemen. Sir, we know perfectly well how these hon. gentlemen have been occupying themselves. We know the contracts they have made, we know the means that have been used by the hon. gentlemen for the purpose of carrying the elections. We know their various devices, and I do not wonder that it has taken whole seas of ink and whole deserts of paper to cover up and conceal the artifices they have had recourse to. I can well understand that 120,000 folios are all too little to hide the tracks of the hon. gentlemen. However, I do not at all consider that this multiplication of work in the Privy Council is in the slightest degree likely to increase its efficiency in carrying on the business of this country. I entirely differ from the hon. gentleman in holding that all these petty references go to show that the work is better done. They go to show that there is a great deal more red tape about it, and that is all. In looking

through these Estimates, in observing the increase which has marked every single one of these items within a very few years, we have the best possible proof that the business of the country is not better done. As the country grows, the expenses ought to be less in proportion to the population. The hon. gentleman knows that the expenses of this country have largely increased in proportion to population. The population has hardly increased by 25 per cent in the 16 years, but the actual taxation has increased 200 per cent, and the nominal taxation 100 per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I find by the Estimates of 1878 that there were then eight clerks in this department. There are 26 at the present time. The expenditure at that time for clerks, door-keeper and messenger, 12 in all, was $16,300; to-day it is $33,855. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of the increased amount of work. We were told this last year. We made some inquiry, and the Minister who had charge of these Estimates last year gave us information. What did that information disclose? It disclosed this fact, that every Minister, instead of discharging those duties which the law has put upon him as a Minister, as the head of a department, has practically trasferred the work, and the duties with regard to appointment, and with regard to many matters that are purely departmental, to the Governor in Council. Sir, it is a highly irregular proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, what?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With regard to subordinate appointments that belong to the department, with regard to many matters that are matters of detail. I cannot recall those that were given to us last year, but a number of them were mentioned here last year that I know as a matter of fact were discharged as departmental matters, that are now being discharged through the Privy Council.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him? He must make the objection more definite. In criticising this item, it will not do to say that certain things that ought to be done by the department were formerly done by the department and are now transferred. What things? There has been no change in the system. What subordinate appointments can he mention that were made formerly by the Minister and are now made by the Council?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not prepared to say. I am prepared to say this, however, that if the hon. gentleman will produce the work of that department for a single month, we will be able to show him that much of the business that is now being done in the Privy Council, was formerly done by the department.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has changed his ground. He made the allegation that it was so; now he says, If you will produce the record we will show you it was so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said the Minister who had charge of these matters last year mentioned the facts to the House. I dare say that anybody who will take the trouble to turn up the "Hansard" when the Estimates of this department were under discussion last year, will see that it is so. The hon. gentleman cannot pretend to say that the amount of business is ten times as great as it was in 1878. What makes the business of the Government ten times as great as it was then? The statement bears upon its face its own refutation. The population is not ten times as great in 1895 as it was in 1878. The wealth of the country has not increased ten fold; the circumstances of the country have not changed so as to have imposed enormously-increased duties on the Government as compared with previous years. It goes to show that the Government have recently made the transaction of business cumbersome and expensive, and it is important that the Government should get back to that simple and more expeditious method, and also cheaper method of transacting business which previously prevailed. In 1878-79—and the charges for that year were larger than during the previous year—there was one deputy head, one chief assistant, one first-class clerk, two senior second-class, and three junior clerks, or, as they are now called, third-class clerks. How does the staff stand to-day? There is one deputy head and clerk of the Council, one chief clerk assistant, one Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who has been transferred to this department; four first-class clerks, where there was one before; one second-class clerk, who is a draughtsman; five second-class clerks, and thirteen third-class clerks. There is no comparison between the constitution of the staff in 1878-79 and that of 1895-96, and there is certainly nothing in the public service to account for this extraordinary charge.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has made no case at all. He commenced by making assertions in a general way, but when he came down to particulars he had no particulars to give.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I had.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the genius and tendency of Government for the Council to assume to itself work to the detriment of the departments. It is rather the genius and tendency of Government for the departments to take work themselves and perform it without burdening the Executive Council with it. I ask the hon.

gentleman to give a single class of work which has been transferred from the departments to the Council, and which had not been performed during the time the Government of which the hon. member for Bothwell was a member, a single case not required by the law under which the appointment is made, and under which the salary is paid. The hon. gentleman could not do it, and he has not done it up to the present moment. Unless the hon. gentleman comes down to something like a definite statement, and keeps clear of generalities, which are very glittering, but yet have very little force, he has not made out a case, in fact, he cannot make out a case. When the hon. gentleman came down to the charge of extravagance as to salaries, his own statement showed that the Government of which he was a member had, in proportion to the work done, more employees, and paid higher salaries than, on the average, is paid to-day for work done. So the hon. gentleman, outside of declamation, which was plentiful and windy, has not made out a case against the department, but, on the contrary, has made out a case against himself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Suppose the hon. gentleman brings down a statement of the work last month before Parliament met, and let hon. members see what it covered, and of what the references were composed. Let the hon. gentleman bring down a month's work as a sample.

Mr. FOSTER. You would not be able to hold a caucus.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will find some hon. members who will be willing to sacrifice themselves to study the papers. I suggest that the hon. gentleman should give us a sample of the business that engaged the attention of himself and his colleagues during one month before Parliament met. This should include the various Orders in Council—indeed, we will be content with them. Let the hon. gentleman bring down honestly one month's Orders in Council, and let the House see what the hon. gentleman and his colleagues did, and what work there was to be performed by thirty clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. You have the record of a year, which is surely better than for a month.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We understand what the record for a year may be; we understand what four thousand references may be worth. We should like to see the genuine article itself. If the hon. Minister will bring down one month's Orders in Council, without reservation, mental or otherwise, we will be satisfied. My hon. friend will make a motion to that effect, if the hon. gentleman will go so far as to promise to comply with it. How many times did the hon. gentleman and his colleagues meet in Council during February, for example? Did they meet three times?

Mr. FOSTER. Now your are asking for information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know perfectly well how these matters are managed. It is quite easy for any of the departments to make as much work as it requires to make a showing.

Mr. FOSTER. Something like one or two of your months in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a volume of 2,000 pages—the Auditor General's Report. We know well the amount of work that enters into that volume, work which requires not four thousand, but forty thousand references to the various departments. Yet this labour is performed by twenty-two or twenty-three clerks under the supervision of the Auditor General. Does the hon. Minister of Finance mean to tell the Committee that the legitimate work of the Privy Council office is likely to be greater than that passing through the office of the Auditor General? If he does, the Privy Council must have become a most extraordinarily hard-working institution.

Mr. FOSTER. So it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it is. Very strange things pass in the Privy Council office, as we know. We do not dispute the hon. gentleman's word, but we should like to see examples of the work. If the hon. Minister will bring down a month's Orders in Council, we shall be satisfied, for we are curious to see what the character of the work really is.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Minister of Finance and the hon. members who have discussed this matter have been labouring under a misapprehension as to the number of employees in the Privy Council office. I call the attention of the Minister to page 2 of the Auditor General's Report. He will find that instead of twenty-nine or thirty persons being employed as clerks and messengers in that department, the number is fifty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That includes contingencies extras.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know why it is necessary to keep a door-keeper and messenger for the Privy Council at a salary of $700. Does the Minister mean to say that it is necessary to pay such a salary? Could not the hon. gentleman fill the position for a less sum?

Mr. FOSTER. No. The man who keeps the door is an old and faithful servant; he is not there as a boy, he has been there for a series of years, has grown old and gray

in the service, and has now reached the salary of $700. The hon. gentleman will not say that is too much. Nor will the hon. gentleman say that the Privy Council should sit without having a door-keeper and some one to attend to messages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to obtain that sample of that work done?

Mr. FOSTER. We will take the matter under consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. No doubt it is necessary for the Privy Council to have a door-keeper in view of the racket that goes on in the committee sometimes, a faithful servant to keep the doors closed when necessary, and to allow members to escape when required. I think if the Government were disposed, they could make reductions in some of these departments. The people of the country are looking to the Opposition to discharge the very onerous duty of pointing out where reductions can be made, and it is highly desirable that the expenditure should be reduced to the lowest possible point. The hon. gentleman has gone back to to 1877-78, when the country was passing through a crisis, which did not, however, compare at all with the serious condition of the country at the present time. The Minister of Finance must also remember that living is very much less now than formerly, and we ought to cut our expenses down in every possible shape and way to meet the altered condition of things and the enormous deficit that has to be provided for. I compliment the Minister of Finance on the fact that he has made some reduction, but I hope he will not change his mind as he did on the tariff items, and bring down further votes to burden the country. I am also glad to know that there will be no Supplementary Estimates for the year we are now considering. We want the Government to understand that we will press for reduction in every single estimate in which we consider a reduction should be made. I intend personally to take that course for the reason that when the Minister of Railways was out on a stumping tour a short time ago, he stated in connection with the Tay Canal, that there never was a single objection made by any member of the Opposition to the expenditure of that money. I am not sure just now whether he was correctly reported or not, but at all events I will find out before the session is over. If the Minister of Railways is correct, then the Opposition did not discharge their duty in not protesting against the scandalous expenditure of money on that ditch. However, my opinion is that it was very strongly protested against. It is our duty to see, and we will see, that no money is wasted in that manner again. I am quite certain the country expects a great deal more from us, than they expect from the Government in the direction of reducing expenses. The Minister of Finance twitted the Opposition that they had been so long out of office that they had forgotten a great deal of what transpired in the Council Chamber. The hon. gentleman had better not be over-certain of the perpetuity of the position he now occupies, because to my mind it is very risky indeed. The Government was in a tight place a short time ago, and I have no doubt that if the walls of the Council Chamber could speak, they could reveal secrets as to the anxious discussion which took place as to whether the Government should dissolve Parliament or call the session. It was only after a long and continued fight that they came to the conclusion that it was better to choose the less of two evils and try to get through with a meeting of Parliament. My own opinion is that when the electorate has an opportunity of pronouncing upon the conduct of the Government for the last ten or twelve years, the gentlemen of the Treasury benches will find that they are not secure in their positions, and that they will have to discharge the duties of an Opposition, which I am quite sure they will not discharge as well as we have done. We have no desire to delay the business of Parliament, but we have a duty to perform and we will perform it. If the Minister of Finance presents any item that in the opinion of the Opposition should not be passed without extended criticism, we will in the interests of the country indulge in criticism. We take this course not because we expect to make any favourable impression on the minds of the Government and its supporters, because they are past reforming, and there is no hope of economy from them; but we want the people of the country to know that we are in favour of retrenchment and we do not want to leave ourselves open to the charge that we failed to urge reductions where reductions should be made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House to the statement made by the Prime Minister last year. Sir John Thompson said:

> The work of the Privy Council has been greatly increasing, and is greatly increasing from year to year. As those hon. members who have been members of the Cabinet know, a great many matters which might be disposed of by the departments come to the Privy Council to receive the consideration of the whole Cabinet.

I hope the hon. gentleman will be satisfied that he is mistaken, and that my statement to the House is perfectly correct.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a very poor logician if he thinks he has made an argument out of that quotation. It may be quite true that a good many things which might be disposed of in the departments do come to the Privy Council, but that might have been equally true, and was equally true when hon. gentlemen opposite were in.

I asked my hon. friend to point out a single class of business which is now given over to the Council from the departments, which was not formerly sent to the Council also. The hon. gentleman has failed to do this.

Mr. FRASER. I think that the logic of the Finance Minister has failed him. It is the place of the Minister of Finance to show that these same things to which the Prime Minister referred last year were performed by the late Government. As we do not know what is performed by the present Government it would be impossible for us to do so. The onus of proof is on the Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. The onus is always on the attacking party.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the onus is clearly on the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have taken the statement of the Prime Minister last year. The Prime Minister last year said : That the work of the Privy Council has been greatly increased and is increasing from year to year, and he gives as the reason, because the business that might be transacted by the Ministers in their departments is brought to the Council for the purpose of being transacted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a question of a good deal of importance underlying this which is worth a word or two. Apparently the hon. gentleman is departing—as the Government to which he belongs has departed, in the past and is likely to depart more in the future—he is departing wider and wider from the English system of cabinet government. That system, as he will find if he wishes to make inquiry, is this : That the heads of departments are held in a very large measure responsible for the management of their departments, as in my judgment they ought to be ; that references are not made to the Privy Council for trifling matters, but on questions of really grave importance. The Privy Council is or ought to be an august, or at least a respectable body, and it ought in all conscience not be convened together for little matters of detail. Its functions,—and I think that this is the view held by most of our constitutional writers—its functions ought to be to deliberate on matters of grave moment to the state. I don't think that it is at all a desirable thing that the time of thirteen or fourteen gentlemen, or whatever the number who are eligible to sit there may be, should be taken up in discussing little matters of which the individual Minister ought to be a far better judge than his colleagues. I think their time ought to be used for the consideration of grave and important questions. If you allow the Privy Council to be turned into a mere chamber for the purpose of registering routine matters, you destroy the usefulness of the Cabinet to a great extent. I know that that system has made considerable progress of late years, and I do not think it is at all an improvement on the old plan or the plan which prevails at present in England. I think the plan of giving a Minister reasonably full control in his own department and holding him responsible if he makes a mistake will be found far more conducive to the public service than shifting the responsibility to a board and saying : "This was passed by the Council and no one in particular is responsible for it." Let each Minister run his own department and be responsible for it, and let the Cabinet deal with important questions.

Mr. LISTER. Year after year for the last twelve or fifteen years the Opposition have been trying to discharge their duty in pressing upon the Government the necessity of practicing economy. Year after year the Finance Minister for the time, and other members of the Government have tried to explain the remarkable extravagance that has characterized their Administration, and have made promises of reformation ; but my experience has always been that our arguments have been fruitless. Year after year, instead of showing economy by reducing the number of public servants, the Government confront us with increases. This economical Government have found it necessary to have some seventeen Ministers to administer the affairs of less than 5,000,000 people, while other governments throughout the world are able to do a great deal more than this Government with from five to seven Ministers. It is only two or three years since this economical Government, while the present economical Finance Minister was in it, found it necessary to take away from the Minister of Inland Revenue the office he held, and appoint a Controller of Customs, a Controller of Inland Revenue, and a Solicitor General, in addition to the officers who were then discharging the duties of those offices. We have also a President of the Council. Nobody can take exception to the Prime Minister occupying that position at present, but we cannot forget that only a short time ago it was held by the hon. Mr. Ives. It is a hard-worked office, no doubt. I do not know whether he is the Minister who remarked that he was very hard-worked—that it took him twenty minutes a day to discharge the duties of the office, for which he was receiving from the people of this country about $8,000 a year. These hon. gentlemen are not content with increasing the members of the Administration, but every Minister who comes into office has a few friends who have done him yeoman service and whom it is necessary to provide with places. The consequence is that year after year, instead of the public service

standing about still in point of numbers, it shows an increase in numbers and a consequent increase in cost. The hon. Finance Minister tells us that the gentlemen in the public service are hard worked—that they earn all the salary that this Parliament votes to them from year to year. I am not going to raise an issue with the Minister of Finance in regard to that; but I will say this, that there is no difficulty whatever in getting any number of people to fill any position that becomes vacant in the service. As a matter of fact, there are three or four thousand people who have passed the Civil Service examinations and who are waiting for their turn, hoping year after year that they may be appointed; but the time never comes, and they find ultimately that much of their life has been wasted. To say that the Civil Service of this country is an efficient one is to make a statement in which there is no truth. The system of appointment is pernicious in the extreme. Instead of making appointments by competitive examinations and only for necessary positions, the Governments appoints its friends regardless altogether of the date of examination or the merit of the applicant—regardless altogether of any consideration, except that of finding places for their friends, where they may have a sure living and by which they may be provided for when they cease to work at all. So that I do not think the Civil Servants are entitled to any particular sympathy. As a matter of fact, they are paid better than any other class of servants in this country; and the best proof of that is that there are thousands of people anxious to enter this service—anxious to sacrifice themselves, if we are to take the words of the Finance Minister, for the benefit of their country. The policy of the Government is the multiplication of the offices in order to find places for their friends. It is a system of nepotism which I believe is unparalleled in any other country in the world. I believe there is not a single Minister on those benches to-day who has not three or four or more relatives and friends in the public service. The consequence is that when a man prepares himself and takes all the pains and time necessary to qualify himself for a public position, unless he is fortunate enough to have some friend in the Government or some friend of the Government, it is needless for him to apply for a position. Why, Sir, a young man in London who some five or six years ago passed his examination for the Civil Service, and applied to a friend of your own too, could not obtain a position because he was not able to get sufficient influence. He applied and applied, year after year, to be taken into the Civil Service, but in vain. He had passed an excellent examination and was in every way qualified for the position, but he failed and failed, and ultimately became thoroughly despondent. He wrote to me, and I said to him: "Unless you have a friend in the Government it is no use of you to apply at all. If you have a friend in the Government or a prominent supporter of the Government, your application will be successful." The hon. gentleman says that the Privy Council department requires thirty clerks having salaries ranging from a thousand dollars to twenty-four hundred dollars. He gave us to understand that these thirty men did an enormous amount of work in this particular department, and the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) tells us that in addition to those thirty, there are some twenty others employed in this department.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I refer the hon. Minister to the statement—he can read it in the Auditor General's Report. There are fifty clerks and messengers.

Mr. FOSTER. Employed through the year?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In the Privy Council Department through the year.

Mr. FOSTER. During the year.

Mr. LISTER. I do not know whether by the year or the month, but at all events thirty people are employed to do work; and I venture to say that the work done in that office is not equal to that done in a leading bank in this city. And in addition to these hard-working individuals, it appears that the Government have twenty others, who either work all the year or at different periods during the year, so that with a force of fifty men the Government is still adding to the cost of the Privy Council. The cost has increased from $12,000 in 1878 to $33,855 in 1895. This is only in keeping with every other act of this Government. In every branch there is nothing but extravagance and some say corruption. I do not wonder that the Minister of Finance would not bring down the proceedings of the Privy Council for the last month. It is said that this Government, in the face of an Act of Parliament, passed an Order in Council, when they thought that there was going to be a general election—and if there had been, the public would have known nothing about this Order in Council,—giving $2,500,000 to a railway company in the North-west. It was said that there was a little bargain or at all events it was done in secret. The public knew nothing about it and the Government appear uncertain at the present moment whether they will carry it out or not. It is said, moreover, that a member of the Government was one of the corporators of that Hudson Bay Company. Whether that member of the Government has any interest in it now or not, I do not pretend to say, but the effect of the Order in Council is this, that the contractors have gone to Winnipeg and commenced, in form at all events

if not in substance, the work which they say they are entitled to begin under the agreement with the Government, whether the Government goes on with the work or not, there will be a claim. If it does not go on with the work, the claim will be for damages. There will be a reference to special tribunal, and the result will be that Canada will have to pay the piper. This country will have to pay damage, whether damages have been sustained or not. The claim of this company is one which this country will not suffer and which the Government itself is divided about, and which its followers are divided about. The scheme is one which the Government evidently intended, at all events, at one time, to proceed with, had they not thought it more prudent and judicious to call the House together. The House has met, the scheme is made public, and I doubt if the Government has courage enough to go on with it. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise the Estimates. We would be wanting in our duty if we did not do so, and I only say in addition that if the Government will try to force through the House expenditures which cannot fairly be suported, the Opposition would be faithless to its trust if we did not oppose this in every way possible.

Department of Justice.. .. .. $23,585

Mr. FOSTER. There are four statutory increases. Then there is a decrease caused by the appointment of Mr. Stewart as Inspector of Penitentiaries, showing a net decrease of $870. The clerk, Mr. Fraser, was given last year the sum of $200 as a recognition of his services ; and it was intended at the time that that should be afterwards made a part of the regular Estimates, and that he should receive that amount in addition to his salary, as was done in the case of Mr. Power. They are both excellent clerks, and the late Minister of Justice had determined to recommend to Parliament to raise the salary of Mr. Fraser permanently, as done with Mr. Power.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should the Civil Service Act be overridden in the case of this officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the Civil Service Act would only give him an increase of $50, but owing to the excellence of his work and the work he is doing, the Minister decided to ask Parliament to give him an increase of salary. He is a lawyer of excellent standing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He may be all that. There are a great many lawyers of excellent standing quite ready to serve, I am sorry to say, for a much less sum than $2,275, or whatever sum Mr. Fraser is entitled to. I doubt very much the wisdom of deliberately setting aside a provision of the Civil Service Act. I do not know anything about the qualifications of the gentleman, whether they make him an especially valuable officer or not; but I do know that to-day, unfortunately, there are an immense number of legal men of very high attainments who find it exceedingly difficult to realize a salary of that amount. I do not think that the mere fact that he is a deserving officer warrants the Government in proposing to override the Civil Service Act. That is a very grave thing, indeed. All through last year's Estimates, I remember, were to be found items to be voted "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary." Now, that is extremely objectionable. We cannot judge from these very general statements that, "so-and-so is a good officer," and it does appear to me rather invidious that any one man should be singled out in this way. The filling of these offices should not be the cause of overriding the law we have deliberately passed for regulating the emoluments of our Civil Service.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think that this system of granting salaries for private secretaries for subordinate officers should be encouraged. We give $600 for a private secretary to the Minister of Justice. And the Solicitor General, who unquestionably must occupy a subordinate position, is granted a similar amount for a private secretary. Next we shall have the deputy of each department asking for a private secretary also. It is in this way that these increases are made. This increase is proposed in order to give it to some man who thinks that he would be better off with $600 in addition to a probably ample salary, and it is given in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. We should not allow these things to be repeated ; it is neither just nor necessary. I should like to know what duties this man performs in addition to those of an ordinary clerk ? Where is he supposed to go in order to perform the double duty ? We have here, in the commencement of the Auditor General's Report, a list covering three or four pages, showing that we have about 500 Civil Servants in this country who are virtually drawing double pay in some shape or form. This thing was commenced some years ago with a few names only, but as members of the Civil Service see others drawing pay for work performed outside of their regular office duties, they seek opportunities of the same kind, and so the number is increased. There is no justification for treating the Civil servants in this way, overriding the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Department of Justice—Penitentiary Branch.. .. .. $5,675

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There have been some changes here. If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to go into them

in detail, perhaps we had better wait until the Minister of Justice is here.

Mr. CURRAN. That has already been explained by the Minister of Finance. The inspector is a new appointee in place of Mr. Moylan, who receives $2,600 instead of $3,200 paid to Mr. Moylan. The other officers are the same as before, except that the messenger has been dispensed with, and that $300 has been applied to contingencies under the title of clerical work in the penitentaries branch.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where is Mr. Moylan ?

Mr. CURRAN. He had to be superannuated.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why ?

Mr. CURRAN. On account of long service.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was he not in good health ?

Mr. CURRAN. I believe he was.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was his age ?

Mr. CURRAN. I do not know exactly, but he was considerably over 60 years of age.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why, you are that age yourself.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman imagines that he himself and I were born about the same time. That is a mistake.

Department of Militia and Defence $44,875

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe Mr. Chairman, that by a curious dispensation the estimates for the Militia Department have been reduced, that is to say, the amount spent on the militia is about 20 per cent less, but in order to handle the reduced amount the expenses of the department are increased some two or three thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing but statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here we have another case of a department going on increasing until we have a central body of 33 officers to manage a total expenditure of about a million dollars. It does appear to me that this is another case in which the amount spent on the headquarters staff is out of all proportion to the work they have to do.

Mr. LISTER. Is there to be an annual drill and camp this year ?

Mr. FOSTER. This item is only for the staff. The Minister of Militia and Defence is not here, and I cannot answer the question. The Minister will be here in a little while.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister explain the reductions. It is well that we should understand why these reductions are made.

Mr. LISTER. What is the increase owing to ?

Mr. FOSTER. I gave that. There are sixteen statutory increases. making a total increase of $800. Then there is a difference in the salaries of messengers and third-class clerks, making a reduction, so that the whole increase is less than the total of the statutory increases.

Mr. FLINT. There are a large number of statutory increases. I would like to inquire if these are likely to go on in this department, because it seems to me that there ought to be, and I suppose there is, a stage when the statutory increase ceases. Now, if any department is to be cut down in order to reduce the expenses of government, the Militia Department is the one in which large decreases should most easily be made. For we are not a military country. If I understand correctly the nature of the decreases in the other appropriations for Militia service, a large amount of work which has been customarily put upon the militia of the country, is to be dispensed with. Now, the temper and feeling of the public generally is in favour of diminishing rather than increasing militia operations in the country, and I should think this was a favourable opportunity for the Government to provide for decreasing the expenditure of the staff at headquarters. There is a slight increase, but I think that in no department could a substantial decrease, a permanent decrease, be better justified than in this department. If there are sixteen clerks, and perhaps more, entitled to statutory increases, we can see that in time this will amount to a considerably larger sum than we have in the Estimates at the present time. Could the Minister give us an idea as to what extent that is likely to grow ?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it will follow the rule that is followed in the other departments, and the trend of the law as long as the law remains as at present. Statutory increases go on from year to year until they reach the maximum, and they then cease until a promotion takes place. If that takes place, the increases go on until the maximum of the next class is reached. When they are superannuated, or die, the statutory always stops.

Department of the Secretary of State $44,350 00
Department of Printing and Stationery 28,162 50

Mr. FOSTER. There are twenty-one statutory increases at $50, one at $37.50, and the difference in salary of a third-class clerk transferred, making a total increase of $1,437.50. Then, taken from that there is the difference between the salaries of

Messrs. Welsh and Lalonde, and those of their successors, $275, on account of transfers. Then, there is the difference between the salary of Mr. Campbell and the estimate, $287.50, making a net increase of $1,150.

Mr. FLINT. Would the Secretary of State give us an idea of the nature of the work devolving upon the large number of clerks provided for in this estimate? From the discussion which took place upon the duties of the same class of officials in the Privy Council office, it would seem to me that here there were more offices than are absolutely necessary. It seems to me that the department of the Secretary of State ought to do a large amount of the work which is sketched out as work done by the officers of the Privy Council. Although large salaries are paid, and no doubt very good men are employed in those offices, yet it appears to me, from the explanations given by the Minister of Finance, that this was largely copying work. The number of folios, and the enormous number of letters written, seemed to constitute a class of work not calling for as high a range of education or talent as is actually at the disposal of the Privy Council office. It seems to be clerical work, copying work, registration, and work of that kind. Now, if the Secretary of State would give the House some idea of the nature of the work done by the large number of clerks out of the twenty odd in his department, perhaps it would be more satisfactory to the House in voting this Estimate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I must ask the indulgence of the House, and of the hon. gentleman to a certain extent, as I have not had time to become thoroughly acquainted with the services performed in the department. But, so far as I have gone in my investigation—and I may say I have endeavoured in the short time I have been there to get knowledge of the work which is done—I think there is more work done there than I supposed when I took charge of the department. But if the Estimates are allowed to pass now, I think I shall be able on concurrence to suggest some changes which may bring the expenditure of the department lower than it is at the present time. I may say with reference to the work which is performed, that there is a correspondence branch as well as a branch for registration, copying, &c., and that the officers for whom salaries are asked to be voted now, are those who are engaged in those branches. I think I had better not discuss each individual officer, because I would, perhaps, prefer to discuss that later on when I come to suggest to the House some changes which I think I may be able to make.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a reasonable proposition, but we have the good fortune to have present the hon. gentleman who was Secretary of State during the entire period when the expenditure was incurred last year, and up to a very recent period of this year. I am sure the Minister of Marine will be happy to come to the rescue of his colleagues in the department, and to give us a full account of the work which is done in that department, which he presided over with great honour and credit for so long a time.

Mr. LISTER. The office of the Secretary of State, of course, is not looked upon as one of the chief offices of the Government, yet the number of men employed in that department seems to be quite equal to, if not more than, the number employed in many offices having much heavier work to do. I do not pretend to understand all the duties that the Minister has to discharge in that office, but it seems to me that his principal duties are granting patents to joint stock companies. Probably there are many other duties to perform. At all events, it is not looked upon as one of the chief offices of the Government, such as the Public Works, or the Railways, or the Finance Department, or the Department of Militia and Defence. On looking at the Estimates, I find that the cost of managing that department is considerably more than the cost of managing some of the other departments. This is evident in comparing the cost with the cost of managing the same department in 1879. In 1879, when the printing was included, the total cost was $32,550. I find by the Estimates here that the printing and other expenditures of the department are separate. The expenses of the department proper, according to the Estimates, are $44,350, and that of printing amounts to $28,162, making something over $72,000 to meet the expenditure of that department in 1895.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The printing of the department, including forms, blue-books, and all that kind of thing, is given in the Estimates for contingencies.

Mr. LISTER. But the stationery in 1879 was included. Of course, this $28,162 covers the printing bureau and stationery also. In 1879, the stationery was included under the Department of Secretary of State. There would be the additional cost of the officers of the printing bureau. At all events, there has been a very extensive increase in the cost of this department since 1879. Possibly there may be a great many more letters to be written, and a great many more entries to be made. But it only cost $32,550 in 1879. The clerks could have done that work, and probably found time to do double the amount of work. It seems to me the expenses of the department have been very large, considering the standing of the department itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we must get the Minister of Marine to give some explanations. At any rate, I think he ought to give us a general idea of the work in his department. It would not be reasonable to expect the present Secretary of State to be au fait in that matter, but it is reasonable that the gentleman who presided so long over it, should be able to tell us what was done. I notice that there is a great variety in the salaries given to the various extra clerks, with regard to which I would like some explanation. I thought the remuneration was fixed; but I observe that some of these clerks receive $1 per day, and others, $2, and others, $2.50 per day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The clerks who receive the larger amounts possess some technical knowledge, such as that of engrossing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That explanation would apply to the Secretary of State's Department, but I do not think it will apply to the other departments. All these men are entered as extra clerks without any explanation as to special qualification, and their salaries vary very greatly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Those receiving the larger sums have all technical knowledge, and a special report has to be made by the deputy before they can be paid over a certain sum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Secretary of State in 1878 had charge of the Mounted Police—part of the time—and also of the Stationery Department. The expenses of the Secretary of State Department alone amount to $43,350. The Department of Secretary of State, including that of the Controller of the Mounted Police and including the Stationery Department, was $11,000 less in 1878 than at the present time. The Controller's Department has increased from less than $3,000 to about $11,000.

Mr. FLINT. I hold in my hands the report of the Secretary of State. We all remember that this report is generally a very small document. It consists simply of a list of companies incorporated by letters patent, with a few other particulars. The total amount of the revenue of the department for 1893 was $9,563, made up from fees on charters of incorporation, applications for patents, copies of documents passports, &c. The department appears to be almost altogether a clerical one and not an administrative department, and the amount of labour and the character of the work appear to differ very largely from most of the other great departments of the country. The estimate of $44,500 is a very large one for the payment of deputy ministers, clerks and messengers in a department of this kind. A new department has been established, called the Department of Trade and Commerce. Whether the officer at the head of that department has yet ascertained the duties devolving upon it by law and those which should be assumed by it, I do not know; but it occurred to me at the time the department was organized, and the point has more forcibly forced itself on my attention since, that the duties it had assumed should have been placed under the care of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State in all countries is the most important officer, and the duties discharged by his department correspond to those now divided between three departments, namely, the Privy Council Office, the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Secretary of State. When the cost of the clerical force in these three departments is considered, we are forced to the conclusion that the Government is very extravagant in the vote it asks to carry on the duties of the Secretary of State Department. I submit for the consideration of the present Secretary and his colleague, whether they cannot evolve some method for combining these three departments, so that the total expenses may be reduced, and at the same time efficiency of the service be maintained. The total expense of these three departments must exceed $100,000, and the amount of responsible and administrative work performed is exceedingly small, and the work generally of a clerical character. I am disposed to be exceedingly indulgent toward the new Secretary of State, but I very much distrust the promises made with respect to explanations on Concurrence. We know the conditions existing at that time, and that explanations received are of a very perfunctory character. Perhaps, however, when some other estimates are before the Committee, we shall receive full explanation from the new Secretary of State or his predecessor as to what appears to be an unnecessarily large number of officers in that department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another matter to which the attention of the Minister of Finance should be called, and it is this: Under the head of the Department of Secretary of State we have a deputy head, two chief clerks, eight first-class clerks. I do not understand what possible justification there can be for employing in one department eight first-class clerks. The Department of Finance, which is certainly a not less important department, has only five first-class clerks in 1894, although I believe there is an estimate providing for one additional clerk. Why should a first-class clerk be necessary to discharge the duties in the Department of Secretary of State? Certainly, there is not first-class work to employ eight first-class clerks, and the expenditure appears to be a deliberate waste of the public money. I doubt whether there is really any occasion for more than two or three first-class clerks at the outside.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), that

the promise I made to give explanations and all information that could possibly be obtained with respect to the department over which I have so recently been placed, was not a promise intended not to be kept. I must apologize again for appearing before the Committee not possessing full information with respect to matters which have been discussed. When discussing any subject I always endeavour to give the best information possible I can obtain, and I can promise the Committee that with respect to departmental affairs I shall pursue the same course. I have no hesitation in saying to the Committee that I had hoped to have investigated personally the affairs of the department with a view to making every reduction possible, and I promise the Committee that I shall do that, and at a later stage of the session I may be able to give my investigations to the Committee, which will be an answer, I hope, to the objections made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and which present themselves to my mind in somewhat of the same light.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is quite right so far as the Secretary of State is concerned for this statement to be made, but it must be remembered that the ex-Secretary of State has been in the House and occupied his late position during several years. The Minister of Marine ought to be able to give this House a reasonable explanation for the extraordinary disproportion in the number of first-class clerks in the Department of the Secretary of State. I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that there is nearly double the number that he required up to the present year in his own department. For instance, in the Auditor General's Department there is but one first-class clerk there, as against eight first-class clerks in the Department of the Secretary of State. There is really, so far as I can see, no earthly ground of justification for it in the business done by that department.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think after the promise given by the Secretary of State——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not an answer, if the hon. gentleman will excuse me. It is a very good answer for the present Secretary of State, and if there was not another Minister present who filled the department for half a dozen years I would accept it without question. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries who has been a half dozen years there must recollect enough about the work of his former department to be able to give some explanation to the House, and the House has a right to get it. The present Secretary of State is reasonably excused, but his predecessor who held the office up to within four weeks ago ought to be able to answer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know whether I am always successful in giving the information asked for from me in connection with my department, and in this case in connection with a department I formerly had charge of; but the House will admit, I hope, that I am always ready to give such information as it is in my power to give. If I did not answer the question of the hon. gentleman immediately, it is because I thought that he would have accepted the statement made by my colleague, the Secretary of State, who said: that he was not long in charge of the department, that he had used every possible means to become familiar with it with a view to making certain reductions in the staff, and possibly in the expense, and he promised that he would be able to submit the result of his inquiry before concurrence. I did not think it would be convenient for me to discuss the organization of the department in advance of the report which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) would make to this House. I might, for instance, point out in one direction that the number of first-class clerks might be decreased, or that the chief clerks might be decreased, but I do not want to anticipate, and I am quite sure hon. gentlemen will think I am right in not anticipating, the decision the Secretary of State may arrive at. We have both discussed the matter together with a view of arriving at the most economical arrangement to be made in that department, and my colleague has my assistance and my co-operation. He is looking into the matter, and having assured the House that he is doing that with the intention of bringing about what hon. gentlemen opposite want, namely, a reduction in the expense, I think the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) ought to be satisfied with that, and ought not expect me to discuss the matter now under consideration by the present Secretary of State.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Marine has given a very weak excuse for the evidences of extravagance with regard to the number of first-class clerks in this department which he has presided over for several years. Whenever these salaries have been before the House we have always pointed out where reductions could be made. Now the present Minister of Marine, who was Secretary of State for a number of years tells us that his successor will devote his consideration to reductions in the expenses of this department. That is a confession from the Minister of Marine that he never studied the question of economy when he was Secretary of State. He allowed matters to run riot and the expenses to go as they pleased, but he expects the present Secretary of State to look after the duties that he should have attented to. If you turn to the Auditor General's Report, page R—2, you will find that there are forty employees in the Department of State, and that sixteen of them including the Deputy Head each

draw an average salary of $1,700. It is an outrage that in this department where merely routine work is performed there should be sixteen clerks drawing such a very high salary. It demands some explanation from the Minister of Marine. Surely he was not asleep all the time that he was Secretary of State, and he must have taken some note of what was going on and of what these men were doing. Does he think that the committee should be asked to accept the excuse he has offered? I do not think he does. Before this vote passes we are entitled to some explanation of this extraordinary state of affairs.

Mr. LISTER. If the statement of the former Secretary of State is correct, it is a very wise thing on the part of the Government to have removed him to some other department. I agree with those who preceded me that the present Secretary of State is to be excused. It is not to be supposed that he is familiar with all the details of the department, but it is somewhat remarkable that within four weeks after his appointment he announces to the House that he is considering what reductions can be made in that department, and that he will inform the House when he has made up his mind upon that point. I must confess that it does not reflect much credit upon the ex-Secretary of State, and it is to be hoped that in the Department of Marine and Fisheries which he now has the honour of filling, the accessions to the public service and the increases of pay and so on, will not be repeated in that department as it appears to have been commenced in the department which he has left. The report of the department itself shows that the duties of the office are of the most clerical character, and it is astounding that we should find there some forty gentlemen to perform those duties, when we find other departments performing enormously more work with a smaller number of officers. I should be sorry to charge the ex-Secretary of State with filling the office with supernumeraries to feed upon the public, and pretending to do something for their pay while in fact doing nothing. The work of that department consists in attending to certain correspondence between the different governments, executing patents for public lands, preparing patents for joint stock companies and preparing certain returns; but all the work from beginning to end is of the most clerical kind. The Secretary of State of course being a Minister of the Crown, is not supposed to devote much of his time to the duties of the office; but I think the ex-Secretary of State owes it to himself and to the House to answer the questions which have been asked, and to account in some way for the enormous staff at present in that office, where it appears so little skilled labour is necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend might have added that in proportion to the small amount of skilled labour, so is the excess of highly paid labour. It is not a trifling matter that this department appears to have in proportion the largest number of first-class clerks of any, perhaps the Department of Interior alone excepted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is hardly fair to claim that the ex-Secretary of State, who now sits in the House as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, should be au fait with the department at the present moment. He has been out for a number of months.

Mr. MULOCK. He spent this money.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am speaking now of the Estimates for the coming year. He has been out of the department for several months, and my immediate predecessor is the present Minister of Militia and Defence, who is at present absent, owing to illness in his family. On both sides of the House there appears to be a desire that this department should be run economically. I can assure the House that I share that desire, and I intend to meet it as well as I can in my management of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I think the item had better stand until the hon. gentleman considers his method.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that would be the better way, instead of arranging it on concurrence.

Department of Printing and Stationery.. .. .. $28,162.50

Mr. McMULLEN. Under whose charge is this department?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is under the charge of Dr. Dawson. Of course, it is in my department. I fancy it is very well managed and no reductions can be made in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some small additions; what are they?

Mr. FOSTER. Just statutory.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is time to stop these statutory increases, which are becoming an enormous burden on the country. The salaries of men are increased without reference to merit. All a man has to do now is to grow old, and he gets his reward. The industrious and efficient get no more than those who may be slothful and inattentive. I think the time has arrived for that system of statutory increases to be entirely revised. Every page of our Estimates is full of them, and they go on rolling up like snowballs. I think the people have spent about all the money they are willing to spend in this way; and in addition to economizing in that direction, I think there should be a doubling up not only of employees but of departments. I never could see the wisdom of multiplying

departments and Ministers of the Crown, as has been done lately. You have increased the number, counting the Controllers, to fifteen, each having a deputy and a complete office outfit. We have eleven Ministers drawing in all $88,000, another Minister drawing $9,000, and three Controllers drawing $18,000; making in all fifteen members of this House drawing $115,000 a year, and having a special interest in retaining their offices. Fifteen out of the House in the pay of the country—not independent men. Add to that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, and you have seventeen; and dear knows how many more are in expectation of offices of one kind and another. What has become of the independence of Parliament? The whole business seems to be now run in order to provide situations for people in the Government or in the service of the Government. The time has arrived, I think, when there has got to be a doubling up. Of course, we have ample proof that the fifteen are not required, in the fact that they are hardly to be found in their departments at any time except when the House is sitting. During the last year they were on circuit most of the time and they have changed their departments so frequently that in the course of one year we have seen, I think, three changes in one department. Not long ago the Department of Militia and Defence was represented by the present Premier, and there were also two ex-Ministers of Militia in the House, all of them having been in the office in one year, and yet the whole three of them together could not explain one little item. The other departments are in pretty much the same position. I would like to know what the duties of the Controller of Customs are. How much time did he spend in his department last year? He was one of the travelling troupe going around the country. It is quite clear that the duplication of offices is simply to provide speakers to go about the country advocating the cause of the Government of the day. If accurate statistics had been kept for the last year, I believe it would appear that the members of the Government have not been spending half of their time in discharging the duties for which they are paid. If that is the case, I think the country is entitled to an entire re-arrangement of the system of representation in the government, which will bring down the cost of governing to the needs of the people. I do not see why the country should be called upon to pay salaries to men simply to go out on the stump, perhaps because there is nothing to do in the department, or because they are not required in their department. I do not see that the country should be called upon, under the circumstances, to pay at the rate of $115,000 a year for services of this kind. If you compare the cost of government in that supposed extravagant country to the south of us, you will find that we have rapidly overtaken the extravagance of the United States, to say nothing about the comparison that could be made with other wealthier countries than Canada. If we are going to return to an economical system of Government, we cannot do better than begin at the very top. The extravagance at Ottawa during the last few years has found its way through every part of the country. It has been imitated in the provinces and municipalities, and a vast amount of the debt and depression which to-day confronts us is directly attributable to the bad example set at headquarters. I do not care what government is in power, it is due to the country now that we should begin our economy at the top, and then our rulers will have a good excuse for extending that system throughout all branches of the service. What is the use of the Government talking about economy when they do not begin it themselves, if they are really desirous of economising and limiting expenditure to the needs of the country, they will begin by reducing the heads of the departments; and until they do that, in my judgment, it is a selfish species of economy when the Government maintain unnecessary ornamental offices and figure-heads, and then profess to be deeply concerned about economical administrations.

Department of the Interior..... $98,454

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that the hon. gentleman has dispensed with some half a dozen of third-class clerks. What has he done with them?

Mr. DALY. The first change is in the first class clerks. One of the decreases is caused by the death of the late Mr. Wm. Mills. That position has not been filled, and the clerkship is done away with. Two offices were rendered vacant by death last year and they have not been filled. A reduction has been made by the retirement of Mr. Lacoste Lacasse. Another by the retirement of Mr. Poper. Another by the retirement of Mr. Hatch. Those three men have been superannuated and their places not filled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are they all young men?

Mr. DALY. Thirty-eight, forty-seven and forty-six years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are those three superannuated?

Mr. DALY. Yes, and their offices abolished.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Really, that appears singular to superannuate men at these ages. Surely they might have been used in the places of the lot of extra clerks of whom we have had such a superabundance always drawing pay. What superannuation is allowed?

Mr. DALY. I think Mr. Hatch $400, Mr. Poper, $260 and Mr. Lacasse $240.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, these gentlemen receive about a thousand dollars for doing nothing.

Mr. DALY. They are entitled to it under the Civil Service Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not intended for cases of that kind. This looks like a gross abuse of the Act. We have always contended that the Department of the Interior was, perhaps, the most extravagant department ; and small as the economy is, we are glad to see that there is some economy going on in that department. But most assuredly I do not think it is a proper use to make of the Superannuation Act to superannuate men like these when you could employ them in other departments. This is the kind of work the Privy Council is engaged in, and which causes it to require 120,000 folios to carry on their work.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This shows the House that the question I put to the Minister earlier in the evening is not academic, but practical, and its importance is illustrated by the statement the hon. gentleman has just made. He has indicated that three permanent clerks in his department, for whom he has no work to do, had to be superannuated. What is true in the Department of the Interior may be equally true in a very short time in a large number of the departments, and the House ought to consider whether this is the way in which reductions in the staff of the various departments are to be made. Is it by discharging such men as these, no matter what their age may be or the length of their service, and placing them on the superannuation list, and making them a charge for the rest of their lives upon the Treasury ? That is a question upon which the Government ought to have a policy and be prepared to submit that policy to the House. If we are to take the statement just made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) as the policy of the Government, then it is clear that the House cannot too soon consider it. Are we disposed, by a reduction of the staff in the public service to put several hundred parties as pensioners on the public treasury ? That is a question that the House has practically before it in the statement which the hon. gentleman has just made. I do not say that you should engage a person permanently in the public service and then discharge him at a moment's notice, and without compensation. The condition of things brought about by the hasty and ill-considered appointments to the public service that have been made beyond the public requirements, is now practically forcing itself upon the attention of the Government, and, at this moment, upon the attention of the committee of this House ; so that we are called upon to consider whether we are to get rid of the supernumeraries in this way, or whether we may, with justice to them, get rid of them in a way less expensive to the public treasury. I do not think that it is anything of which a young man ought to be proud that he has been made a pensioner upon the public service for the remainder of his life. He ought not to be discharged at a moment's notice, without some consideration being given to his case. But the fact is that you have such, the fact is that you have in the department of which the hon. gentleman is the head—I do not say that he is personally responsible—a large number of persons beyond the actual requirements of the department if it is efficiently organized. And, that being so, it has seemed to me of the first consequence that this House and this Committee should consider, in the interest of the country, what is to be done with these supernumeraries. The Government have the question practically before them, according to the statement which the hon. gentleman has made, which shows that the expenses of the department are apparently reduced for this year by the transference of three officers from that department to the superannuation list.

Mr. FOSTER. I think a reasonable view to take of it is this : If these men have, by reason of age or incapacity, become unfitted for their work, I think it is clearly better to put them on the superannuation list and save their salaries, than to keep them at full salary. The cost to the country is not nearly so great in that particular.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that the only alternative in the reformation of the service, either to superannuate them or retain them ?

Mr. FOSTER. There is another—to give them what is called a reasonable gratuity. It might be reasonably considered in some cases whether that step should be taken. But I think in every case, care should be taken to discriminate. With regard to the three clerks mentioned by my colleague the Minister of the Interior, he seems to have come to the conclusion, and no doubt upon good grounds that the best way was to superannuate those gentlemen, that that is the best way to take care of them with the least burden upon the treasury. We have now spent some time in discussion, and have not done a great deal of work. But, for my own part, I do not feel disposed to ask the House to remain too long ; and if we are not able to get through in a reasonable time, it is hardly worth while to keep the House to unreasonable hours. I would like the House to meet as promptly as possible at the appointed hour. I believe that half past seven is the hour for meeting in the evening. That seems to be

considered a little early. But I was here, as was also the chairman of committees, at a quarter to eight, and if we could get to work at that time it would be something of a gain. Then, if we have a mind to work we could get through a good deal in the course of two or three hours in the evening.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Our usual hour for meeting in the evening has been eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. After eight, more frequently, in practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is better to name an hour, and I think we can meet any time the hon. gentleman chooses. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman proposes to meet punctually. I think he will find that, for the convenience of all, eight o'clock will be a better hour than a quarter to eight.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister to bring the particulars showing the exact dates of the appointments of these gentlemen and the Orders in Council on which they were superannuated.

Mr. DALY. Their combined salaries were $2,912; the superannuation allowance is $1,100, making a saving of $1,812 a year. I have no objection to inform the hon. gentleman——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a rather important subject, and the hon. gentleman had better bring down the facts in detail.

Mr. DALY. I have the facts here, and could give them if the House was not about to adjourn.

Mr. McMULLEN. The remarks of the Minister of Finance with regard to the superannuation, in my opinion, call for some reply, and I shall take the opportunity to reply to them on a future occasion.

Resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THE CENSUS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you put that motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words with reference to an article which appeared in this morning's "Citizen," and I do so because it is pretty evident from the character of the article that it has been inspired in a certain department of the Government in Ottawa. I do not charge any Minister of the Government with having inspired the article; but it is perfectly clear to any one who reads it that this article originated with an important officer of the Department of Agriculture. That article charged myself and other members of the House with an exhibition of ignorance in the discussion which took place here yesterday, a very brief discussion, on the subject of the census. Now, while I do not accuse the writer of that article with being ignorant, I wish to show to the House that that charge does not apply, either to myself or to the hon. gentlemen who, on this side of the House, referred to the census. It is pretty clear that, although the writer may not be ignorant, he was not disposed that the public should be accurately informed. In speaking of the census of the city of London, I said the census was inaccurate and misleading, and in proof I say the census shows that the number of industrial establishments in 1881, was 317; that the number of persons employed was 4,917, and that the capital invested was $1,511,723. In the census of 1891 there were 804 establishments, with 6,045 employees and $1,847,353 capital invested. Now, it will be observed that there is more than 100 per cent increase in the number of manufacturing establishments. The increase was 433. The increase in the number of employees is 1,128, or two and a half to each one of those establishments. In 1881 the product of manufacture in those establishments was $8,660,627, and although the number of establishments has increased more than 100 per cent, the product of manufacture in 1891 was $425,420 less. So that the 433 new establishments employed two and a half persons each, the product was $775 each, and it was $425,420 less than it had been ten years before. Yet we were told by the Secretary of State, who spoke yesterday, who spoke under the inspiration of the officers of the Government, who ought to know, and who ought not to undertake to mislead the House or the country, that a new classification was being made, which would show that these manufacturing establishments that had less than $2,000 capital, were not to be included in the census calculation that was submitted to the House, and which showed you, Sir, that the amount of capital of each of these 433 new establishments is $775.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman going into a discussion of the census without making any motion?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am going to exercise my right, and to disabuse the public mind of the misstatement, the untrue statement, the untrue charge of ignorance, that was made against myself and others on this side of the House. I am doing so, not because it appeared in a newspaper—for if it was written by the ordinary editor, I would not have taken notice of it—but I know, from the character of the article, whence the inspiration of the article came, and I wish, not only that the country should be disabused of the attempt to mislead it, but that the thoroughly dishonest manner in which the census had been made up should be made known to the public.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BAKER moved:

That the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1894, and the report of the Auditor General on appropriation accounts for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Bankers' Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the St. John River Bridge Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the James Maclaren Company (Limited).—Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Deschenes Bridge Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Canadian Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Featherston.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, and to change the name of the company to the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the salaries of Lieutenant-Governors.—(Mr. McMullen.)

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the gross amount of our imports to the first days of April, 1894 and 1895? How much of above were entered for consumption to said dates? What are our gross exports up to the first days of April in 1894 and 1895? How much of above consisted of the produce of Canada to said dates?

Mr. WALLACE. The gross amount of our imports during the year 1893-4 to 1st April, was $94,341,482; the gross amount of our imports during the same period in 1894-5 was $80,987,079. The value of importations entered for consumption for the year 1893-4 to 1st April were $86,370,739; the value of importations entered for consumption in the year 1894-5 to 1st April was $78,126,603. Our gross exports for the year 1893-4 to 1st April were $89,606,033 in value. For the corresponding period of the present year, our gross exports were $86,271,861. During the said period of 1893-94, the value of the goods, the produce of Canada, exported was $78,915,133; and for the corresponding period of the year 1894-95, the value of goods, the produce of Canada, exported was $79,492,649.

GENERAL BOOTH'S PROPOSED CANADIAN SETTLEMENT.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked, Has any correspondence or other communication taken place between General Booth, of the Salvation Army, and the Government with reference to the establishment of a settlement in any part of Canada by General Booth, of persons brought by him from England? If so, has any arrangement been made with General Booth of such a nature as is above referred to, and what are the terms proposed?

Mr. DALY. Further than an interview with some members of the Government in which Mr. Booth discussed the scheme, no correspondence or other communications have taken place between General Booth of the Salvation Army, and the Government with reference to the establishment of a settlement in any part of Canada by General Booth, of persons brought by him from England.

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION EXPENSES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What has been paid on account of expenses of Behring Sea Arbitration to date? How much remains to be paid, or is claimed by the British Government?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I presume the hon. gentleman means the total expenses. The total expenditure on account of the Behring Sea question, to date, is $134,191.68, which sum includes about $45,000 for counsel fees in the case of a schooner "W. B. Sayward," which was seized and taken to an American port. The Government is not aware of any further expenses claimed to be due.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR APRIL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have to thank the hon. Minister for the ten days' statement, but, no doubt the whole House will be interested in the answer to the question of which I have given notice. What was the amount of revenue received during the months of April, in 1894 and 1895, respectively? What was the expenditure chargeable to the Consolidated Fund during same periods?

Mr. FOSTER. Revenue—April, 1894, $2,442,537.98; April, 1895, $2.896,500.84. Expenditure—April, 1894, $2,183,624.90; April, 1895, $2,375,801.60.

FISHING REGULATIONS IN THE GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. Does the Government propose to change the Order in Council of the 10th April, A.D. 1894, respecting "Fishing Regulations for the Protection of the Cod Fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence," so as to permit vessels of 100 tons and upwards the use of two traps? 2. Does the Government propose changing said regulations so as to allow vessels of 50 to 80 tons two traps? 3. Does the Government propose to make the above changes during the present fishing season? 4. If the Government does not propose to make said changes, what changes, if any, do they propose making?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. I beg to state that it is not proposed to make any further changes in the Order in Council of 10th April, 1874. It has already been changed so that vessels measuring over 100 tons shall be allowed two traps. 2. The Government does not propose to allow vessels of from 50 to 80 tons to fish two traps. The other two questions are answered by above.

CARRYING THE MAILS IN CAPE BRETON.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. How much has been paid for carrying the mails from Hawkesbury, Inverness County, to Sydney, Cape Breton, during the years 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894; giving the amount for each year? 2. Who was the carrier of said mails for each of said years, and was the work done by tender and contract? 3. Are the mails now carried by the Cape Breton Railway? If so, when was the change made? 4. Are the present carriers required to use as many horses and use similar carriages as were in use in 1879? If not, where is the difference?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. In 1889, $5.724.88; 1890, $6,270.73; 1891, $9,000; 1892, $9,000; 1893, $9,000; 1894, $9,000. 2. John Morrison was the contractor from the beginning of 1889 until the 1st March, 1894; since that date Mr. J. S. M. Morrison has held the contract. Mr. John Morrison acquired the contract originally in 1885 by transfer from Mr. P. S. Lindsay, and on its expiration in 1889, the service was left in Mr. Morrison's hands under yearly agreement. The agreement was transferred to Mr. J. S. M. Morrison on 1st March, 1894. 3. Mails have been carried by the Cape Breton Railway since 1st June, 1892. 4. The requirements as regards horses and veichles have not been changed since 1885.

THE DREDGE "LAVAL."

Mr. DEVLIN asked, 1. What was the contract price and the total cost of the dredge "Laval"? When was the contract given? To whom, and when was the work accepted by the Government? 2. Were any claims in connection with this dredge made by workmen employed at its construction? If so, by whom, and what was the amount of such claims? 3. Were the claims paid? If so, to whom, and who signed the receipts? 4. Had Edward Watters, of Hull, a salary in connection with this work? If so, the amount, and by whom drawn? 5. Are all claims settled? If not, whose remain unpaid?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. The contract price for hull alone of the dredge was $21,000; for boilers, $3,700. The balance of the work including the engines, fitting up of the dredge with frame, buckets, &c., was done at our shops at Sorel, and the total cost of the dredge was $39,552.78. 2. The contract for the hull was given to P. G. Watters, of Hull, on 20th June, 1892; and for the boilers, to P. G. Powers, on 7th July, 1892. 3. Claims for wages were preferred by a number of workmen, to the amount of $363.41, for work done for the account of contractor Watters, between September 23 and October 14, 1892, the latter being the date at which the department took possession of the hull of the above dredge. 4. Subsequently claims were also made by certain parties against Watters, their employer, for work done up to the 22nd July, 1893. These latter claims were as follows:—Albert Turgeon, $1.25; P. Lainee, $1.25; Wm. Watters, $29.50; Edward Watters, $58.64; Willie Watters, $67.80; P. G. Watters, $90.50; Pete Watters, $43.08; James Highland and horse, 4½ days, $7.88, making a total of $299.90. These claims were not recognized by the department. 5. The claims amounting to $363.41 were paid to the parties themselves by the departmental paymaster, and the workmen have themselves signed the receipt. This sum was charged to the contractor. 6. In the amount of $363.41 paid as above, appears an item of $31.14 claimed by and paid to Edward Watters, as carpenter, for 20¾ days, at $1.50 per day. He re-

ceived the money personally, as shown by the pay-list. The total amount paid to the contractor P. G. Watters, is $19,363.41. This sum includes the $363.41 paid by the department for wages due by the contractor, and at the latter's request. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not wish me to read the names, and the number of days' work, and the amounts paid to each of these men.

Mr. DEVLIN. No; I will be satisfied if the hon. Minister says that the men themselves were paid, and that they signed the receipts for the amounts.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes. I will send the list over to the hon. gentleman.

IMMIGRANTS FROM MICHIGAN TO ONTARIO.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, 1. Has the Government promised to aid a colonization scheme promoted by Rev. Father Paradis, or a company represented by him, in transporting immigrants from Michigan to Verner, or other places in the district of Nipissing, Ont., and if so, to what extent? 2. What steps, if any, has the Government taken to see that the immigrants so assisted were properly placed?

Mr. DALY. 1. The Department of the Interior has deposited with Mr. J. D. Rolland, president of the General Colonization and Repatriation Society of the province of Quebec, the sum of $1,000 to be expended by the said society in furthering colonization, and the scheme promoted by Father Paradis, subject to the conditions that no portion thereof shall be expended in transporting the immigrants, the understanding being that they will either pay their own way or be granted free transportation by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. 2. The duty of seeing that the immigrants in question are properly placed, lies with the promoters of the movement and the Government of the province of Ontario, as they are to settle on provincial and not Dominion lands.

CENSUS OF MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have a census of the province of Manitoba taken in the year 1896?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The answer is, yes.

THE SIX NATION INDIANS.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) asked, How many copies of the Report of the Department of Indian Affairs have been sent to the Six Nation Indians, and to whom have they been sent?

Mr. DALY. Fourteen copies were sent on the 19th inst. to the Indian Superintendent at Brantford, for distribution among the chiefs.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What was the cost of the "Maintenance of way and works" on the Intercolonial Railway for the year ending 30th June, 1894?

Mr. HAGGART. The cost of "Maintenance of way and works" on the Intercolonial Railway for the year ending 30th June, 1894, was $656,758.04.

FISHERY REGULATIONS ON ST. JOHN RIVER.

Mr. COLTER asked, What changes are contemplated by the Government in the fishing regulations on the St. John River, New Brunswick? In what way, and to whom, has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries signified his intention of having the fishing regulations changed on that river? When will such changes take effect?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The changes at present contemplated are shortening weekly close-time for shad and gaspereaux by making it begin on Saturday night instead of Friday night; allowing an increased depth of shad and gaspereaux nets to be fished; reopening the sturgeon fishery there; reopening the bass fishery there. 2. By letter to the inspector of fisheries for the district in which the St. John River is situated, and to the petitioners. 3. As regards the shad and gaspereaux fisheries, at once; as regards the sturgeon fishery about midsummer, after the expiry of the close season; and as regards the bass fishery, in the fall.

PORT OF TIGNISH.

Mr. PERRY asked, What is the amount collected and paid in by the wharfinger at the port of Tignish, Prince Edward Island, for the year 1894?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No return has been received from the wharfinger at Tignish for 1894.

Mr. PERRY asked, What is the amount of expenses incurred in keeping up the signal station at Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island, including the keeper's salary for the year 1894? Who is in charge of said signal station?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The whole cost is $50.54. George Conroy is the signal agent. $45 covers the salary and $5.54 covers the expenses.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has a lighthouse-keeper been appointed for Tignish breakwater light, Prince Edward Island, in place of Isidore Gaudet (deceased)? If so, who is he? What is the date of his appointment and what salary is he getting?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Joseph S. Richard was appointed light-keeper on the 18th June, 1894, at a salary of $130 per annum. Mr. Richard has since resigned, and an officer will be appointed immediately to take the vacancy.

GOVERNMENT INSPECTOR OF WHEAT AT FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. MARTIN moved for :

Return showing the names of the Government inspectors of wheat at Fort William, the number of cars of wheat inspected during each of the years from 1887 to 1894, both inclusive, the number of bushels of wheat shipped out of the elevators at Fort William during each of said years, the average quantity of wheat in store in the Canadian Pacific Railway's elevators at Fort William during each of said years, the fees allowed for inspection, and the quantity of grain allowed to be taken from each car as a sample by the inspector.

He said : Considerable discussion has taken place, particularly in the province of Ontario, on the question of payment of public officials by fees. I desire to draw the attention of the House and the country to the case of a public official who is paid by fees and whose emoluments are simply enormous. Hon. members will understand that nearly all the wheat shipped from Manitoba and the Territories passes through the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators at Fort William. This wheat is inspected according to law by an official appointed by the Dominion Government. The fees received by the inspector are paid by the owners of the wheat, but, of course, in the end they come from the farmers of the country that produce the wheat. The fees for inspection amount to 60 cents per carload for inspecting wheat into the elevator, and 40 cents per thousand bushels for inspecting wheat out of the elevator. I ask in this motion for accurate information, so as to be able to ascertain exactly the emoluments of the gentleman who has the good fortune to hold the position of Government inspector at Fort William. I may, however, give a rough estimate, which I believe is fairly accurate, of the emoluments received by that official. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), last session, and I think this session, placed a notice on the paper, intimating his intention to introduce a Bill to cut down the salary of the Governor General. The official to whom I refer in my motion receives fees running up quite closely to the payment which the Governor General receives under the law, according to the information I possess. The number of carloads of wheat shipped at Fort William last year numbered something like 20,000. At 60 cents per car the fees of this inspection would amount to the modest sum of $12,000. Then, this wheat during the course of the year, most of it during the course of the fall and winter succeeding the season in which it is harvested, is shipped out by lake and rail, the larger portion going out by lake. The inspector is allowed 40 cents per thousand bushels for the wheat he inspects out. On 20,000 carloads the fees would amount to about $4,800. That makes the total fees received, on an estimate of 20,000 carloads, $16,800. But this is not all the emoluments received by this official. A certain quantity of wheat is taken from each carload for the purposes of inspection, and this wheat is stored by the inspector, and afterwards sold, and this amounts, so I am informed, to several carloads, for which the inspector is able to realize something like $1,500 or $2,000. This brings his emoluments up to $18,000 or $19,000 per annum. But that is not all. Most men would be fairly well satisfied with an income of that amount ; but this gentleman is able, through his position, to control absolutely all the fire insurance upon the grain in the elevators at Fort William. I am informed by gentlemen who operate in wheat that they find it in their interest to do their insurance entirely through the inspector, and while I have no accurate means of giving the House the exact amount made by the inspector out of the insurances, my informant states, and he is a man who is very reliable, that he is satisfied the commissions on insurance fees will amount from $8,000 to $10,000 a year, so that altogether the fees obtained by the Government inspector at Fort William run from $25,000 to $30,000 per annum. The House will understand that only a few minutes are occupied by the inspector in inspecting a carload of wheat. He has an instrument which he shoves down into the wheat, pulls it out and examines it. It only takes a very few minutes and the inspector is able to do the great bulk of the work, so far as the inspection of the work is concerned. In very busy seasons he has, I believe, to employ a few assistants, but his total expenses would not, if my information is correct, amount to more than perhaps $1,000 or $1,500. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not brought this matter before the House for the purpose of finding any fault with the inspector. I do not consider that he is to blame in any degree for the state of circumstances which exist, for no man would refuse to take the fees which he is entitled to collect by law. So far as I know, the gentleman who is there has given satisfaction. I have no complaint to make against him, and certainly he is not to blame in the slightest degree for taking what the law allows. It may be considered perhaps, that he is pressing his rights a little far in obtaining these insurances upon the grain, and I think he should be prevented from doing that. At the same time I do not know that it is any great injury to the shippers of wheat that he should have that monopoly, but still, it does seem that there must be something very wrong indeed when it is possible for one man to

make $25,000 or $30,000, a large portion of which—all the fees, at any rate, for inspection—comes in the end out of the unfortunate farmers of the North-west, who have a very hard time to make a living at present. This is not all, Mr. Speaker. Nearly every car load of grain is inspected twice. It is inspected at the city of Winnipeg and again at Fort William. I do not say every car load is inspected twice, but a great many car loads are inspected at Winnipeg and at Fort William, so that there is a double charge. The inspector at Winnipeg also gets 60 cents a carload, which, as the House will understand, in the end, comes out of the farmers. There has been more or less discussion as to the necessity for those two inspections. It might be thought, perhaps, that one inspection would suffice, but the answer that is made to that, and I must say there is some point in it, is, that the inspector who inspects the grain out of the elevator must inspect it into it, because if grain were taken into the elevator at Fort William upon the inspection of the Government inspector at Winnipeg, it might occur that when it was inspected out by a different man the quality of the grain would not pan out. Under these circumstances it seems to me that the very strong criticism which has been directed, more especially by the Patrons of Industry, to the comparatively very moderate emoluments received by registrars and sheriffs and other public officials in the province of Ontario, sinks into insignificance compared with the emoluments received by those officers of this Government. I do think that if this Government were not busy in every conceivable way, except in looking after the interests of the people, and the effect of their laws upon the people, that they would not allow fees of the magnitude of these to which I refer to be imposed on that class of the community for whom I speak in this House. As I have said, the figures which I give are estimates, but I believe that they are tolerably correct. At any rate, they were given to me by gentlemen who are well versed in the grain trade, and I think the House and the country will be surprised to find that there is an official, a man requiring no very great amount of education or ability or skill, drawing such a revenue. After all, it is a very simple thing indeed to judge of the quality of wheat, and there are dozens and hundreds of grain buyers making from $60 to $70 a month in Manitoba and the Territories, who are quite as competent in this business as the inspectors, and in saying this I am not saying a word against the qualification of Mr. Gibbs, or of Mr. Horne, the inspector at Winnipeg. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the same fate which met most of my motions asking for information last session will not be meted out to this one, but that the Government will in a reasonable time bring down the information I ask for. I hope also that the Government will take into consideration the necessity of making very considerable reductions in the amount of the fees to be paid for this inspection. Twenty thousand cars of wheat is nothing compared with the number of cars which we expect shortly to ship over the Canadian Pacific Railway from that country, and as the number of cars increase so do the emoluments of the inspectors, and, as I have pointed out, the amount of work done in inspecting each car is so small that the fees received are almost clear profit. Another point, Mr. Speaker, which I have almost overlooked. I have been informed that Mr. Gibbs intends in the future not to do the insurance himself—or perhaps he has not directly done the insurance in his own name—but that he intends to make some arrangement with his son to do it. Though this may be the case, practically he controls and gets the benefit of the commission on the premiums upon all the insurance on the wheat in these elevators.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is no objection, Mr. Speaker, to bring down the papers which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) requires, with the exception, perhaps, of the return he asks for, of the number of bushels shipped ex-elevator from Port Arthur, because some of the grain goes into the elevator and is not inspected. Now, with regard to the exorbitant salaries to which the hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House, I think he must be mistaken. If he will look at page 26 of the Commissioner's report he will find that the amount drawn, instead of being about $20,000, as he says, is actually $8,770.90, out of which the inspector has to pay his assistants. It must not be forgotten that the inspection of grain at Port Arthur, especially the inspection of the large quantities now shipped from that port, is a matter of comparatively recent date. There was a time, not so very long ago, when the fees were very much below even the amount I have mentioned here as appearing in the report for the current year—in 1889, $3,691; in 1892, $2,902, and so on. Whatever the actual fees are, I will see that the statement is brought down in time for any further discussion which the hon. gentleman may wish to have in connection with this matter. I have no reason whatever to defend the excessive fees obtained by any officer in any branch of the department over which I preside; quite the contrary. I may say that during the two years that I have been at the head of the Department of Inland Revenue, this matter has been brought to my attention, and I am myself of opinion that when the fees reach a certain figure they should be either reduced, or else the amount in excess should be placed to the credit of consolidated revenue. I have scarcely had time to look into that subject, along with a great many others in connection with which I propose to recommend

some changes ; but that the hon. gentleman is altogether in error in the figures he has quoted to the House, I have no doubt. With regard to what appears to be a reflection upon the officer in question, that he sells the samples of grain which he takes, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken, because every inspector must keep those samples, in view of the possibility of questions arising between the sellers and purchasers of the cargoes of wheat, as to which he may be called in evidence. The Act does not regulate the quantity of grain the inspector is to retain. Presumably he retains sufficient to answer all the purposes of inspection. I have never heard of any complaint of that kind by any shipper of grain regarding the conduct of Mr. Gibbs. With regard to the double inspection of grain at Winnipeg and at Port Arthur, referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg, that is not a subject germane to the motion which the hon. gentleman has made. As I have said, I have no hesitation in bringing down everything in the possession of the department in relation to this question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who fixes the amounts charged for inspection ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The amount is fixed either by the statute or by a regulation under the statute. I will inquire into that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the Controller's attention to the fact that, after all said and done, on the main question the hon. member for Winnipeg is very nearly correct. His statement, if I remember it correctly, was that the officer received $12,000 for the inspection of 20,000 carloads, at the rate of 60 cents per carload. The hon. Minister says that is altogether incorrect—that the amount received was $8,700. If the export of grain from Manitoba proceeds in anything like the increasing ratio which we all hope it will, it is clear to see that an enormous charge might easily be made in favour of this particular official. It is very probable, as the hon. gentleman says, that this business has grown up rapidly within the last two or three years ; but if the process of inspection be such as is described by the hon. member for Winnipeg, I do not know that it would be a very difficult thing for one man to inspect 20,000 cars in the course of a season, which I suppose would extend over 150 days or thereabouts, spring and fall. That would not amount to a very great number per day, and would certainly not be beyond the power of one man to inspect ; and in such cases the charge is altogether excessive in proportion to the work required to be done. I think the suggestion the hon. gentleman makes, that in all cases some limit should be fixed, is a very useful one ; but, having reference to the state of the North-west, I think that instead of making use of this inspection as a means of getting revenue out of the North-west farmers, the rate should be reduced from time to time to such a figure as would afford a decent but not excessive remuneration to the officer employed. What that might be is, of course, for the department to ascertain. The more cars that are inspected, the lower, I presume, the rate could be made. There is no doubt that from time to time just such cases as the hon. member for Winnipeg has brought up will occur ; and, unless the matter is carefully watched, large sums of money may go into the pockets of individuals which ought never to be exacted from the farmers or other parties concerned, but which, if exacted, should undoubtedly go into the public treasury.

Mr. MULOCK. One other branch of the case brought up by the hon. member for Winnipeg was not alluded to by the Controller. The hon. member for Winnipeg stated that the inspector was also engaged in the insurance business. If that is the case, I submit that that ought to be brought to an end. My hon. friend sees no objection to that. I do. Where a public servant is engaged in some private business more or less connected with the subject-matter of his official duties, complications are sure to arise. That must be the case here. We hope that every year there will be an increase in the output of grain from Port Arthur. It is not a case of allowing fees to be collected at isolated or remote points in the North-west, where there will be an uncertain amount of business ; but at Port Arthur we trust there will always be a sufficient flow of business to employ one man all his time ; and I submit whether the time has not arrived when this officer should be put under a reasonable salary and be required to perform his duties in person instead of farming them out, and engaging in other lucrative occupations. If he is engaged in earning $10,000 or whatever it may be in insurance, he must certainly be neglecting the business for which he is employed. The country is entitled to his full time in the discharge of the important duties for which he is engaged, and he has no right, in my opinion, to embark in outside business such as insurance, quite apart from the complications which are likely to arise. When it is added that this fee is a direct tax upon the farmers of the country, it should be only necessary for the matter to be emphasized in the House to induce the Controller to deal with it as he has promised to do.

Mr. FRASER. There is one other reason why no officer should be permitted to carry on insurance business, particularly in connection with the grain trade. If, as has been hinted, it is found convenient that insurance should be given to this man, it is easy to know why ; for if it is not given, the grain may not be inspected in a way to suit the man requiring the inspection. If

this officer is engaged in the insurance business, I think he should be at once stopped. Anybody can see that when this inspector says to a shipper of grain, give me the insurance, the shipper will do so, although he might insure in an office at the same or, perhaps, at a lower rate. The shipper, however, wants to get his grain passed, and will not, therefore, refuse to place the insurance with the inspector. This may open, also, a door to fraud by enabling the inspector to charge a larger premium, provided he will pass grain which otherwise he might not pass.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). As I said before, I have for some time been considering the advisability of making a change. As the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has truly observed, this is a trade which has grown up within a comparatively recent period. As far as the matter of insurance goes, I never knew before that the inspector was engaged in the insurance business, and it is very singular that no objection has been made before on that score.

Mr. MARTIN. I fancy there is no danger whatever of any objection being made by any shipper of grain, because those gentlemen who have given this information have asked most particularly that their names should not be mentioned. It is easily seen that a large shipper of grain is entirely at the mercy of Mr. Gibbs. I believe he has done his duty fairly well, but when it is known that he takes insurance on the grain, you may depend that he will have the insurance, because it makes no difference whatever to the owner of the grain whether he pays the premium to Mr. Gibbs, or some other insurance agent. I had no intention of saying that I thought this action on his part was right. What I said was that I could not blame him very much, but I think the Government should prohibit him absolutely from having anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the insurance on the grain. It is most unfair to other gentlemen engaged in the business. The hon. gentleman has said that the fees only amount to some $8,000. If so, my information is quite inaccurate. I gave it to the House as it was given to me by more than one gentleman engaged in this business. I cannot see how it is possible that the fees should only amount to $8,000, because, supposing there were only 10,000 car loads of grain inspected, the fees should certainly amount to more than $8,000. And it is well known that, according to reports furnished to the public—I do not know how accurate they are—12,000,000 bushels have been exported from Manitoba over the Canadian Pacific Railway, apart from what went out over the Northern Pacific to Duluth, and that, according to newspaper reports, is a very moderate amount for recent years. I fancy that there must have been, last year, and for several years previous, at least 12,000,000 bushels that went out of the country in that way; and, in that case, my estimate of $16,000 or $17,000 for fees must be strictly accurate. As to the question of selling the samples, I gave my information to the House as it was given to me. I do not know that the dealers in grain have any particular fault to find with that. I did not mention it in that sense, but simply as showing an additional prequisite to swell the emoluments of this gentleman. I am very much pleased, indeed, at the attitude taken by the hon. Minister, and I hope he will give this matter very full inquiry, and that the result will be to put the inspector on a salary, which, in my opinion, would be very much the better way, so that he would know exactly what he has to get, and the question of a large or small amount of wheat would have nothing to do with his salary. If there be a large amount, he will simply have to pay so much more for assistance. I should only charge fees sufficient to reimburse the Government for the necessary expenses in connection with the matter. That is all that ought to come out of the farmers who grow this wheat.

Motion agreed to.

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the amount of money collected for tolls, fees or rents of any kind by the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company in each year separately, up to the close of their last year's business; the amount of money paid the Dominion Government as interest on the $300,000 loaned to the company, and the arrears due to the 30th June, 1894, and the amount since paid, if any.

He said: I wish to draw the attention of the House to a few facts in connection with the formation of this company. It appears that this company was chartered in 1885. It was chartered for the purpose of building a bridge across the St. John's River. The chartered members were Thos. Temple, who is a member of this House. Egerton R. Burpee, Alexander Gibson the elder, Alexander Gibson the younger, and Fred S. Hillyard. These five men are the charter members of this company. The House will notice, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Temple, who is a member of this House, and the two Gibsons, have a controlling interest in that board. The capital stock of that company was named in the charter at $400,000, with power to increase to $500,000. The charter authorized the company to go into operation when $200,000 was subscribed, with 10 per cent paid up. The board formed with a capital, paid up, of $20,000. In 1887 the Government gave the company a loan of $300,000—this company with its paid-up capital of $20,000—with interest at

4 per cent. It appears that they paid the interest the first year, at least I cannot find that there is any balance of interest for that year. Sir Charles Tupper was Finance Minister at that time. I think it was in May, 1888, the present Finance Minister took the office which he has held ever since. The company went on and constructed the bridge, together with 2 1-10 miles of railway as part of the work. The cost of the whole structure, bridge and railway, was $419,586. Now, the money that was contributed for the purpose of the work was as follows:—The capital stock, as I have stated, was $200,000, 10 per cent paid up on which made $20,000. The Government loan was $300,000; the company issued bonds—under the authority of the Dominion, no doubt—for $50,000. These bonds were placed on the market and, no doubt, realized the full amount. The Dominion gave them a free grant of $30,000 in the year 1889. These amounts make a total of $400,000 raised by the company to construct the work, the total cost of which was $419,586.

Mr. LISTER. The alleged cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. The alleged cost, yes. Well, Sir, according to the last report filed with the Department of Finance, the company has a floating debt of $19,975, so, taking into account their floating debt, and the actual cash received, the company has in hand a balance of $389. The company has not paid a cent of interest to the Government for the last five years. The interest, at 4 per cent, comes to $12,000 a year. This year, I presume, as last year, the interest will be charged to a special account. I notice that the Auditor General brought the condition of this company before the Finance Minister for the purpose of ascertaining why this interest had not been collected. The reference to the matter will be found in the Auditor General's Report for 1893. He says:

> I do not find that anything has been paid on account of the arrears due for interest by the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company. What action has been taken by your department to obtain payment of these arrears?

Now, the Finance Minister, I understand, replies:

> I beg to say that the arrears of interest by the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company have been charged to a special account.

That is the reply of the Finance Minister, and not a single dollar has been paid. Again, the Auditor General has drawn the attention of the Finance Minister to the condition of this account, and the Finance Minister, on another occasion, says that the company has been written to with regard to the arrears, and that no answer has been received at the Finance Department. Now, Sir, this is a most extraordinary transaction. Here we have a company formed with the very flimsy basis of $20,000 paid-up capital. We have the Government of the country in control of the funds of this Dominion granting to the company $300,000 of the people's money for the purpose of constructing this bridge. In addition, the company is granted a bonus of $30,000 in order to enable them to carry out this work. And, putting all the sums together, allowing nothing for the amount of tolls that they have received, we find that the company have an actual balance left in their hands. In considering this case, you must take the position as it stands to-day. What is its position? It owes the following sums:—Government loan, $300,000; accumulated interest on that loan, $72,000; bonded debt, $50,000; floating debt, $19,975; in all, $441,975—against a work that the company, in its own report to the Government says cost $419,586. So that the work stands with a debt against it, including what the Dominion holds and the bonded debt, but without counting anything on account of stock, of $22,389 more than the entire cost. Now, Sir, the Finance Minister, I understand, has recently paid a visit to this particular county of York. I understand that the Conservatives there have done him the honour of nominating him to become the representative of the county in which this bridge is located. I understand, also, that Mr. Gibson, who, I am told, has been in the past a Reformer, has pledged his word that in the coming contest he will support the Finance Minister. Whether it is Mr. Gibson, the elder, or Mr. Gibson, the younger, we do not know—there are two of them that sit on that board, and they, with the powerful backing of the present member for the county form the majority of the board. So the Finance Minister stands a good chance, no doubt, of being elected in that county. Now, is it possible that this Dominion of Canada, with its present financial embarrassments, with the great strain to which the people are subjected in order to raise the enormous sums to provide for our annual expenditure, and to meet demands in the way of interest on the public debt, is going to sacrifice $72,000 of accumulated interest in order to find for the Finance Minister a comfortable and easy seat? Are these the terms on which this nomination has been given to the Finance Minister? Well, Sir, it looks very like it. It is a very singular coincidence that from the moment the Finance Minister took the position he now occupies, not one farthing of interest has ever been paid upon that investment. How is that? Why is it that, although interest was to be paid yearly, from that until now not one farthing has been received? How is it that these men have not been called upon? Where have the receipts for tolls for this bridge gone? They have

under their statute power to arrange tolls and power to collect tolls, to be approved by the Governor in Council, which I have no doubt they have done. Where have these tolls all gone? Where is the money? Into whose pocket has the money thus collected found its way? I think this certainly requires an explanation at the hands of the Minister of Finance; and I question very much if, in face of the facts disclosed by the public records, it is possible for him to give the people of this country a satisfactory explanation with regard to this whole question. It is an outrage that the people of this country, in their straightened circumstances, have got to consent to drains of this kind upon their resources for the purpose of finding comfortable and easy seats for Ministers of the Crown. We are coming to a pretty condition in the country. It is a pretty state of affairs when the Executive of this country take public money in this way to make comfortable seats for themselves. I hope the Minister of Finance will explain to us what he intends to do with this particular bridge. We all heard that he proposed to put the author of the scheme, perhaps, in a comfortable place. We don't know what he is going to do. However, we would like to know. In view of the Finance Minister becoming a candidate for that riding, we would like to know whether the country is going to be called upon to lose this money, and is going to take the bridge over. I must say that from the statement presented to the House, the company is indebted to the amount of $22,389 over and above the cost of the whole structure. Now, is the Minister going to take it over? If he does, he will have to pay the bonded debt, no doubt, of $50,000. What is he going to do with it? Is the whole thing going to be smothered over on condition that the county of York will give an easy seat, without much of a contest, to the Minister of Finance, and continue him in that seat, and is the country to be called upon to sacrifice the accumulated interest upon this particular loan, and possibly the principal as well? We shall all be glad to hear what the Finance Minister has got to say with regard to this transaction.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. Minister desires to speak, I will wait for him.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to take away your privilege.

Mr. LISTER. I am not at all surprised that the Minister is loath to say anything upon the subject now before the House. I am not at all surprised that the present member for the county of York (Mr. Temple) is also silent, because, Sir, if the statement of my hon. friend who has made this motion, at all approaches the truth, it is almost incredible that any man or body of men could be found parties to a transaction as disgraceful as this. Why, Sir, what do we find? We find, as a member of this bridge company, the hon. member for the county of York, a staunch supporter of the Government, supporting them strongly when they are right, and more strongly when they are wrong. We find him always backing up the Government in this House, no matter what proposition they may bring forward. Sir, my hon. and industrious friend behind me has given the House and the country some little inkling into the peculiar methods of these hon. gentlemen. We find that the hon. member for the county of York, who always supports the Government, has been purchased by a bridge at Fredericton.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. LISTER. Rewarded, then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. LISTER. Recognized, then. The services of the hon. member for the county of York have been recognized.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. The point is simply this, and I should think the hon. member and his friends would see it. He has deliberately stated in the House that an hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House was purchased, that his support was purchased by a loan which was made to a company for the purpose of building a bridge. The hon. member has not taken that statement back. I think he ought to take it back.

Mr. LISTER. Well, I won't say purchased; I will take that back. I will say recognized. At all events, whether I say purchased or not, is of very little consequence. If it pleases the Minister of Finance, I will withdraw the word purchased. At all events, we find that the hon. member for York, sitting behind the Government, has supported it in all its acts, and there may be a question as to whether all its acts will bear the closest scrutiny. At all events, Mr. Speaker, we find the astounding fact, that a member of this House, supposed to be an independent member of Parliament, solicits from the Government, and the Government gives him—because it is virtually that—gives to his company a present of $30,000 of the money of the people of this country, for which they have not received value to the extent of one farthing. We find this company, with a nominal capital of $200,000, have the magnificent sum of $20,000 paid up—it is so reported. Whether it was ever paid up or not, it is difficult to say. But at most the paid-up capital of the company was only $20,000. We find them with a paid-up capital of only $20,000 in a scheme involving an expenditure of nearly half a million dollars, and the Government

consider the company's financial standing sufficient to justify them in making them a present of $30,000 of our money. And what more do they do? They lend upon that visionary scheme $300,000 more of the people's money, making $330,000 in all, taken out of the treasury of Canada and placed in the hands of three or four individuals, one of whom is a member of Parliament and a supporter of the Government, and another of whom is his son-in-law. We find four men composing that company; we find two of the Gibsons, the hon. member for York, and one other gentleman, composing what is known as this company. And we can draw the inference, if we like, that there may have been influences brought to bear on the Government to give this remarkably favourable consideration to the speculation of the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple). They lend them the money. We are told in this House by the then Minister of Finance that this is a good investment. We are told we are getting 4 per cent for our money and it is sure to be paid, and we can borrow money in England at 3½ per cent, making the desirable and profitable bargain of ½ per cent on the interest. We lend them the money, I repeat; the company goes to work and builds the structure. They are in possession of it: they are the recipients of what profits may be made out of the tolls collected, and for one year these generous beings pay the Government of Canada the interest on its investment, amounting to $12,000. The old Finance Minister leaves the country, a new Finance Minister takes his place. Not a dollar has been paid since this new Finance Minister has occupied the comfortable seat he now fills. He has allowed this company to go on year after year and make default; not one shilling has been paid into the treasury by this company, and we find two or three feeble letters written by the Finance Department, in a way begging this company to do somethting about the interest. Year after year it goes on, until the attention of the Government is called by the Auditor General to the fact that the interest has not been paid. A letter is written, another letter is written; no response is made to those letters. Time runs on. The life of the present Parliament is about expiring, it will be soon dead, and we find a shuffle of the cards. There are no more letters written, there are no more demands made on the company to pay what they owe to Canada. Time runs on, and the elections are coming along. My old friend the member for York (Mr. Temple) would certainly like to pass his latter days in that receptacle in the other end of this building. I read that, at the nomination the hon. gentleman told the electors of York that he did not want to be a candidate again, a significant statement. No doubt the hon. gentleman has the promise of a senatorship in his breeches pocket at this moment. The Finance Minister goes down to King's. Things are not as nice there as they used to be. They tell me that down in King's his last election cost him almost a king's ransom, and we know that he has not very much money to spend in that sort of way. A candidate comes before him, and with a discretion that does him infinite credit he abandons his old county of King's and says it is for the good of his health—and perhaps it is. He goes down to York. He finds the present member for York, who tells the people there that, having served them so long, he does not think he will serve them any longer, and after due time and all proper proceedings are taken, the Finance Minister becomes the nominee of the Conservative party in the county of York. And the hon. gentleman takes it with more avidity than he otherwise would have swallowed it, because, forsooth, Mr. Alexander Gibson has promised him his support. Alexander Gibson, the cotton king of the province of New Brunswick, at one time a Liberal, the man who lost his principles when they came, as he thought, in conflict with his interests—he tells the Finance Minister that he shall receive his support and influence, and the Conservative press of this country, from one end to the other, tell the people of Canada, for the purpose of affecting, no doubt, the Liberal vote and showing what prominent and influential men are abandoning that party, that Alexander Gibson, a Liberal of the Liberals, is now going to support the Minister of Finance. Under these circumstances the hon. gentleman consents to be the Conservative candidate for the county of York. Let me tell the hon. gentleman this, that if all accounts are correct, if all reports are true, he will probably back out of that county before the election and seek a seat which he can secure with more ease probably than the seat in that county. We have this sum of $300,000. What does it amount to when you look at the Sault Canal? What does it amount to when you look at the Sheik's Rapids and other little works down there? It is a mere drop in the bucket. What are $300,000 to the people of this country? It may be true that in almost every city in Canada during the past winter the charitable people have been called upon to establish soup kitchens to save the poor from starvation, yet we are told day after day that the country is prosperous and the people are happy. That may be so. And then, what does $300,000 mean, what does it amount to to the people of this country? What does a gift of $300,000 amount to when made to the four gentlemen who compose this company? What does it matter if we allow them to take all the earnings of the bridge and the road and put them into their own pockets, instead of paying the honest debt they have contracted with the people? It all amounts to nothing when weighed in the balance with the Fiance Minister in one cup and that in

the other. Are the people willing that, to secure and retain the services of the Finance Minister, we should give to those four gentlemen $300,000 or $400,000 of the money of this country? Sir, with a wonderful sagacity, and in order that the books may be kept clear and not show a deficit, and not show that these men are not paying up their debt, the Finance Minister said, Let us open a special account; we will charge up the company and debit them with the interest, and at the same time credit them in the old account as having paid the interest. So, as a matter of book-keeping, it would appear that the money has been paid, when, in fact, it has not been paid, and it remained for the remarkable financial skill of the Finance Minister to invent a device and scheme whereby a debt not paid would appear to have been paid in the books of this company. Sir, it seems to me that if the statement of the hon. gentleman is correct, the transaction we have under consideration today is the most disgraceful one we have had during the present Parliament. Why, the Curran Bridge was not a circumstance to it. There they stole from us $200,000; but here, if we do not enforce our rights, the result will be that in fact this company will have stolen from us $330,000, and $70,000 added, making over $400,000. If the people of Canada are willing to submit to jugglery of this kind, if they are willing to have their money expended in a way like this, then we shall have to abide by what they say; but my hon. friend, in bringing this matter before the House and exposing this transaction, has done something that entitles him to the thanks of the electors at large, because I believe there is hardly one man outside the Government who had any conception of the transaction which has been brought to light.

Mr. TEMPLE. I desire to reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman, that I have been purchased——

Mr. LISTER. I took that back.

Mr. TEMPLE. That statement having, however, been made, I shall be obliged to follow it out. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I never obtained one cent or anything else from the Government. So far as the company is concerned, they have sunk on the bridge $120,000 of their own money. That is the position in which the matter stands in regard to the bridge. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has not got the statement right. If he will go to the Railway Department, he will find there a report with reference to all the tolls collected every year. Now coming back to what my hon. friend says about my being purchased. I can tell that hon. gentleman, as I have already said before here, that I never was purchased by this Government, no, not to the extent of one single cent; but I have been offered by one of the leading men in the party opposite, that if I would only join them: "We will take your bridge and pay you your money." That is a fact and I state it here as if I were on my oath.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. TEMPLE. I would not expose that man. He is one of the leading men you have got in your party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. TEMPLE. No, I will not. It would blind you with astonishment if I were to give you his name.

Mr. MULOCK. Name.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think, Mr. Speaker, that as a matter of fairness the hon. gentleman (Mr. Temple) should give the name, because he has made a statement which casts an implication on this side of the House, and there may be a number of gentlemen who will feel a little delicate about it. The member for York (Mr. Temple) never should have made this statement without being prepared to back it up by giving the name.

Mr. FOSTER. He need not give the name if he does not like.

Mr. CHARLTON. If he refuses to give the name the inference will be, perhaps, that the statement is not as well founded as it might be. I would say something stronger about it if it were not against parliamentary rules.

Mr. TEMPLE. I did not say he was a member of this House, but he is a member of your party.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker, although I do not now reside in the county of York I may say that for many years of my life I did reside there, and I was residing there when this bridge was built, some nine years ago, I think. I happen to know some of the facts in connection with it, and that being the case, I think I might be able to remove some of the impression that may have been created upon this House by the hon. member from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member from Lambton (Mr. Lister), by the statements they have made, if I give just a few facts in connection with the reasons that led to the construction of that bridge, to the formation of the company that built the bridge, and to the loan by the Government of $300,000 to that company. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that before this loan was made to the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company, a loan had been made to a company for the purpose of constructing a bridge across the falls at the mouth of the River St. John. That loan, I believe—speaking now without having looked into the matter lately—was in the neighbourhood of $400,000, and it was for the purpose

of constructing a bridge that would connect the railway system on the eastern side of the River St. John with the railway system on the western side; thus giving complete railway connection from the upper provinces right down to the lower provinces, whereas previously there had been a break at that point, and passengers, and mails, and freight had to be ferried across the river or across the harbour. Every cent of interest on that loan has been paid to the Government. It resulted satisfactorily and successfully. The tolls which the bridge company collected from the railway companies using that bridge were of such a character that then and up to the present time, they have been able to pay every cent of the 4 per cent interest, and so the investment has been one that has been profitable for the Dominion. Soon after that you recollect, Mr. Speaker,—the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) were in the House at the time and they will recollect also—a Bill was passed and a subsidy was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of constructing what was known as the Short Line Railway to the maritime provinces. The Bill with respect to the Short Line provided that this railway, after leaving the south side of the St. Lawrence near Montreal should traverse a portion of Quebec province, then cross the state of Maine, and then go from Harvey, which is a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway line via Fredericton, to Salisbury. To enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to go via Fredericton to Salisbury at that time, it was absolutely necessary that the St. John River should be bridged at Fredericton. The gentlemen who composed this company. Mr. Gibson and the other gentlemen, having in view the fact that the legislation of this House for the construction of the Short Line Railway was based entirely upon the idea that that road should go from Harvey via Fredericton, to Salisbury, got incorporated for the purpose of bridging the River St. John at Fredericton; it being understood at that time that the Canadian Pacific Company were not willing to build that bridge themselves out of their subsidy. The gentlemen I have referred to got incorporated as a bridge company and applied to the Dominion Government for a loan of $300,000 on terms similar to those of the loan made to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, which, as I have explained, built the bridge at the falls on the River St. John. There was every expectation, there was every reasonable probability, there was more than reasonable probability at this time, that this Short Line Railway, according to the vote of this House and the subsidy granted by this House, would cross the River St. John at Fredericton, and go from a point on the Intercolonial Railway to Salisbury, which is about 11 miles west of the city of Moncton. Having that in view, these gentlemen incorporated themselves as a Bridge Company, borrowed the money and constructed that bridge. They had every reasonable expectation, in consequence of the Short Line Railway being constructed by the route fixed by Parliament, that the tolls they would receive from the cars and passengers and freight would give them ample money to pay the interest on that loan, and also give them interest on the money which they themselves were out of pocket, and probably leave them, as they had reason to expect, a fair margin of profit for their own enterprise in investing their money and carrying on the work. I submit also, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time the Government of this country of that day had every reason to expect that that road would be built, and that they would get every cent of interest upon the money they loaned to that Bridge and Railway Company. But things did not turn out as they were expected to turn out. It will be remembered in the first place that the Canadian Pacific Railway, for reasons of their own, constructed their line across the province of Quebec, and across the state of Maine down to Mattawamkeag, and then followed the existing lines to the city of St. John. They declined to build the line from Harvey to Salisbury by way of Fredericton. If I recollect aright, Mr. Speaker, legislation was then introduced into the House of Commons by the then Premier, Sir John Macdonald, with a view of constructing that work independently of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that legislation was thrown out and voted down when it came before the hon. members of the Senate. So I submit, Sir, that at the time this work was undertaken it was undertaken in good faith on the part of the promoters, who never would have put a dollar of their money into it had they not thought that this road from Harvey to Salisbury would have been built via Fredericton. Not only was it undertaken in good faith, and the best of commercial good faith on the part of the promoters, but it was also undertaken in good faith on the part of the Government of the day, who at that time had every reason to believe that the arrangement entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway would be carried out, that this road should cross the country there and would have to cross the bridge at Fredericton, which would result in the tolls being of such extent that they would be sufficient to pay interest to this country on the $300,000 which it had loaned to the promoters of this undertaking. These are the facts in connection with the building of the bridge. As it is at present, the bridge is used now by only one line of railway, I think—that is, the railway known as the Canada Eastern, which runs from Chatham, in the

county of Northumberland, to the city of Fredericton, in the county of York. That road passes over the bridge to reach Fredericton, and the tolls are collected upon the cars, the passengers and the freight that cross it. But, unfortunately, the sums received in tolls from the Canada Eastern Railway—and I am informed that fair rates are charged—have not been more than sufficient, I understand, up to the present time to keep the bridge in repair and to pay the ordinary expenses connected with its maintenance, although I believe the greatest possible economy has been exercised by the gentlemen controlling the company. But I submit that the money expended upon this bridge has not been wasted. I submit that, from the fact that one railway uses it in order to reach the city of Fredericton, instead of transporting all its freight and passengers by ferry across the river, the bridge has been of considerable advantage, not only to the people of Fredericton and its vicinity, but to the people of different parts of the province who are interested in the business of that railway—a business which I understand is steadily developing, and has developed considerably during the last year. That road and bridge will in future be used for other purposes. At the last session of the legislature of New Brunswick a subsidy and charter were granted to Mr. Leckie, a gentleman well known in Nova Scotia in connection with the iron industry there, who has acquired large coal areas in the county of Queen's, N.B., and who has given assurances that he intends to develop those coal areas and ship the coal to the western parts of this country via a railway he proposed constructing from Grand Lake to Fredericton, and this bridge making connection with the west at Fredericton. If that bridge were not there, no such idea would have entered into the mind of Mr. Lackie or any other sane man, because, without it, it would have been impossible to transport the coal to western points from the coal mines in the county of Queen's. Therefore, I have no doubt that a considerable amount of revenue will accrue to the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway and Bridge Company from the tolls that will be collected upon that coal, if Mr. Leckie's statement is correct, and I have no reason to doubt its correctness. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken about the loan to this bridge company as a most corrupt transaction, and as though the money had been voted for corrupt purposes. Knowing what I do, though I never had any personal interest in the bridge, I desire emphatically to deny that there was anything corrupt in the original loan made by the Government to this bridge company. The loan was made with a fair reason for believing that it was in the interest of the country that the bridge should be built, as it has been in the interest of the province of New Brunswick, and for believing that, from a commercial point of view, the loan would be a fair investment for this country to make. But, Sir, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), very unfortunately, went out of his way to make a personal attack upon Mr. Gibson, one of the members of that bridge company; and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke of Mr. Gibson as though for the first time Mr. Gibson was going to give his support in the next election to the present Government. If these hon. gentlemen had inquired in the province of New Brunswick, they would have ascertained that in 1887 Mr. Gibson gave his influence, in the county of York, in favour of the candidate supporting the Conservative Administration, and that it is not because the interest has not been paid on this loan that Mr. Gibson was influenced in 1887 or is influenced to-day to suport the Conservative Government, but that he is influenced by the same consideration that has influenced very many of the leading men of the province of New Brunswick to withdraw their allegiance from the party of hon. gentlemen opposite—because they believe that the policy of that party is not in the best interests of the country; and, as men having a stake in the country—and no man has a larger stake in the lower provinces than Mr. Gibson—and desiring to see the country advance and progress, they believe it is their duty to cast in their lot with and do all they can to support the Government now in power. It is most unfortunate that hon. gentlemen opposite should make these attacks upon men of the character and standing of Mr. Alexander Gibson. It is most unfortunate, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite should be led to adopt such a course simply because Mr. Gibson is now opposing them. When he supported them, they were only too happy to have his support, and the Liberal party of New Brunswick could not find words of praise strong enough in which to speak of that hon. gentleman. I have no hesitation in saying that New Brunswick has never had a citizen to whom it owes so much as it does to Mr. Alexander Gibson. We have other men of wealth in that province. We have had men who acquired wealth in that province just as Mr. Gibson did, but in very many cases, after acquiring a certain amount of wealth, they were content, and made no further effort, and in too many cases, went to other countries to spend their means. But in Mr. Gibson's case, although he might, ten or twelve years ago, have retired with an independent fortune, amply sufficient to support himself and family in affluence for the rest of his days, and to leave adequate provision for his family after his death, yet he was so enterprising that he would not take his ease, and well-earned rest, but he took a large amount of money made

out of his lumber business, invested it in a cotton mill, and operated that mill successfully, steadily and continuously, thus giving employment to hundreds of people, and affording a large home market to the farmers of that locality. We have never had a man in that province who has done so much to develop its resources, who has given so much employment to labour, and who has exemplified so fully, in every sense of the term, the ideal of a good citizen, as this gentleman who is now abused and slandered and vilified by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to offer a few words in reply to the statement made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen). The statement he has made requires, indeed, very little reply. He has virtually acknowledged the whole corn. He has acknowledged that this was a speculation entered into by those men. The Government backed them up in the speculation, and risked the money of this Dominion. These gentlemen would not have risked their own money.

Mr. HAZEN. They risked $120,000 of their own.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HAZEN. If the hon. gentleman refers to the $50,000 bonds issued, I am informed—and have no doubt my information is correct—that these bonds are simply held by Mr. Temple and Mr. Gibson, that they put their own private money into the enterprise, and have never put the bonds on the market.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Government are compelled to take over the bridge, they will have to pay the bonds. No doubt about that. So that it matters very little, so far as Parliament is concerned, whether Mr. Gibson or Mr. Temple holds the bonds, or who holds them. That, I think is quite clear. With regard to the statement made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) that the company have spent $120,000 of their own money, if that be the case, then the returns which the company is compelled by law to submit annually do not show any such expenditure. They only show that these gentlemen have contributed $20,000 paid-up stock ; and if there is any more than that paid up, they have made a false return, because the returns do not show anything in excess of the $20,000. My hon. friend, when he rose to address the House, tried to draw a herring across the track. He tried to excuse the company and the Government for the imprudent expenditure and the advances which had been made to erect this structure, by saying that the company anticipated that the Canadian Pacific Railway short line from Harvey to Salisbury would cross this particular bridge. I suppose the company anticipated that the tolls which they would then receive would make the speculation a good one from their point of view. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had used the bridge to the extent anticipated, the speculation would have been, for them, an excellent one. Mr. Gibson is a very wealthy man, and no doubt he could furnish the whole $300,000 himself, but it appears that he is a very prudent as well as a wealthy man. No doubt he thought it was more prudent to utilize the money which the Government advanced at a low rate of interest than invest his own funds. It would be much safer, from his standpoint, to be merely a small stockholder, and utilize his friend, Mr. Temple, to secure from the Government a loan at a very low rate of interest. In this he was successful. They obtained this loan in 1887, and in return Mr. Gibson joined the ranks of the Tory party, and has supported them ever since.

Mr. HAZEN. If you knew Mr. Gibson, you would not attribute such motives to him.

Mr. McMULLEN. The one thing was concurrent with the other. He got the loan in 1887, and he gave his support to the Tory party in 1887. Another thing that is admitted is that the Government made the advance of $300,000. The Government surely knew that they were dealing with wealthy men, but they did not attempt to secure this country against loss by holding the directors personally, as well as the company as a corporation. They did not do that. They ran the risk of making an advance of $300,000 on the very flimsy basis of $20,000. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House says that Mr. Gibson is immensely wealthy. Well, he was still not willing to put his own money into the concern, and the Government did not require that he should become personally responsible in any way for the amount they were advancing to the company. It appears to me that this investment is a clean loss to this Dominion. It is on a par with the Tay Canal and the Caraquet Railway, and many other investments which hon. gentlemen opposite have made of the country's money in undertakings which are, year after year, proving to be absolutely useless. I notice in the assets of the Dominion that this is set down as a valuable asset, as something upon which the country is receiving interest every year, and one of the things we are supposed to hold against our enormous debt. Now, the Government would be just as well justified had they assisted a company in the North-west to control a town site in anticipation of the Candian Pacific Railway running through it, and then, after the Government had advanced the money, the railway was run in another direction, the speculation failed, the site remains in the hands of the owners.

and the Government find they have advanced a loan on a worthless security. This bridge was a pure piece of speculation on the part of a sitting member (Mr. Temple) and those associated with him—on the part of Mr. Gibson as well as on the part of his son-in-law, Mr. Hilliard. It was a family affair, and through the influence they were able to exercise on the Government, they got the Government to put $300,000 in a place whence it will never be drawn. That bridge will stand at Fredericton as a monument of political folly, extravagance and recklessness, and this amount of the people's money, which the Government invested, advanced on a basis of $20,000 security, will be for all time a positive and absolute loss. We have many other exhibitions of that kind throughout the country. We see them on the right and on the left as we pass through from east to west. My hon. friend said that Mr. Gibson was a very wealthy man. I am glad to hear it. But it is rather singular that a man of his wealth should, in connection with an hon. gentleman who has a seat in this House, submit to this exposure and to the scandal which must attach to them rather than pay the $72,000 interest, and by keeping this business secret a little longer, prevent, for the present, at least, the miserable exhibition which has been made in connection with this whole matter. This is one of the many things that are coming to light from time to time. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been so long at this kind of work, that their secrets are fairly well covered up, but from time to time, transactions are disclosed which show plainly how the affairs of this Dominion are managed. Sir, corruption and bribery are rampant from one end of the country to the other. We can say truly, in the language of the Good Book, that from the head to the foot, from the Atlantic to the Pacific——

Some hon. MEMBERS. What verse?

Mr. McMULLEN—there is nothing but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores. The whole body has become corrupt, and the people are beginning to realize the condition of things, and, from time to time, as corruption oozes out in connection with the Fredericton Bridge Company, and the Tay Canal, and the Curran Bridge, and other "jobs" of that kind, the country is beginning to get enlightened as to how its affairs have been, and are being, mismanaged.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing this matter on the information—naturally somewhat partial and incomplete—that has been presented to the House by the hon. gentleman who made the motion. When the papers are brought down, as they will be, I shall take the opportunity of having something to say on the subject. I must, however, congratulate my hon. friend and gentlemen opposite generally upon the tactics which they have commenced to develop, the tactics of assailing persons who are not in a position to reply; of attacking officer after officer of the Government instead of attacking the responsible political head who is in the House, and who is the only person who should be attacked, of attacking private gentlemen of unblemished character, of a long life of usefulness, of probity and of honour, and of setting them in the category of men of no principle, men who are seeking to be corrupted and to corrupt others. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that is a good course to pursue, let them pursue it. I do not think they will make much of it in this House; I do not think they will make much of it in the country. What right, as a gentleman, what right as a man, has my hon. friend who sits opposite to me, and who has moved this resolution, to pursue such a course? What right, as a member, has he to rise and, out of a business transaction developed in the records of this House and growing out of legislation passed years ago, a transaction that has been before the House every year, and open to that gentleman as a member of the House—and you may say it is wise or unwise, that is a matter which can be fairly and rightly debated—what right has he or any other gentleman to rise and declare that wounds and bruises and putrefying sores are the unvarying conditions and characteristics of political opponents, and that he finds these same things in the transaction which he is discussing to-day? What right has he to impugn the honour and honesty of a man immeasurably above him—Mr. Gibson—a man whose work has not been, like that of the hon. gentleman, to find wounds and bruises and putrefying sores where they do not exist save in his imagination, but whose life has been one continued series of works of usefulness in the development of the resources of his own province, the province of New Brunswick, adding to its material wealth and bringing wages and prosperity into thousands of homes in that country which, but for him, would not have been so well off? When that gentleman supported the party of hon. gentlemen opposite there was nothing too good to say of him. So long as there was a prospect that he would support them, there was nothing too high to say in his praise. Only a few months ago an hon. gentleman high in the councils of the party, a gentleman sitting opposite me to-day, made a pilgrimage with others to the city of Fredericton for political purposes. They made speeches in the city hall, and then in their best bib and tucker they made a pilgrimage to the cotton mill owned and carried on by Mr. Gibson, went through it from bottom to top and praised everything about it, praised the gentleman himself, and, returning got upon a public platform and praised

the public spirit and enterprise of Mr. Gibson, who was so great an employer of labour. That is one phase of the matter. But to-day it is different. The colleagues of this hon. gentleman who moves this motion applaud him when he calls a man, immeasurably above him, a corruptionist, applaud him when he throws his vile insinuations against gentlemen outside of this House, as well as inside of this House. Those in this House, I am glad to say can defend themselves. But I ask whether that is a fair or honourable species of warfare ? Very ingenious was the hon. gentleman's attempt—but very bald and open—to connect me with this transaction. He gives me credit for great sagacity, for great long-headedness. Nine years ago, it would seem, I was laying the pipes for the purpose he sets forth. I happened to be a member of this House at that time, and then, according to the hon. gentleman, I was laying pipes against the time, eight or nine years in the future, when I should want some other constituency than the one I had been representing up to that time. And to-day it is plain, according to the hon. gentleman, that there was a bargain, a corrupt bargain, and that the Finance Minister was in it as well. I am not at the present time going to defend myself against a charge of such a nature and coming from such a source. By and by, if it comes from gentlemen who have more standing——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER—when it comes from gentlemen, who have probably more of that weight and character behind them to make it a point to be considered whether an assertion that they make in this House might not have some weight in the country, then it will be time for me to say something with regard to it. At present, I do not propose to do so, considering the source from which the charge has come and the evident lack of weight behind the charge. When all these papers are brought down and all the information is before the House, I shall have something to say about this matter. Meantime, I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite that I think they might pursue better tactics, that they might act more in accordance with the courtesies of this House than to assail public officers who have no seats here, than to assail private citizens and public benefactors whose character is above reproach, simply because these gentlemen do not see eye to eye with them or feel as they do upon political affairs, than to throw out insinuations of wrong-doing where they have not a single scintilla of evidence. They may find fault with the business sagacity of a Minister, they may find fault with the policy of the Government. That is one thing and a perfectly proper thing to do. But to assail the characters of honourable men, to send through the party press and into the public mind the vile poison of their insinuations, is something which it is better for a political party or a statesman not to do, in my opinion. I repel and resent any insinuations of that kind when they come from a quarter which renders them dangerous, and I shall always hold myself ready to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that before he is done with him the hon. gentleman will find that the charges made by my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) are not to be lightly set aside. My hon. friend has won for himself, though the hon. gentleman may not know it, a very high and well-deserved reputation throughout this country as a man——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—yes, a high and well-deserved reputation as a man who has stood upon the floor of Parliament, times without number, against overwhelming odds, for the purpose of uplifting his voice against those who were despoiling the people of their inheritance. My hon. friend's record will bear comparison, and good comparison with that of the hon. Minister of Finance himself. My hon. friend behind me did not climb into power on the shoulders of, what shall I call them ?—"association," perhaps, would be resented, but he did not climb into power as the professed champion of an object for which, since he got into power, he has done very little. So far as regards Mr. Gibson, I am perfectly prepared, and so is every man on this side of the House, to give him all the praise he may deserve for enterprise, for anything that he may have done honestly and genuinely to promote the welfare of his province, or of the country at large. I believe he has done much in that way. I am quite prepared to give him all credit for it. But, Sir, Mr. Gibson, as well as other people, has his moments of weakness. Mr. Gibson, as well as other people, possibly desires to obtain for himself a little larger—gratuity shall we say, or assistance shall we say, or recognition shall we say, from the public treasury, than, perhaps, citizens of less wealth are likely to secure. Sir, this particular transaction is a very old friend of mine, and, as perhaps the hon. member for York knows, this is not the first time it has been before us. It is not the first time I have had to comment upon it, it is not the first time that very extraordinary statements, some of which I have under my hand, were made by former Ministers, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir John Macdonald, and the hon. member himself, when these matters were under discussion before us. Now, Sir, I can understand that the Minister of Finance, as a Maritime champion, thinks that the time has come when New Brunswick should do something worthy of the high position she occupies in the councils of this country. Has not Ontario got her Tay Canal ? Has not Quebec

got her Curran Bridge? And as for New Brunswick, I think she might have been content with her Caraquet Railway. But, Sir, I am inclined to think that this bridge, when properly looked into, will overshadow even the Caraquet Railway. Now, this is one of those numerous transactions, which have been alluded to, in which the Government have allowed themselves to be seduced, or, shall I say, have seduced members of Parliament in equivocal and compromising positions. You will find, if we had a commission of inquiry with power to examine into it, that the history of the subsidy to the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company is probably only too true an examplification of the history of a vast number of railway subsidies which we have been granting for the past nine or ten years. Now, what are the facts about this—facts, mark you, which have not been denied at all, or refuted, in reply to my hon. friends. Now, it may be that a considerable sum of money has been dropped in the railway, but there is no doubt whatever that when this bridge was intended to be constructed, we are told, and I have the statement here, that it was to cost $375,000; we were told that $75,000 of it were to be provided by the promoters, and that the Government were to pay $300,000, not after it was completed and the cost ascertained, but as the work went on, to the tune of at least 80 per cent. Those were the terms of the Order in Council which I have got here. Then, Sir, the Government came down and gave $30,000 in one lump to the gentlemen who were only to have expended $75,000. More than that, the hon. gentleman wanted to know why it was that these gentlemen, Mr. Temple and Mr. Gibson, and the rest of them, desired to build this line. If they will refer to the "Hansard" of 1889, and to page 1620, they will find that a certain conversation took place between myself and the hon. member for York on that subject. The hon. member was very candid. He admitted that all they were going to put into it was $75,000. The hon. gentleman admitted that they were going to get $300,000 from the Government at 4 per cent, and he went on to state:

I am in hopes the profits will be thousands of dollars when we have the Short line built.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apart from the Short line, what profit does the hon. gentleman, who is largely concerned in this road, expect to achieve? What is the annual income likely to be got from the toll?

Mr. TEMPLE. The cost of keeping up the bridge will not exceed $2,000 a year, and we expect to get $30,000 a year out of it.

Mr. TEMPLE. I wish to say one word with reference to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. We will give him a plentiful opportunity as soon as I am done. We will be delighted to hear from him, and I am sure from this side of the House he will be welcome to speak not only once again, but twice or three times, if he wishes. The point I wished particularly to make was this: It is not what the hon. gentleman has realized out of this, not what has materialized, but what he expected to obtain. Even the then astute leader of the House, Sir John Macdonald, expressed doubts whether the hon. gentleman would get all he expected from it. Sir, what did these gentlemen expect to get? They expected that the road would cost them at the outside $75,000, that the cost of maintenance would be $2,000, and they would make $30,000. Now, deducting the $12,000 that they were to pay, it is plain that they expected to get over 20 per cent on an expenditure of $75,000, which was afterwards reduced by the $30,000 I alluded to. Sir, if there ever was a case in which gentlemen played heads I win, tails you lose, it was the case of Mr. Gibson and the hon. member for York. Now, there are a great many questions which arise, and which I think, in another place, ought to be made the subject of an investigation. In the first place, I should like very much to know the true value of that bridge, valued by a genuine and independent expert, not in the employ of the Government, but some person whom both parties could trust. I have heard—although I do not pretend to say that I will dispute good evidence to the contrary—I have heard that if that bridge was to be built to-day it could be built for far less than $375,000, which was stated by Sir Charles Tupper as the estimated cost of it. I am aware that it is a very easy thing to show an expenditure on paper very considerably in excess of the true cost. We know that in a great many cases items can be put in so that the actual cost of a bridge may be a very different thing indeed from the reported cost of a bridge. That may or may not be; but we would desire, in addition to that, to know particularly—and this the Minister of Finance ought to be able to tell us—where these $50,000 bonds come in? Are they ahead of our $300,000 or are they behind this $300,000? If they are ahead of this $300,000, then I do not concede that, even if the hon. member for York and Mr. Gibson have placed any money in this, they have run any appreciable risk. If they come behind, why, Sir, they are pretty much at the mercy of the Government of which the Minister of Finance is at present the leader. Now, there is another thing we want to know. So far as I understand it, 90 per cent of the capital stock of this company has not been paid in. I do not know in what proportion it is divided between Mr. Gibson, senior, and Mr. Gibson, junior, the hon. member for York and the hon. member for York's son-in-law; but this I do know, that if 90 per cent have not been paid up it was the duty of the Government, it was the

duty of the Finance Department, it was the duty of the Minister of Justice in particular, if his attention was called to it, to have taken steps, when this interest fell due to call in the balance of the 90 per cent, which is apparently uncollected to this date. That appears to me, if it is in the hands of a gentleman of such high standing as Mr. Gibson, to have been their clear duty. Before this matter closes, I would therefore like to know what steps have been taken on the part of the Government to realize the uncollected 90 per cent. Perhaps the hon. member for York, who is, I understand, still a shareholder, can give us this information. But, Sir, that is not the only important point connected with it. Now, I called attention, not once, not twice, but many times over, without reflecting on the hon. member for York, to the very inconvenient position in which that hon. gentleman, as largely concerned in a bridge company of this kind, is placed towards the Government. It is not desirable, it is, in my judgment, wholly contrary to the Independence of Parliament Act, that any man should hold a seat in this House, from whatever province he comes, who is to all intents and purposes a defaulting debtor to the Government; and, so far as appears—and I did not hear the hon. member for York deny the charge—so far as appears, if he has not paid up the balance of his subscription, the hon. member for York clearly stands in that position. The truth of the matter is, that as a business transaction this thing is utterly indefensible. If the former bridge was only going to cost $375,000, was it worth the while of the Government, first of all, to advance the loan of $300,000, then to give a gratuity of $30,000. Sir, the Government had no business to advance a cent upon it. What sort of security was that? Which of us as a business man would advance $330,000 when those who constructed it were only going to spend $40,000 or $50,000 more. Sir, if there ever was any justification at all for the loan, it was the bounden duty of the Government to have built that bridge and to have owned it. For my own part, I will not enter on that side question, because I have not the requisite knowledge to say whether this was a railway bridge which it was really in the interests of the country to construct. That may or may not be. But I do say that if there ever was any justification for a loan, there was an absolute necessity in that case that the Government should have built and owned the bridge. I say this, that the position in which, whether by his own course, or whether by the fault of the Government, the hon. member for York was placed, was one that rendered his position in the House fatal to his usefulness from that time. The hon. gentleman was placed in a false position: the hon. gentleman, I repeat, was in the position of a defaulting debtor; the hon. gentleman could not be a free agent, nor can any other hon. member who has been the recipient of large sums from the Government, or who has received great favours—because this was a great favour on the showing of the hon. gentleman himself, from the Government—even if those favours have not resulted, as the hon. gentleman tells us they have not resulted, in enabling him to make a very large sum of money at an almost infinitesimal risk to himself. What did the hon. gentleman risk? The hon. gentleman and the friends with whom he was connected, risked, or supposed they risked, $40,000 or $50,000 for the sake of making, as they supposed, a return of $16,000 or $18,000 a year. There are a great many business men who would like to take such a chance, who would consider it a great favour when they were advancing $40,000, or $50,000, or $60,000, to find a generous creditor who would lend them $300,000 at 4 per cent. I repeat, and this is a point, at all events, that cannot be contradicted, that all such transactions to which members of this House are parties are fatal to the independence of the members, and ought, if justice were done, to involve their instant withdrawal from this House.

Mr. MULOCK. There is only one point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. This item of $300,000 is included in the assets of the Dominion. In the Public Accounts, which I hold in my hand, this is put down as a good asset, equal to its face, and on this representation it is deducted from the debt of the country. That is either a true representation of the value of that asset, or it is a false one. I am not going to say it is incorrect, I will assume it is true. I will assume, for the purpose of my argument, that the asset is a good and valuable one, or we must discredit all the sixty-two millions, or a considerable portion of the securities in which our funds are invested, not, of course, those which are our own debentures. Taking, therefore, the Public Accounts as containing a fair representation of the value of our assets, I should like to know why the Finance Minister, under these circumstances, has not done his duty in realizing upon a security which is now six years in arrear for interest. I want the Finance Minister to tell this House, if he does not desire the investments of our public funds to be discredited by this act, because many of our investments consist of securities of a semi-private character like this one, why he allowed six years interest to accumulate. He must be aware that the Act of Parliament under which this loan was made required that a first mortgage be taken by the Government upon this property to secure this debt; and, reading the debates on the question, I find that Sir Charles Tupper pledged himself to the House and the

country at the time that this mortgage would contain a stipulation that upon default being made, whenever it should happen, the Government, as mortgagee should be entitled to realize on the security by realizing on the mortgage. Assuming that what was pledged to the country by the hon. gentleman's predecessor was carried out, I suppose we have a mortgage. Can the Finance Minister say whether there was a mortgage taken to secure the money or not ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know the facts of the case.

Mr. MULOCK. It is most extraordinary that, with a security six years in arrears, the Finance Minister should tell us to-day that he does not know the facts of the case. Can any better proof of his inability to grapple with transactions of finance be advanced ? A sum of $300,000 of the public money was advanced, and six years of arrears of interest accumulated, to which the hon. gentleman's attention was called by the Auditor General on more than one occasion, and to-day the hon. gentleman tells the House that he does not know whether there is any security or not for the loan ; and yet, not knowing whether there is any security held by the country, he tells the House that the loan is absolutely safe. I should like to know on what evidence he bases that opinion, when the hon. gentleman has just told the House that he does not know whether there is any security or not. What is his explanation to-day ? It would be unfair to hold him responsible for the original investment, except as a member of the Government, and the hon. gentleman entirely misapprehended the point when he stated that we would seek to charge him in 1887 with having been trying to lay pipe for his candidature in 1895 because of this loan. No, that is not the point ; but I commend the hon. gentleman for his tactics in trying to evade the point at issue by turning attention to that feature of the transaction. The Minister of Finance should explain why he has not proceeded to collect the debt now due. It is his duty, and it was his duty in 1892 when the Auditor General called attention to the matter, and it was his duty from that year ever since till 1895, to collect that debt. Let the hon. gentleman tell the country why he did not collect it. That is the point at issue. The Minister of Railways seems to think that this is not a vital point. It may not occur to him that the people would wish to collect the debts due; but I submit, as the representative of the section of the people who pay for these investments, and whose money has been invested, that the time has arrived when the country should not be called upon to buy seats by such lavish expenditure, and at such demoralization of public morality.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you mean by buying seats ?

Mr. MULOCK. I mean to say this : That the Finance Minister, if he were a faithful steward of the public funds, would have realized upon the security and collected the interest due to the country, instead of stating to the House that he knows nothing about it, and opening a special account and representing that this was a good asset, and doing that on the eve of applying to these gentlemen for political support to enable him to get a seat in this House. That is what I mean.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has asked several questions, and expects to get answers to some of them, and not to others. He will receive a full answer with respect to the whole business transaction when the papers are brought down, and if there is any discussion we shall then be able to see exactly what the facts are. The hon. gentleman made an insinuation. His insinuation was not a manly one—it was one of the nature that he frequently makes. When I asked him courteously to explain what he meant by saying that this was a transaction for the purpose of buying a seat, he made a turn around and came back in a subdued and milder form, not in the same language, but his intimation was that the transaction was carried out for the sake of buying a seat for the Finance Minister.

Mr. MULOCK. Why do you not collect the interest ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is now asking a question which any hon. member has a right to ask. When the hon. gentleman insinuates that inaction was for the purpose of buying a seat for the Finance Minister, he is making a statement in an unmanly way, a statement which no gentleman should make, a statement which he cannot prove.

Mr. MULOCK. Why did you not collect the interest ?

Mr. FOSTER. There are certain questions that an hon. gentleman can ask, and if the hon. gentleman would wait at that question and go no further, he would be, in my opinion, all right. When he goes further, and insinuates, what he will not state in his seat and on his responsibility as a member of this House——

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, I would state it on my responsibility. I do not shirk from stating it on my responsibility.

Mr. FOSTER. Then make your charge and state it on your responsibility. I have heard these insinuations before.

Mr. HAGGART. And a good many of them will be put a stop to, too.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, then, after this little breeze has passed, I will answer the hon. gentleman with reference to the bridge. The bridge was a public undertaking and a grant of money was passed by Parliament, after discussion in Parliament, to the company who undertook to build the bridge. That money is at the rate of 4 per cent. It is secured upon the bridge structure itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whereabouts does the $50,000 come in? Does it come in before or after the $300,000?

Mr. FOSTER. That I do not know, but I imagine that the Government has the first lien. The tolls to be collected were relied upon, I suppose, to pay the interest, and to pay as well a return to the gentlemen who formed the company and put a large amount of money into it. The anticipations of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Temple), which was alluded to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), did not result as he anticipated, and the simple facts of the case are, that owing to certain conjunctures of circumstances the bridge has been used by but one of the roads, instead of two or three railroads which it was supposed would have used it. The tolls have simply, as I believe, about paid for the working expenses of the bridge and therefore no money has been going into the pocket year by year, of the persons who form the Bridge Company. They are not getting wealthy from any results that are coming to them from the bridge. A part of the interest has been paid and a part has not been paid. Now, I am asked: Why don't I collect the interest? There was but one way I suppose in which one could do that. You could foreclose, and take the bridge structure. Does the hon. gentleman think that that would be a profitable transaction for the Government?

Mr. MULOCK. There is another way. That is not the only way.

Mr. FOSTER. One thing I wish to say in relation to that. I do not at all hold the opinion that this is a totally unprofitable investment. I believe that ultimately that bridge will be used——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I have a right to say what I believe.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And I have a right to applaud you.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, if it is applause; but my hon. friend has such a peculiar way of making applause that I almost took it for something else. I believe that the bridge will yet be a paying bridge. I believe that the railway companies will use it, and that the resources which are about to be developed, and which will make their way across that bridge will make it so that the company will be able to pay its interest to the Government, and by their management may get something to themselves. It is better that it should be done that way, even though we have to wait a little longer for a return on the money, than that the Government should foreclose the mortgage and take the structure over. Hon. members have brought the charge that this was put in the Public Works as an asset.

Mr. MULOCK. Excuse me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. The hon. Minister of Finance interrupted me and I gave place to him for the moment but I did not finish my speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MULOCK. When the Finance Minister desired to make an explanation I allowed him to do so, as was due to him, but I just want to put him one further question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is six o'clock.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not finish my speech. I wish to put the Finance Minister a question on this point. He tries to explain why he has not collected the interest, and he says that the only source from which he could collect it was by foreclosure. Now the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out that there are $180,000 of subscribed capital uncollected, and if the hon. Minister allows years to go by, what becomes of the liability of this $180,000 of security? I would ask him to explain if he has looked into that asset, or supposed asset, in order to realize on that. That is not a source of revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. All this comes from going into a long discussion before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has any information on the matter. My hon. friend has no reliable information as to $180,000 subscribed capital being liable to be called upon. I will finish what I had to say when my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) interrupted me. He intimated that this was given a false place in the Public Accounts, and that it was held out in the Public Accounts as a good asset worth its face. That is not true. Those who make up the Public Accounts have no right to leave it out as an asset because it is an asset. All the assets are placed in the Public Accounts, but there is also in the Public Accounts columns given of assets which are paying interest, of what they do pay, and of those that pay no interest. These are simply matters of book-keeping. I would not think that the officers of the department would be for a moment justified in dropping that out as an asset.

Mr. MULOCK. It is deducted, as worth its face, from the liabilities.

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

After Recess.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House at any great length. The question has been discussed here upon more than one occasion, and the reasons for the passage of the Bill have been very fully urged. The Bill may be termed an old one; yet it is not as old as the principle upon which it is founded. That principle has often been ineffectually urged here; it may be ineffectually urged again; but if that is the case, it is not the first great truth that has been urged and rejected by multitudes of men; and I believe to-night, as I have always believed in presenting this Bill, that the principle upon which it is founded is a sound one, and that the legislation it calls for would be beneficial to the country. Last session for the first time a limited measure of success was secured for the Bill in this House, through the support and courtesy of the then First Minister, the late Sir John Thompson. Two sections of the Bill, one relating to the closing of canals and the other relating to the publication of Sunday newspapers, were allowed to pass the House; and this partial success I consider was a very important one, for the reason that the principle of the Bill was affirmed by the House, and also for the reason that the two sections carried were in themselves of very great importance. To-night I ask, as I did then, and as I have asked upon other occasions, that the Bill be accorded fair consideration upon its merits, and that no prejudice that may exist against the mover of the Bill because of active party hostilities in which at times he may have been engaged, may be allowed to prejudice the interests of the Bill itself. Some years ago, when I urged another Bill in this House, I made a similar request to the then Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, and that right hon. gentleman indignantly spurned the idea that he would allow himself to be influenced in his attitude towards any measure by personal considerations regarding any member by whom it might be presented; and I ask the exercise of the same spirit to-night. I ask for this Bill the consideration which it deserves upon its merits, entirely dissociated from any consideration as to the member who presents it or what may be urged against him.

Last year this Bill, after it passed this House, was taken in charge in the Senate by the hon. Mr. Allan, who, in introducing it there, made use of this language with reference to it:

> This is a bill, which, as the hon. gentlemen are aware, has been before the other House of Parliament, I think, for more than two sessions. It has been very thoroughly discussed there, and has been amended and altered to a very great extent, so that it comes to us with most of its original provisions cut out, and indeed, I may say, in such an emasculated condition, that I do not think it can provoke much opposition from any one.

Well, this is a very fair instance of damning a thing with faint praise, and it seems to have thrown a wet blanket on the Bill in the Senate, and for this and other reasons it not only failed to pass that body, but failed to receive courteous treatment. Mr. Allan was followed by Senator Almon, and the chief reason urged by that hon. gentleman against the Bill was that it had been introduced into this House by an American, and he proceeded to indulge in a diatribe of abuse against me—scarcely touching the character of the Bill, but pouring out the vials of his wrath against me because of a malignant slander against me which just the day before had appeared in some of the newspapers, and which my credulous friend in the Senate accepted as gospel truth—I refer to charges against me, made in connection with the securing of free lumber at Washington in exchange for free logs. It was unfortunate for the Bill that its presentation in the Senate was contemporary with the publication of this statement. Then followed an apology from the Hon. Mr. Allan, who proceeded to say:

> There is no question about it that the bill and its treatment for the last two years in the House of Commons has been very materially affected by the unpopularity of the gentleman who had charge of the bill there; but when the bill came up to this House it was impossible for me to decline to take charge of it.

That was certainly very generous and warm support of the Bill, speaking ironically. The natural effect of this was seen in the fate that the Bill met. The leader of the Senate, the Hon. Mr. Bowell, now the Premier of the Dominion, made the following remarks, among others:—

> I look upon the bill as unnecessary. If it were in order, I should be inclined to express my disapproval of the bill in even stronger terms than the hon. member for Halifax has used.

Later on he said:

> It is only another evidence of what one might designate—if it were at all in order—arrant hypocrisy.

Again he said:

> There can be no doubt the object of the gentleman promoting the bill must have been to show to the world how good a man he was.

Well, Sir, I have only to say that this assertion, that my object in presenting and promoting this Bill is to secure popularity, is too absurd to be entertained for a moment. No man can stand up in face of this House and urge this Bill without realizing that he is undertaking a thankless task, that he is swimming against the stream and beating the air. If he takes this position for the sake of securing popularity, his conduct is idiotic, for popularity is not to be obtained from it, and that degree of sympathy which is required to win popularity is not to be found, I fear, in the country, and certainly not in this House. The assertion, therefore, that my motive in presenting this Bill is to secure popularity in the country and the applause of my fellowmen, is simply preposterous, for I have received nothing of the kind. On the contrary, I have ever felt, in presenting this Bill, that I was doing something which, if I consulted my own tastes and regard for popularity, I would shrink from doing. I am sorry the leader of the Senate so far forgot the dignity of his position as to attribute to a member of this House hypocrisy and a desire to show to the world how good a man he was in presenting this measure. I might account for the promptings of the hon. gentleman, but prefer not to do anything in that line. The promoters of the Bill in the Senate asked for a second reading and a reference to a committee, and the Senate declined to accord to the Bill this courtesy, but summarily and incontinently kicked it out of the House. And the Hon. Mr. Miller, in speaking to the Bill, previous to a vote being taken, said: "The sending of such a Bill to the Senate is simply an insult which can be only resented by adopting the motion of the hon. member for Halifax, which I intend to vote for." The Bill had received the assent of this House, and whatever might be its character, the conduct of the Senate in refusing it the courtesy of a second reading and reference to a committee was not only an indignity placed upon the mover and seconder of the Bill, but upon this House which had sanctioned it. We all remember the ordeal through which the Bill passed in this House. It went to the Senate ultimately in an amended form. The condition of affairs was such last session that it was doubtful whether public Bills would be reached at all, and when the Bill was in committee, that was the last occasion upon which it could be reached for consideration, so that whatever was to be done had to be done there and then, or else nothing could be done. The Bill from the necessities of the case left this House in an imperfect shape, and it was the proper function of the Senate to have referred that Bill to a committee and to have amended it in such a shape as to correct any imperfections resulting from the hasty action of this House at the last moment, when it was necessary to run the Bill through or shelve it for the session. The hope that was entertained that a calm consideration and fair treatment would be accorded to the Bill in a committee of the Senate was not realized, and I can only express sorrow for the evidences and exhibitions of passion and prejudice which characterized the conduct of the Senate in its treatment of that measure.

Now, Sir, I present the Bill again to-night. I present it, not because I expect that it will be popular, not because I feel that it will carry me upon a wave of sympathy, but because I feel it my duty to do so, and because I believe it to be a measure which will confer great benefits on this country. I present it as a matter of conscience and duty, and as I will continue to present it so long as I am a member of this House, whether it be received with favour or disfavour. I now wish to urge very briefly because I do not intend to enter into a long discussion, some of the reasons why this Bill should receive the favourable consideration of this House. It is a Bill which, in the first place, is in the interest of labour. It is in the interest of the labouring man that he should be allowed his weekly day of rest, and it is, unfortunately, the case, that a very large number of the labouring men in this country are not masters of their own conduct in this respect, and without the intervention of the law to protect them, the exactions of capital and of employers who have no regard to the rights of labour to a weekly days' rest, will compel the men to do violence to their conscience and to labour upon that day. I present the Bill because it is in the interest of morality, and because it will promote public and private virtue. The observance of the Sabbath, I need not tell any intelligent member of this House, is something calculated to elevate the moral tone of the people, and to create and promote public and private virtue, and for that reason I present it. It is, in the highest sense, in the interest of the state. It is in the interest not only of the labourer, not only of the citizens, but of the state. Of all the institutions of the state, of all the interests of the state, this measure is, in the highest degree, a safeguard. I wish to say that this Bill, as presented to the House, is not a religious Bill. Although the sentiment in favour of Sabbath observance is founded upon religious convictions, yet this is not a religious Bill, and the word "religion" is not mentioned in it at all. The Bill deals purely with civil and natural rights. It does not profess to say that man shall be religious; but it does profess to say he may be religious, and, if religious, is entitled to have his rights of conscience respected. It proceeds upon the principle that a weekly day's rest is a physical neces-

sity. It proceeds also upon the principle that a weekly day's rest may not be secured by all men, without the intervention of the law to protect them in that right. Of course, the weekly day's rest is based upon a divine command, but the Bill does not treat that side of the question at all. The Sabbath rest confers, in the first place, individual blessings. The first statesman in this Empire, Hon. W. E. Gladstone, attributes the marvellous preservation of his physical and mental powers to his observance of the Sabbath day, to his dismissing all cares and labour and everything that appertains to his week-day life upon the Lord's day, and spending that day entirely disassociated from all worldly cares and occupations. The testimony of all men who have had experience is that the observance of a weekly day's rest confers physical blessings of the greatest possible importance. And, in addition it confers social and national blessings. We may compare the civilization of our day with the civilization of heathen nations —heathen nations which have existed with civilized institutions longer than our own, heathen nations which had a culture and refinement in a certain sense. But if we compare our civilization with that of Rome or Greece, or any of these ancient nations, we will see, upon the one hand, fraud, lust murder, robbery, rapine—we will see a condition of society that we are preserved from knowing about, because it was so thoroughly vile and odious that we cannot produce upon the printed page what was the ordinary and regular condition of affairs then. Contrast that with the civilization of to-day. The change is due to Christianity, the change is due to the observance of those commandments which God has given to men, and among the most important of those is that to remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. So we have the individual and national and social blessings which I have portrayed. And if I am asked: What warrant have we for the enactment of this law, I reply: This professes to be a Christian nation, and if we profess to be a Christian nation, that is a sufficient warrant for passing a law that Christianity and the founder of Christianity demand shall be observed. And if we are asked for precedents for this enactment, we turn to the history of the British Empire, and we find upon the statute-books of that Empire, more than thirty laws regarding the observance of a day of rest, laws dating back as far as eight hundred years ago. We find enactments in this direction in almost every colony of Great Britain, and in forty of the forty-two American States. We find that almost wherever there is a Christian nation, wherever Christian institutions are recognized by the law, a precedent for the enactment of the kind I refer to to-night exists. If we have the question raised as to the proper day, without attempting to enter now upon a theological discussion as to whether the change from the seventh day of the week to the first day of the week is proper, suffice it to say that this change has been accepted by almost all Christian denominations, accepted by the Catholic church and by all the Protestant churches with one or two trifling exceptions in point of numbers. So we do not require to deal with the question of the propriety of the change, because the propriety of the change is recognized in such a way that we are bound to accept and recognize it. And if we inquire as to the authorities that recommend the observance of this day, we have the authority of the oldest and most binding code of law, the decalogue; we have this law embodied in the ten commandments. We have the authority and support of all the great names in all the churches. The sovereign pontiff has expressed his opinion that Sabbath observance is necessary. Leo XIII. issued an encyclical in favour of it. You can hardly find a prelate of that church in the United States who is not a strong supporter of the Sabbath rest. I attended the meeting of the Sabbath Rest Congress in Chicago, and was associated there as a vice-president with Archbishop Ireland, who delivered a strong address upon the subject. And one of the best papers read before that Congress on the suppression of Sunday newspapers was that of Cardinal Gibbons. All the great names in the Protestant church favour the enactment of such a law. I could give scores of names of statesmen and public men and business men, names that would carry weight in any assembly, who are in favour of the enactment of such a law as I propose to-night.

It may be asked: Why not leave the observance of this commandment, the observance of this Sabbath rest to be a voluntary matter. Why interfere with individual conscience? Why put a law upon the statute-books to say that a man must do what we admit he ought to do. The law does not say that a man shall be religious, that he shall attend church, that he shall belong to this denomination or that, that he shall read the Bible. The object of the law is to provide that if a citizen wants to be religious, if he wants to attend church, if he wants to exercise his right of conscience, he shall have the privilege of doing so, and the law will protect him in the exercise of that right. Obedience to the commands of the Divinity is voluntary. A man has the opportunity to disobey every command put upon him. Of course God never laid a command upon man or made a requirement of him that it was not in his interest to observe; but he is free to accept or reject the commandment. And the human law may go just as far as to give to the citizen its protection, if he wishes to obey the commands and discharge the duties placed upon him. That is the object of this law, and that is its only object—not to com-

pel a man to give attention to a certain line of religious observance, but to permit him to do so and to secure for him the right of conscience and his right to a weekly day of rest.

It is said some times that such a law as this is inconsistent with the principle of liberty and the principle of justice. Now this law, I think, is not inconsistent with the principle of liberty, and not inconsistent with the principles of justice; because, upon broad grounds, it seeks to promote the public welfare, and it will inevitably have that result. It seeks, first of all, as I have said, to secure for the citizen the enjoyment of his rights of conscience. If he believes he should not work on the Sabbath, the law steps in and says that he shall not be dragged out to work, as thousands of men are against their will. If he wishes to go to church with his family, the law says he shall have the opportunity to do so. This law is not inconsistent with the principles of liberty because it seeks to educate citizens and prepare them for their duty in the state. It is calculated to form and continue just and stable institutions. Where we have no Christianity we have no just institutions nor stable institutions. Where Christianity prevails, and so long as a country conforms to its dictates, we can have nothing but just laws and stable institutions, and stability and justice of institutions rest upon the recognition of Divine authority and compliance with Divine commands. And it is not inconsistent with the principles of liberty because it is calculated to foster and promote private virtue and public virtue, individual virtue and national virtue—an article we are very much in need of in this country, an article we cannot have too much of. Anything that will tend to the establishment and maintenance of public and private virtue is in the highest interest of the state and ought to command sympathy and support of every public man. And it is not inconsistent with the general interests of the country because it is calculated in the highest degree and will be efficient in the highest degree in promoting material prosperity. Find a community where morality prevails, where religion is respected, and you find a community of great material prosperity. This law should commend itself to our respect and good wishes because, above all other instrumentalities, it is calculated to promote the material welfare and prosperity of the state. Now, it is a remarkable fact, Mr. Speaker, that of late years, notably within the last four or five years, there seems to have been a very great revival in favour of Sunday rest. That movement was first inaugurated, on the continent of Europe, in the international Sunday Congress that was held at the time of the Paris Exposition, and in the Federated Labour Congress which met under the auspices of the Emperor of Germany in 1890. Since that time laws of this character have been passed in Belgium, in Holland, in Germany, in Hungary, in France, in Spain, in Norway, in Denmark, in Sweden, in Russia and in Italy.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Laws of the same character as this?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not entirely. But a law of this kind is a recognition of the principle if it secures only one of the rights for which we contend. The Bill I present to the House does not go so far as to give all that the advocates of Sundey rest require. But any one of the laws I refer to recognize the principles that Sunday rest is a sound public rule and makes enactment to secure to some extent at least, the observance of that rule. For instance, in Holland the publication of newspapers on the Sabbath is prohibited. In Hungary the publication of newspapers is prohibited. In all the cantons of Switzerland the publication of newspapers is prohibited on the Lord's Day. In Switzerland employees are guaranteed 52 days rest in the year, 17 of which shall be on the Sabbath, and the companies denying them this are fined from 500 to 1,000 francs. No employee is permitted to work upon that day, it is obligatory upon the company to give it. So, without entering fully into the details of the provisions with regard to these various Sunday rest enactments in Europe, suffice it to say that all these nations are moving in that direction, and every one of these powers have passed laws to a greater or less extent recognizing the principle. For instance, in France the Catholic party are advocating a Sunday rest with the greatest energy and the greatest devotion, and the French Assembly have given a week day's rest in the army and many departments of industry. They would not say Sunday rest, but they have provided a weekly day of rest: and, out of difference to the infidel sentiment of France, they did not recognize any religious sentiment or name in the matter at all. But a weekly day of rest is given to the army, a weekly day of rest is given by enactment to the labourers in the sewers of Paris, given to women and children in factories, and to various other classes of employees.

Sufficient, however, for this branch of the matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government has no Sabbath Day rest legislation, and I think it is high time we took our place abreast of all these other powers in this march of progress, and gave some evidence that we are progressing in this direction. Originally, the provisions of this Bill that I presented to the House, covered fully the ground of Sabbath observance. That Bill, I think, was introduced and was under discussion in the House on three or four different occasions. It was finally referred to a select committee, and in that committe a

great many of its original provisions were eliminated. The ground was taken that in any matter where the Dominion Government had not exclusive jurisdiction, we should not exercise jurisdiction. Wherever provincial jurisdiction could be brought to bear upon the provisions that were contained in the Bill referred to the committee, these provisions were struck out. Only four provisions were retained, four provisions which it was held were under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. One of these provisions was with regard to the closing of the canals on the Lord's Day. Another was a provision with regard to the suppression of the publication and circulation of Sunday newspapers. It was held by some members of the committee, and I think it has been held by some of my friends on this side, that this was a matter that pertained to provincial jurisdiction, but it was in reality, in the opinion of the committee, a matter of national importance, of national scope. The Dominion Government controls copyright, controls the admission of literature, it exercises control over the mails, and it was held that on the same principle it should control the publication of newspapers. On the question as to the propriety of prohibiting the publication of Sunday newspapers, a great deal of influence was exerted by the facts brought out in relation to this evil in the United States. It was pointed out that in the United States about 1,000 daily Sunday papers are issued, and it was shown beyond doubt that their influence upon the public sentiment and upon society is a most pernicious one; that the existence of a Sunday newspaper, in fact, is incompatible with the retention of the Sabbath; that it not only destroys all taste for religious reading, but that it creates a taste for gossip, sensational stories and effervescent trash. They destroy all taste even for solid literature of any kind, and were justly characterized by the greatest American editor, Horace Greeley, as social demons. Now, this Sunday newspaper evil in the United States has been chiefly instrumental in breaking down the good old Puritan barriers that were established in that country against immorality and Sabbath desecration, and the result is that a striking contrast exists between Canada and the United States in the matter of Sabbath observance, and that contrast, largely in our favour, is due, so far as the United States are concerned, to the demoralizing and debasing influence of its Sunday newspaper press. That is something we desire to avoid introducing into this country, and the Bill provides:

> Whoever shall, upon the Lord's Day, in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical for the purpose of sale or distribution, either by carrier or through the mails, upon that day, and whoever shall engage in the sale of any newspaper on that day, shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence; but nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the gratuitous distribution of a religious publication upon the Lord's Day.

The next provision of this Bill is the one with regard to railway traffic, and in this respect the Bill does not profess to go as far as it should go. It does not attempt to grapple with the evil fully, but we are content with doing what we are able to do. The position of our railways is somewhat peculiar. Nearly all of them are connected with American lines, either to the east or west, or both; nearly all of them have passenger arrangements and freight arrangements with American roads; and to have passed a Bill that absolutely cut off freight traffic with those lines connected with American railways, would, unless there was concurrent legislation in the United States of the same character, be fatal to a certain extent to our roads. So this Bill, with regard to the curtailment of railway traffic, simply provides that no local passenger trains shall be run upon the Lord's Day, that no local freight trains shall be run, that cars shall not be moved from station to station, and that, so far as we can control the traffic within our own borders, it shall cease upon that day. I may say, with reference to this matter, that this Bill has never received the protest of a single railway manager in Canada. It was submitted to Sir Joseph Hickson, and he suggested some additions to the sections, and they were incorporated in it. Mr. Van Horne has never raised a voice against it, nor has any railway manager in Canada ever said aught against the provisions of this third section of the Bill with regard to the curtailment of railway business.

The last section of the Bill, the fourth section, is one with reference to excursions, excursions upon the Lord's Day by steamer and railway, or by railway. Now, it is a noticeable fact that our railway managers in this country have not encouraged Sabbath excursions. I believe the Grand Trunk Railway has never permitted them at all. I had a conversation upon one occasion with the manager of the Michigan Central Railway, Mr. Ledyard, and he told me he had always set his face against railway excursions on the Lord's Day, and never would permit them. He thought they were demoralizing, and, although he was obliged to ask from his employees more Sabbath labour than he desired to do, yet to place voluntarily upon them additional Sunday labour in the shape of excursions, was something that he never would do, and never had done. That is the sentiment of most, if not all, railway managers in Canada. Now, with regard to excursions, we hear a great deal about the desirability of permitting people to go out and take a little fresh air, and worship God in the country, &c.; and I am not prepared

to say that an orderly and decorous excursion into the country, to a beach, or something of that kind, in the summer, is as wicked as some things might be. But we must bear in mind that the embryo excursion of this character goes through a process of evolution, it grows worse and worse, and it ends up in such excursions as were prohibited by the police in San Francisco, where hoodlums, men and women, went out and terrorized the suburbs of the city upon the Sabbath, and came back drunken and infuriated, with the lights turned down in the carriages, and there were such scenes of scandal and dissipation that these excursions were suppressed as a nuisance. So with excursions in great cities, the class of people that patronize them are not the ordinary law-abiding population, but they are the roughs and scum of society. Their influence, as shown in some American cities, is debasing and demoralizing, and the process of evolution carries the excursion on to the excesses that I am speaking of. An excursion is not a restful thing on the Sabbath. Men and women who go out on an excursion usually come back bedraggled, tired and worn out. Hugh Millar, the great Scotch geologist, once said that he noticed that the class of workmen who stayed at home and attended church and Sabbath school, usually came up fresh, and vigorous, and alert for their work on Monday morning, but that the excursionists came back at night tired, dissipated and dissatisfied with themselves, and were unfit for work on Monday morning. That is the effect of excursions, as a rule.

Mr. AMYOT. Do you exclude the omnibus ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am talking about railway excursions and steamboat excursions. I do not suppose the Bill will reach those who want to go out in an omnibus, or to take their own carriages. Now, I promised I would not detain the House long upon this Bill, and the extreme unpopularity of the measure, I think, is sufficiently evidenced by the reception of this news. This Bill I present to the House with the profound impression that it is a Bill in the highest interests of Canada, that it is a Bill not calculated to force the observance of the Sabbath according to the views of any particular religious sect, not calculated or prepared to interfere with any man's right of conscience or right of action, but it is a Bill that will place this country in line with other Christian countries that believe in the observance of a day of rest. It is a Bill designed to secure for the labourer, who cannot control the situation himself, that rest which is a physical necessity to him, and which is a mental and a spiritual blessing. It is a Bill that is calculated to promote the welfare, to increase the happiness and to increase the harmony that should exist in this country. It is a Bill, in my opinion, in the highest sense conducive to the general good of Canada, and I present it not as a puritanic or drastic religious measure, not as a Bill forcing on any class of the community any man's particular views with respect to religious observance, but I present it as a Bill calculated to secure for the toiler his right to rest, a right he can not enjoy without the protection of the law, as a Bill calculated to array this Dominion upon the side of justice, truth and right. I present it as a Bill that recognizes that there is a God who reigns and has authority, and whose commands are worthy of respect and worthy of some degree of attention ; and presenting the Bill in that sense, and believing, as I do, that it is calculated to secure the results of which I have spoken in presenting it, I now move its second reading.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned I have no objection to the hon. gentleman having the discussion upon the motion to go into committee, and taking the second reading, if it be the wish of the House, as affirming simply the principle of the Bill. I do not think there is any disposition on this side of the House to oppose the Bill simply because it comes from the hon. gentleman opposite, but the Bill may be found to contain objectionable and unworkable provisions. When it comes before the committee it will be for the House and the Government to see that the Bill is made a workable one.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill, because it is simply affirming its principle. That principle is a very good one, we all admit. We all agree that Sunday cannot be too well observed, just as we all agree that God cannot be too well adored. We do not agree, however, as to the mode of keeping Sunday. The details of the Bill will, of course, come before the committee, and I intend to oppose as strongly as I can many of its provisions. I consider they are tyrannical, and if they were passed they would bring us back to the inquisition of Spain, to a time when the people were compelled to go to mass or go to jail. This Bill is of the same kind as regards many of its provisions, and I shall do my best to oppose such a law being imposed on this country, at all events on the province of which I am a representative in this House. But I repeat that I do not want to oppose the principle, which is simply affirming that Sunday should be well observed, in which we all agree ; but I do not agree with the way in which the mover provides that Sunday should be observed. We think there are other ways of observing Sunday than those held by the hon. gentleman, and I do not think any one has a right to impose on me, as this Bill would seek to do, a certain method of observing Sunday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence and papers by or on behalf of the Dominon Government with the United States authorities, since the last session of this Parliament respecting permission to transport Canadian cattle over American territory for shipment to Great Britain from American ocean ports, and copies of any regulation respecting the same.—(Mr. McMillan.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government, or any person or persons, together with copies of all petitions to the Minister of Public Works, and of all reports of engineers, relating to the Pier at Morden, Nova Scotia, since 1st January, 1891.—(Mr. Borden.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That the first report of the Standing Committee of Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the report?

Mr. SPROULE. It is in favour of leave being granted to employ a shorthand writer to take down the evidence.

Motion agreed to.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 40) concerning drainage on or across railway lands. He said: In explanation of the Bill I may say that different municipalities and land owners in Ontario, and doubtless in other provinces also, have found considerable difficulty in obtaining outlets for natural watercourses and other drains across lines of railway since nearly all the railways in the Dominion have been declared to be under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The railways have contended, since that took place, that they are not subject to provincial laws regarding watercourses and drains; and so, when it has been necessary to carry a municipal drain or sewer, or the outlet of a natural watercourse, or of a drain from some person's private property across one of these lines of railway, the railway company has been able to dictate its own terms to the parties requiring facilities for drainage. In some cases they have made rent charges for the mere privilege of constructing drains on or across their lines, even when the landowner bore the whole cost of securing the outlet. In other cases they have refused to enlarge outlets for existing drains when these drains themselves had to be enlarged for the public benefit. In more than one instance litigation has arisen over these conflicting claims, and it has not been finally established by the decision of the highest courts, whether railways under the jurisdiction of this House are subject to provincial Acts respecting drainage. The Act I wish to introduce contains only one clause, and is for the purpose of declaring that railways under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada are and shall be subject to the legislatures of the different provinces and territories of Canada which make laws concerning drainage across railway lands. I will give further explanations on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

Mr. SPROULE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) to amend the Act respecting the adulteration of food, drugs and agricultural fertilizers.

Mr. CASEY. Explain.

Mr. SPROULE. The object is to prevent bee-keepers from feeding sugar to bees for the purpose of manufacturing honey.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Hamilton Distillery Company (Limited).—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 39) to amend the Hamilton Township Loan Society's Act of 1885.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 43) to determine the hours of labour for workmen and labourers employed on public works.—(Mr Lépine.)

VOTING BY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. RIDER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 42) to facilitate voting by employees at elections of members of the House of Commons. He said: The Bill provides that workingmen or employees shall have the right to leave their work for the purpose of voting on any day during which a Dominion election is held. It seems there is no provision made in the Franchise Act whereby they can absent themselves from work, except at the noon hour when they go to meals, as the hours for voting are between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Consequently they have no other opportunity during the day when

they can go and deposit their votes. The Bill provides for giving two hours during which the voter may absent himself from his work for the purpose of voting. Of course such changes as are thought desirable, may be considered when the Bill reaches the committee stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES AFFECTING CANADA.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 44) respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada. He said: The object of the Bill is to carry out what was alluded to in the debate upon the Address. It is to make provision for the admission, at the same rates as are granted to France under the treaty which has been passed by Parliament, of the same articles to nations which have the most-favoured clause treaties with Great Britain; and to give power also to allow these same products from colonies to come in at the same rate as they come in from France.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state to what extent that will increase the loss of revenue that may accrue under the French treaty?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may remember that a full statement was made last year. I do not remember at the moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That point was not included, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps not, but I am not able to state that at present. When the Bill is read, I will have all information.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the second reading, it would be well to have the correspondence moved for the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be brought down.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JAMES ANDERSON, OF SUTTON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND asked. (a) Whether one James Anderson, of Sutton, was in the service of the Government? (b) If so, how long was he in the service, and when did he cease to be in the service? (c) What were his duties? (d) How much has he been paid for such service? (e) What was the rate of his remuneration?

Mr. DALY. James Anderson, now of Sutton West, Ont., was in the service of the Government as Crown timber agent for Manitoba, the North-west Territories, and Keewatin, from June, 1879, to 1st February, 1882, receiving a salary of $100 per month, total, $3,200. During the same period he acted as fisheries inspector, receiving therefor $25 per month, total, $800. From the 25th May, 1887, to 1st January, 1888, he acted as assistant to the Half-breed Commission in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, receiving a salary of $3 per diem, total, $660. He was employed as an immigration agent as follows:—From 11th April, 1892, to 13th June, 1892, at $75 per month, total, $200. From 1st July, 1892, to 29th May, 1893, at $75 per month, and from 30th May to 30th June, at $100 per month, total, $926.61. From 1st July, 1893, to 30th June, 1894, at $100 per month, total, $1,200. One week, 6th to 13th July, 1894, $25. Total, $7,011.61. Mr. Anderson ceased his connection with the service on the last mentioned date.

SEIZURE OF TOBACCO IN TEMISCOUATA.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked. 1. Whether, in the autumn of 1892, a seizure of tobacco was made, by Customs Department, on the premises of Charles Bertrand, merchant of Isle Verte, in the county of Temiscouata? 2. What quantity of tobacco was seized? 3. Did the department dispose of the said tobacco, or did they return it to Mr. Bertrand? What penalty did Mr. Bertrand pay, in view of the said seizure?

Mr. WALLACE. The records of the Department of Customs do not show any seizure of tobacco from or on the premises of Mr. Charles Bertrand, either during the year 1892, or at any time since.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Was any seized before?

Mr. WALLACE. That is very indefinite. The question was from October, 1892. There was none seized during the whole of 1892, nor at any period since.

SEIZURE OF TOBACCO FROM ALPHONSE THIBAULT.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, 1. Whether within the last three years any seizure of tobacco was made, by the Customs Department, on he premises of Alphonse Thibault, merchant, of St. Louis de Ha Ha? 2. What quantity of tobacco was so seized? 3. Did the department confiscate the tobacco, or did they return it to Mr. Thibault? 4. What penalty did Thibault pay to the Government, in view of the seizure?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. Yes. 2. Fifteen pounds. 3. The tobacco was confiscated. 4. No penalty, except forfeiture of tobacco.

VACANCIES IN THE SENATE.

Mr. FLINT asked, 1. How many vacancies are there in the Senate at the present date?

2. To whom have the senatorships referred to in the following letter been promised :—

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, April 2, 1895.

A. McNeill, Esq., M.P.

My dear McNeill,—I have no doubt you have seen, as I have, notices in the papers that you had been or were to be offered a Senatorship. I know of no man in the Commons whom I would rather see elevated to the honourable and responsible position of a Senator than yourself; but the rumour must have been set afloat by persons having some ulterior object in view, as no such offer has been made, nor has it been considered. Certainly a Senatorship was never asked for by you, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, such a step is precluded for the present by the fact that there are no vacancies that have not long since been promised.

Trusting that you may be successful in the contest before you.

I remain, etc.,
Sincerely yours,
MACKENZIE BOWELL.

3. When will the said appointments be made?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. I believe there are at present ten vacancies in the Senate. 2. I do not know. 3. As soon as they conveniently can be.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, 1. What has been the cost of the Trent Valley Canal, including the amount of the present contract, since confederation? 2. Has there been a permanent survey of the canal made as to location? 3. What is the depth of water obtained in the completed portions of the canal? 4. What has been the cost of maintenance for the year 1894? 5. What have been the receipts to the Government from the canal in 1894?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Cost of the Trent Canal since confederation to date, $803,252.82. Amount of present contract, $492,059.15. Total, $1,295,311.97. 2. There has been a location survey of the canal made. 3. The depth of water on completed portions of the canal, is 6 feet. 4. The cost of maintenance for the year ending 30th June, 1894, was: Staff, $3,833.51; repairs, $4,988.59; total, $8,822.10. 5. The receipts from the canal for the year ended 30th June, was $1,286.45.

PAPERS RELATING TO THE DISCHARGE OF MR. LOISELLE.

Mr. BRODEUR (Translation) asked, 1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to lay before the House, this session, the papers relating to the discharge of Mr. Loiselle, as postmaster of St. Angèle de Monnoir, as requested by the resolutions of this House in 1892 and in 1894? 2. If so, when will the said papers be brought down?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I may say that the papers referred to in his question have disappeared from the office of the Secretary of State and have not yet been recovered. I already had the honour to give the same answer to the hon. member. The only paper in the Post Office Department is the Inspector's report, which is confidential.

POST OFFICE INSPECTOR—DISTRICT OF MONTREAL.

Mr. BRODEUR (Translation) asked, 1. Is the position of Post Office Inspector for the District of Montreal vacant? 2. If so, since what date has it been vacant, and why has it not been filled up before this time? 3. Have members of this House made application to the Government, or to members of the Government, for that position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. member, to the first part of his question, my answer is: Yes. The vacancy exists since September 1st, 1893. The selection of a man to fill the vacancy is still under consideration. Many letters were received asking for the position. None of these was addressed to the department by any member of this House.

CIVIL SERVICE PROMOTION EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Whether an Order in Council has been passed whereby the Government have abolished promotion examinations for the Civil Service?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No Order in Council has been passed doing away with promotion examinations. But an Order in Council was passed doing away with the examination that would have been held in the present month, because the vote for such examination during the present year was exhausted.

SENATORSHIPS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the following letter was written by the Premier to Mr. McNeill :—

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, April 2, 1895.

A. McNeill, Esq., M.P.

My dear McNeill,—I have no doubt you have seen, as I have, notices in the papers that you had been or were to be offered a Senatorship. I know of no man in the Commons whom I would rather see elevated to the honourable and responsible position of a Senator than yourself; but the rumour must have been sent afloat by persons having some ulterior object in view, as no such offer has been made, nor has it been considered. Certainly a Senatorship was never asked for by you, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, such a step is precluded for the present by

the fact that there are no vacancies that have not long since been promised.

Trusting that you may be successful in the contest before you.

I remain, etc.,
Sincerely yours,
MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Mr. FOSTER. It was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, At what dates the several Senatorships below named became vacant:—Trent, Ont., Billa Flint: Rougemont, Que., W. H. Chaffers; Sunbury, N.B., John Glasier; De Salaberry, Que., Jos. Tassé; London, Ont., Mr. Leonard: Bedford, Que., Mr. Stevens; Inkerman, Que., J. J. C. Abbott; New Brunswick, — Botsford; New Brunswick, John Boyd; and one in Neva Scotia—ten in all?

Mr. FOSTER. The vacancies in the Senate and the dates thereof, on the 1st of May, 1895, are as follows: Ontario, Hon. Billa Flint, died 15th June, 1894. Quebec, Hon. W. H. Chaffers, died 16th July, 1894. New Brunswick, Hon. John Glasier, died 7th July, 1894. Quebec, Hon. Joseph Tassé, died 17th January, 1895. Ontario, Hon. Elijah Leonard, died 14th May, 1891. Quebec, Hon. G. G. Stevens, died 15th April, 1892. Quebec, Hon. Sir J. J. C. Abbott, died 30th October, 1893. New Brunswick, Hon. A. E. Botsford, died 19th March, 1894. New Brunswick, Hon. John Boyd, died 4th December, 1893. Nova Scotia, Hon. T. D. Archibald, died 18th October, 1890.

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE COMPANY.

House again resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. McMullen for:

Return showing the amount of money collected for tolls, fees or rents of any kind by the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company in each year, separately, up to the close of their last year's business; the amount of money paid the Dominion Government as interest on the $300,000 loaned to the company, and the arrears due to the 30th June, 1894, and the amount since paid, if any.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There is a further point of information required. I therefore move, in amendment, that the following words be added to the motion:—"Also, any copy of any mortgage security held by the Government in respect of said loan."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. MULOCK moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) in further amendment of the Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons. He said: Inasmuch as this Bill is but a repetition of the Bill which I had the honour to introduce last session it will not be necessary, I assume, for me to make any extended explanation. I may remind the House that the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 11, which provides for payment of members of Parliament, clearly contemplates the mileage being an indemnity for expenditure, and nothing else. Hon. members will find on reading the statutory declaration required to be made by members that they are obliged to testify as to the distance they travel from their homes to Ottawa in order to attend to their parliamentary duties, and the payment of mileage to members is based upon the distance between their homes and the capital. It is a varying sum, not a fixed sum, independent of expense, but it is a variable sum, dependent upon the expenses that may be incurred, and it is at the rate of so much per mile. There is growing up in Canada a system of railways giving passes to the public, including at times members filling representative positions, among others, members of this Assembly. Now, when one thinks of some of the powers and duties exercisable by this Assembly, I think it ought to suggest to us, that we should, if possible, eliminate from our minds every influence that is likely to bias us in the exercise of our discretionary powers, which are at times almost judicial. For example, to-day two Bills were introduced into Parliament by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) dealing with the question of railway law. If you take the Railway Act you find it has been built up year by year in dealing with important matters of public and private concern, and in this Assembly, and in all assemblies having similar powers, there is a constant contest between the people and between corporations which ask for privileges which are to a certain extent regarded as infringements of the rights of the people. I make these remarks not intending to say or to have it thought for a moment that this Assembly, or any individual member of it, has at any time been biased by the existence of the practice to which I allude. But, Sir, when we find that the public are criticising the acts of members of this House in receiving passes from railway companies entitling them to free passage to Ottawa and return to discharge their duties and at the same time drawing from the treasury of the country, mileage never paid to the railways; when, I say, we find public criticism of a character likely to degrade the high standing that Parliament ought to occupy in the opinion of the people, I venture the proposition that the time has arrived when we should seek to guard our own dignity and remove a practice that exposes Parliament to such criticism as this. For example, I have in my hands a cutting that I procured from a paper the other day, a somewhat severe one, perhaps, but yet one which may to some extent be warranted in

the minds of newspaper critics by the practice in question. I maintain that it is due to ourselves that we should not allow it to be possible for such things as I am about to read, to be written, or for such sentiments to be entertained by the people. This extract is, I think, from the Ottawa "Journal," but at all events it has appeared in the press of the country and the particular newspaper is immaterial. After referring to the question of railway passes, it says:

The Toronto "World" thinks that the acceptance of passes by members of Parliament should be made a criminal offence. And certainly, so long as legislators who use passes continue also to take the country's mileage money for expenses in travelling to and from their legislative duties, there is actually moral, if not legal ground for criminal proceedings. Call it embezzlement, or call it obtaining money on false pretenses, either charge could be put perilously near substantiation in a court of law. The country cares little for the mileage, of course. That is a trifle. What we have both cause and need to be concerned about is the influence which passes exert upon members, consciously or unconsciously, when railway matters are before the House and railway men lobbying in the corridors and the city clubs and hotels.

Now, Sir, I am not admitting the correctness of the suggestion in that article that the acceptance of a railway pass has produced any such biased judgments as are here suggested. No person is in a position to make that statement, but we do know this: There is high authority for the statement that "gift blinds the eye," and it is our duty, I think, to avoid even the appearance of wrong-doing, by abolishing a system such as this which exposes Parliament and its members to criticism of this character. I am sure that I am voicing the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the House in the view I am presenting and the action I am taking. I do not take this action in criticism of any hon. gentleman's course. I do not consider I have the right to sit in private judgment upon my fellow-members here, but in all humility I present this motion to the House, trusting that it will receive unanimous approval. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that my Bill simply deals with the question of mileage, and provides that the members shall not be entitled to draw mileage money out of the public treasury, unless they shall have first paid it. That is the extent of the measure. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Charlton, the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call attention to one point, at this stage. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) says that this Bill refers solely to the question of mileage, and merely provides that no member should be paid mileage who has travelled on a pass. I beg to call the attention of the House to the fact that that does not describe the scope of the Bill. The first section of the Bill says:

1. No member of the Senate or of the House of Commons shall travel by any railway to or from Ottawa, in connection with his attendance at the session of Parliament, either free or at any rate of fare less than that allowed to the general public.

Then the Bill goes on to provide that the form which we have to sign before drawing our indemnity shall contain the following declaration:

That I have not travelled by railway to or from Ottawa in connection with my attendance at the said session, either free or at any rate of fare less than that allowed to the general public.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in that. The first section provides that the members shall not travel to Ottawa and return, in respect to their parliamentary duties, at any rate less than that given to the general public, and that they shall not be entitled to draw mileage until they have made affidavit to that effect.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, but it not only provides that the member shall not have his mileage until he has made an affidavit to that effect but it really provides that he shall not travel on a pass at all. It prevents his travelling to Ottawa on a pass whether he draws his mileage or not.

Mr. MULOCK. Certainly, it does

Mr. CASEY. It would also prevent his drawing any portion of his indemnity unless he could certify that he has not travelled to Ottawa on a pass at the opening of a session. I wish to have this point clearly understood before the Bill goes to a second reading, because we should know what the Bill is before we vote upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House proposes to vote upon this measure now, without further discussion, I do not wish the vote to be taken without emphasizing the objection which has been raised by my hon. friend opposite. I do not think that this House will pass, I do not think that it ought to pass, any mandate prescribing how a man should travel or should not travel with reference to his fare upon any railway. What this Bill sets out to do is to affirm the principle that a man must travel in a certain way and in no other way. You can put a penalty upon a member of Parliament who travels by a pass, the penalty being that he shall not draw his mileage unless he makes a declaration that he has not travelled by a pass; but I object to our passing a law which provides that a member of Parliament shall not travel by a pass. A member may come here by bicycle if he chooses, he may come by carriage if he chooses, he may walk if he chooses, he may beg his way if he chooses; he may come here just as he likes. We cannot interfere with that. But it is another thing to say whether or not he shall draw his mileage if he travels in a certain way. If it is considered a part of the principle of the Bill that a man shall not travel in a certain way.

whether or not he is willing to take the penalty of so doing, I do not assent to its going to a second reading; but I do not think that is what the hon. gentleman meant to do by his Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you ask me to say what I meant?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I mean that a man shall not travel to Parliament and back free, or at a lower fare than that charged to the general public.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he means that this law shall apply when the House is not in session?

Mr. MULOCK. No.

Mr. FRASER. I think there is a good deal in the principle of the Bill. When there is an indemnity provided for members of Parliament, I think it is only fair that that indemnity should be used for the purposes for which it is granted. Either do away with that and pay the members their actual outlay in coming here, which would be the better way, or else do another thing. While the objection may apply to railway companies, I submit that there is no danger in travelling on a half pass upon the Intercolonial Railway or on other Government railways. But there is another difficulty. Suppose a man comes by boat a good part of the way, and gets a pass for that part of his journey; is not that just as bad as travelling by railway on a pass, and should it not be included?

An hon. MEMBER. Or by bicycle.

Mr. FRASER. Oh, there is no man here except myself who could come on a bicycle, and there should be no legislation for my particular self. But I was going to point out that if there is much to be said for the principle of the Bill, let it apply to steamboats as well as to railways. On this question, I have my own individual opinion. In certain countries, and countries pretty far advanced, every railway and steamboat company is required by statute to pass a member of Parliament. There may be much to be said in favour of such a law, and if it were the law, this Bill would not be necessary. But if we are going to have a Bill, let it apply to every member whether he comes here by coach, by steamboat or by railway. I know, for example, that one man has to travel forty or fifty, or a hundred miles by coach, which he gets free. If the driver of the coach chooses to pay that much compliment to the member simply because he carries the mail, I submit that there is as much crime in that as in travelling free by railway. Let the Bill be universal in its application. I do not think it goes far enough.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). If the Bill is not perfect, let us go into committee upon it and see what we can do to improve it. While I do not wish to judge any of my fellow members, I will support this Bill, for two very substantial reasons. In the first place, this Parliament votes every year over $33,000 for mileage of its members. That money is voted for a certain purpose, and it is intended to reach certain corporations in this country; but we are given to understand that they do not get it. If the revenue of those companies were increased by $33,000 every year, they would be in a position by that much to give the general public reduced travelling rates.

An hon. MEMBER. Too fine.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It is not too fine; and when you put to that $33,000 a year the additional thousands of dollars a year which they lose in fares by reason of these passes, the railway companies would have an income of a quarter of a million dollars a year which could be devoted to the reduction of railway fares in this country. If we take up this matter and try to remedy the evil, we can do it in two ways. If we vote the money for the railways, let us give them the $33,000 or $34,000 every year; or let us capitalize that amount and give them the lump sum, and then make it the law that railways shall carry members of Parliament free; and let us insert a clause in every future charter incorporating a railway company, making it a condition precedent to the granting of the charter that the company shall carry members of Parliament free. Let us take up this question and deal with it. Let us try to preserve the respect of the people for this Parliament, and to do so we must remove the stigma—and I say, with all respect to the House, that it is a stigma—that while the railway companies of this country refuse to reduce the rate of travel to the general public, we by our action are depriving those railroads of an income to the extent of at least a quarter of a million dollars a year. Therefore I hope the House will go into committee on this Bill, consider it, and if it is defective in any respect, try to improve it.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no doubt a great deal to be said in favour of the principle which appears to some extent to underlie this Bill. I think it is pretty hard to justify members drawing a mileage allowance and not paying any fares on railways or steamboats or coaches. But I think the Bill goes a good deal further than that. I should be glad to have it referred to committee, and put in a shape which strikes me as being more reasonable. I would suggest that a clause be added to the schedule and declaration which we have to make in drawing our indemnity, something to this effect: That I have purchased a railway, or steamboat, or coach

ticket to and from Ottawa in connection with my attendance at said session, at a rate of fare not less than that allowed the general public. So that unless a member bought a ticket to and from Ottawa, he would not be entitled to draw his mileage allowance, and I suppose that would be reasonable and fair.

Mr. OUIMET. If the intention of the hon. mover of this Bill is to prevent hon. members from receiving money in the shape of mileage for travelling expenses, which they have not paid, I think there would be a much simpler way of reaching that object, and I would suggest this remedy. Have an amendment passed providing that members will only be paid their actual expenses from their home to the capital and back, say twice every session. Sessions are now so long that it is only reasonable that they should be given the advantage to go home at least twice during each session. If we were to pass an amendment to the House of Commons Act providing that the members shall be paid for actual expenditure while going to the capital and coming back, say at least two or three times during each session, the evil which my hon. friend proposes to cure will be at once remedied in a fair and direct manner. There are a good many members of this House who, perhaps, are not very much interested in this, because they can have, and are entitled to have, passes in other capacities. How are you going to reach these men? Are you going to say that the president or director of a railway company is not entitled to travel free even on his own road, when this privilege is granted to other gentlemen, not members of this House, but holding similar positions in railway companies? That would be utterly ridiculous. It is proper that a member should not receive money for expenses which he has not incurred, but the remedy I have indicated would meet that point. I think the last suggestion, that made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is a reasonable one. If we look to one of the foremost countries in Europe, we will see that in that country all the members of the Senate and House of Representatives are entitled, by virtue of their position as representatives of the people, to travel free on every railway in that country, both during the session and outside the session. That would be a reasonable rule to follow. There is certainly something invidious in the fact that a certain number of members of Parliament are given passes, while others, who stand in the same position as regards these companies—and I will not go the length of saying that the giving of a railway pass by a company will influence the vote of any member of this House—are not given them. The fact that the majority of the members are given passes by these railway companies, while a few are refused, is certainly invidious. It would be a much more reasonable and manly stand to take before the country, to state that, after all, the members and Senators, who represent their country in this House and Senate, should be entitled to travel free on the railways of this country, all of which have received large subsidies of public money. It would be a fair proposition to lay before the country that while we refuse to pay anything in the shape of mileage, we should arrange to have every member of Parliament entitled to free travel from these companies which have received subsidies. I am certainly of the opinion of those hon. gentlemen who think that this Bill does not meet, at all, even the apparent intention of the hon. mover; and I should not be very much astray if I were to show that he has made the application of the principle in his Bill so stringent that the Bill must, of necessity, be rejected by this House, either at this stage or later.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think that the criticism indulged in by the hon. Minister of Public Works as to the alleged motive of my hon. friend the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is either merited or in good taste. I think that the principle enunciated in this Bill is the correct one.

Mr. OUIMET. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not allege any motive. I only stated that it appeared to be so.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman stated that the hon. member for North York had introduced a Bill couched in such language and framed in such a way as to make its rejection by this House a foreordained conclusion, and that he had purposely introduced the Bill for the purpose of securing a certain amount of eclat and applause in the country, without, at the same time, any intention of having it become law.

Mr. OUIMET. I said that he had missed his shot.

Mr. CHARLTON. That impression is conveyed by the hon. gentleman's language. In the discussion, two suggestions were made regarding amendments, but the ideas thrown out by hon. gentlemen as to what would be proper are entirely out of place at this moment. The time to effect changes in this Bill is when it reaches the Committee of the whole House, and the question for the House now to decide is whether we shall adopt the general principle of the measure. If the majority of members believe that passes should, under no circumstances, be allowed, or if they should take the position that passes should be allowed as a matter of right, let them adopt such amendments, or, if they prefer the Bill as it is, let them vote for it. If, however, they believe that the principle of the Bill is not a correct one, let them

vote against it. We will be prepared to receive, should the Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole, such amendment as may be found advisable, but there is no use making any suggestions at this stage. But if we do not give this Bill its second reading, we will be open to the insinuation of having shown our hostility to the entire measure under cover of objections to some of the details. Let the Bill receive its second reading; let it receive the support of those who believe that the system of passes is an evil, and the opposition of those who believe that it is not an evil. Let us cease this discussion as to details of the Bill, which is totally purposeless at this moment, and either reject it, or else pass it and let it go to committee, where its details can be considered.

Mr. WELDON. My remarks on this subject shall be very brief. I rise merely to support the view so well expressed by the Minister of Public Works, which I very heartily share. I think that we sometimes, inconsiderately, make a mistake and are unjust even to ourselves, and lead the people of the country to think that we are much less worthy men than we really are. Now, the members of this Parliament seem to me to be particularly free from the reproach of being greedy or grasping.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is left for the Government.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. member will allow me;—I did not interrupt him. It is 22 years since the indemnity of members was fixed at its present figure. I do not think that you will find a legislature in any of the British colonies—I have had occasion to look into the facts with regard to a great many of them, provinces of Canada and of Australia, and of other colonies—where they have exhibited such self-sacrifice and consideration for the public as to allow the amount of indemnity to stand unchanged for 22 years. In this country, as we know well, our sessions have grown longer and the cost of living at Ottawa has greatly increased. This shows a public spirit, a spirit of personal sacrifice and some degree of patriotism in the members of these successive Parliaments, which the public should not forget, and which, at all events, should protect them from the reproach of being too greedy or grasping, or forgetful of the public interest and too careful of their own. I think that the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Public Works is well worth considering. It was only the other day that I read that the Italian railways are governed by a similar law. The Italian Parliament has passed a law compelling every railway system—I think there are four great railway systems in the kingdom—to give free passes to all members of the Italian Parliament in session and out of session, on grounds of public policy. They hold it to be in the public interest that those deputies who live in the southern provinces of Italy should have every facility to travel in the north, and conversely. In other words, the breaking down of provincial feeling and the development of national feeling will be helped by such a law as this. I know that a good sentiment exists here, and I think it is a mistake to give out to the country that we are less worthy men than we are.

Mr. FLINT. I think it will be generally conceded that the tone of the discussion shows that the principle of this Bill is favoured by the House, although we may have suggestions to make in committee as to the best means of reaching the end desired. But I think it would be highly advisable, in the interests of the House, to accept the principles enunciated by the hon. mover of the Bill. We all know that the payment of mileage is made upon the principle of indemnity allowed to representatives for one journey to Parliament and return. Whether the mileage allowance is sufficient to admit of members making repeated visits to their homes may be open to question. There can be no doubt than in a long session of Parliament it would be advisable, highly advisable, that members should be allowed to visit their homes on more than one occasion; otherwise the sacrifices which many professional men would be obliged to make would be more than they could be fairly asked to make as representatives of the people. I think there are objections to the form of this Bill, and I think it will be conceded by those who have thought much of the matter that the subject ought to be considered on a larger basis than appears to be attempted in the motion before the House. We are aware that in the United States the question has assumed another form altogether, and that legislation has been enacted dealing directly with the railway and transportation companies; and I think the suggestion that the Government, on some future occasion, should take that matter into consideration, ought to be favourably received. After all, no matter in what form this Bill may be passed, there can be very little doubt there would be many ways in which members of Parliament, if they desired to do so, could evade its provisions. But if a measure is passed dealing with railway and transportation companies, and insisting upon the principle that no free pass of any kind shall be granted by these companies, then we shall be able to deal with this question, I believe, upon a reasonable basis. In such a case, the legislature does not select any particular class, making an invidious distinction between it and other classes of the community. We know that journalists and large numbers of people connected with the transportation interests, and others as well as members of Parliament, are allowed free passes by railway and transporta-

tion companies. The figures that might be adduced, too, shows the loss to the shareholders of these companies would be much larger than those given by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Now, if Parliament sincerely desires to protect the companies from this loss, suggested by the hon. member, it will be dealing properly by passing stringent legislation forbidding the granting of passes to any individual, members of Parliament included. That done, each will stand in his true relation with regard to the mileage indemnity he draws for coming to this House. I think that is the only fair and reasonable manner in which this question can be viewed—not dealing with ourselves invidiously, but dealing with all classes of people who use these means of transportation. There is no doubt the principle of the measure is sound and that any member of Parliament travelling from his home to Ottawa and back should not draw mileage and at the same time travel free. I do not know that there is any provision in this Bill with regard to intermediate visits that a member might make to his home during the session; it provides only that mileage shall not be drawn if he travels to and from his home on a pass. However, the principle of the Bill being sound, the House may accept it, and then amend the measure in committee in such a manner, if possible, as to remedy any real grievance while not causing a greater evil than it overcomes.

Mr. DENISON. Although I approve of the principle of this Bill, there may be some parts of the details that I would not altogether approve of. The suggestion made by the Minister of Public Works is one which, I think, would hardly work out in practice, for this reason: If we allow the members' expenses for three trips, it will be practically about the same thing as our mileage is now, as the mileage under present rates, I take it, would carry a member three times to his home and back. While I approve of the principle of the Bill, I think it would be better to follow the suggestion made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), that is, to take our mileage away from us, capitalize it, and divide it among all the railways of Canada in proportion to the amount of mileage that we get over these railways; and then pass a law in this House saying that every member shall travel free during the whole year, and as often as he likes, with the object of encouraging them to travel about the country and make themselves acquainted with the different sections, and its capabilities, rather than that they should remain at home in their own county. Now, we know that the Canadian Pacific Railway is grumbling about the bad times, and the Grand Trunk Railway is also grumbling about bad times, and under these circumstances, they would drop into such an arrangement, and be well pleased to carry it out. It would certainly be a fair one, because we would be taking nothing from them that we would not be paying for. I feel satisfied, too, that this move would meet with the approbation of the country at large, because it does seem to me that the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) are apropos. Now there is another point. The Grand Trunk Railway issue half passes, while the Canadian Pacific Railway issue the full pass, and that shows to my mind that they must look upon it as an object to retain the half fare, or to give the full fare, according to the interest of the company. If we adopted the system of carrying all members free, we would be adopting the plan that has been pointed out by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) as existing in France. I believe the same idea has been carried out in Australia, and I hear, also, in Italy. I shall be glad to support the principle of the Bill.

Mr. COCKBURN. So many objections have been made to the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that there seems to be no possibility of amending it. It is lost already in the multitude of objections that have been made to it, both by members on the Government side of the House, and on this side. I do not wish to add any other objections, but it would strike me that under the Bill which is here proposed, I could travel from Hull away to Vancouver and back again to Hull, and yet I could not be brought under this Bill. I think with my hon. friend from Albert that something must be allowed to the honesty of the members of this House; and any attempts to force legislation of this character would, I think, simply tend to lower the character of the House. I am not prepared to go the length of adopting the French system, and enacting that all railways shall carry us free, because it is to be remembered that the greater number of railways in France belong to the Government, whereas here the roads are private enterprises. It is true, as my hon. friend remarks, that we have subsidized all our railways, and I can only hope that we will have fewer to subsidize in the future.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I would ask the hon. member why private companies should carry members of Parliament free?

Mr. COCKBURN. If I choose to carry any member in my carriage, or on my back, or in my arms, I am at perfect liberty to do so. It is my business, and nobody elses.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). I would ask the hon. gentleman another question. If Parliament votes money for an indemnity for these railways, why do the railways not get it?

Mr. COCKBURN. I am not aware that the Government votes any indemnity to the

railways. I might have come here without ever getting into a railway car at all. I suppose, under this rule, I would not be allowed even to travel here on my own bicycle. Sir, the whole proposition is so faulty that I am almost driven to the conclusion that the hon. member was riding for a fall, and were it not for his strict honesty of purpose, as well as his integrity, and his strict adherence to the minutiae of facts, I should have been led to the conclusion that he wished to pose before the public in the light of an over-virtuous man, and that in view of the coming elections in North York, he wished to receive the support of the Patrons.

Mr. LAURIER. This question has taken a wider range than I supposed at first sight it would, when the Bill was introduced by the hon. member for North York. For my part I am bound to say that the Bill goes much further than I supposed, from a hasty glance at it. I had supposed the intention of my hon. friend was to prevent any member who travels on a pass, from drawing mileage under the statute, which would seem natural enough. But the Bill goes much further than that, and forbids a practice which is now universal in this House, I may say. Well, this is a question of public interest, and may be discussed upon its merits, but if I may judge from the temper of the House at this moment, the Bill is not likely to be discussed in that spirit. I daresay that the House was taken, perhaps, somewhat by surprise in the discussion which has taken place. There seem to be so many different opinions regarding the proposition. I would suggest, under the circumstances, that the debate be adjourned at the present time, so that an opportunity may be given to the House to consider it, and that when it comes up for discussion at a future time, its purport may be better understood, and that it may receive an unbiased judgment from the House, such as its importance deserves. I, therefore, move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to reply for one moment to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). This is not the first occasion on which the hon. gentleman has considered it his public duty, I presume, to analyse my motives in the discharge of my duties here. He may have a perfect justification in his own mind for it. I wish him to understand, and I wish the House to understand, that I am not responsible to him for my motives. I am responsible to those whom I represent, and to the public as a whole, and to the extent of the little infinitesimal part that he forms of the general public, I am responsible to him, but only to that extent. The principle of this Bill is a sound principle, in my judgment. I would go further if I thought there were any prospect of a further proposition being admitted. I maintain that the directors of a railway—if we want to deal with a large question—have no right to part with the earning power of their road, except for value. They may give it to business men for the sake of securing trade, whether they fail in their object of giving free passes to members or not. What must be the manifest object of railways in giving passes to members of Parliament having powers? The hon. member for Centre Toronto, as soon as ever he had ceased to be a member of this House, would find his pass cut off.

Mr. COCKBURN. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, he may have a way of securing it, but I fancy that most of the members who have passes, would find that privilege terminated with the termination of their seats in this House. As long as they have not got something to give in return, they will get no passes.

An hon. MEMBER. Motive.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the object of the railway. I am not saying it is successful. Now, hon. members have shown great astuteness in finding defects in this measure; they have shown great interest in it. Some of them have shown great anxiety to promote the object in view, but unfortunately this measure has not been framed in a way to commend itself to the judgment of its critics. There is a simple proposition in it, and that proposition is that members of Parliament shall not receive gifts from possible suitors at their hands before this House—suitors for favours, shall I call it? or for legislative grants, or for subsidies, or for substantial aids, and so on. The principle of the Bill is that railway companies shall not present free gifts to persons in these judicial positions. I believe that is one of the positions which members of the Government fill. That is the principle of the Bill, and it is a very simple principle, and a set of words could easily be found which would fit, if hon. gentlemen think the words here suggested do not fit, but which, I submit, do fit and attain the object sought to be secured. If it is meant by the adjournment of the debate that it is for the purpose of killing the Bill, I should prefer a division being taken this moment on the principle. If the suggestion to adjourn the debate simply means that the Bill will come up in its regular order again, I have no objection to the adjournment. The hon. leader of the Opposition says he simply moved the adjournment of the debate in the ordinary course. The Bill will, therefore, occupy its place on the Order paper, and, as I do not wish to be unreasonable, I am willing to accede to the motion for the moment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not rise for the purpose of calling in question the principle of the Bill or the propriety of the legis-

lation proposed ; but I think the question is a very much wider one than is indicated in the Bill now before the House. Parliament is, no doubt, an important factor in the government of the country, and so is the press. We are all more interested often in reforms which affect others than in those which affect ourselves, and so, while the press has with great unanimity expressed itself in favour of the abolition of passes so far as members of Parliament are concerned, I have not seen it anywhere suggested that passes should be abolished so far as the press is concerned. And yet I believe this is necessary in order to secure fair and independent expressions of views.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The press, in taking passes, give full value for them, and the railway companies find it to their advantage to grant them ; and, as regards giving passes to members of Parliament, they give them for the same reason.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not mean to say the press is bought by passes ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. member wishes to convey the idea that questions affecting the interests of railway corporations from whom passes are received, are always very fairly considered in consequence of the receipt of such favours, and perhaps the railway corporations are more fairly dealt with if passes are granted to the press than they would be if they had not been received. I do not know whether that is the view which the hon. gentleman wishes to convey to the House or not. But what I rose principally to call the attention of the House to is that a large portion of the time of the House every session is taken up with the consideration of questions of a private character, private and local Bills, Bills incorporating companies of various sorts, and Bills amending Acts of incorporation. Now, according to the immemorial usage of the House of Commons in England, every member of every committee that sits upon a private Bill receives in compensation for his services one guinea each sitting of the committee, this sum being received, not from the public treasury, but from the company interested. The question is whether the railway corporations of Canada consider themselves as doing anything more in granting passes than compensating members for their services on the committees where the legislation required by these companies comes up for consideration. It seems to me—I am not saying one word against the principle of the hon. gentleman's Bill, I am not saying whether the Bill should go much further or not—the whole question is whether a company should be at liberty to grant passes to anybody, if it has received aid from the public chest, may very well be considered. But I think there is a great deal to be said, if we do not adopt the British practice of charging those who have private legislation to promote, for the purpose of securing that private legislation —for we all must bear in mind that the session is a good deal lengthened owing to this private legislation, for which no member receives one dollar as compensation from any one, except the favours they may receive from the railway corporations in the way indicated—in favour of the proposition of the hon. Minister of Public Works. It is very important that every man who represents this country, whether poor or rich, whether he can afford to travel at his own expense or not, should have an opportunity of visiting every section of the country and making himself familiar with the character of the different sections. I believe the vast majority of members would be very much less qualified to discharge their duties on questions which come before them, if such a privilege did not exist. I think, therefore, it is in the public interest that this course should be taken. Whether the present practice that exists to some extent is the best one, is, of course, fairly open to argument and consideration, but I see no reason why a member of Parliament should be called upon to devote his time and attention and abilities to serve private parties and corporations without receiving compensation, any more than any other party in any other business of life should be called upon to act. My hon. friend near me (Mr. Lister) says that is in the agreement when an hon. member is elected. It is not in the agreement when he is elected, that he shall do this work gratuitously, or that he shall be compelled to devote his time to mastering the application of private parties for legislation in their interest only. If it is, I am bound to say that I could name a great many hon. members who do not conform to the agreement, who do not attend committees, who do not discharge their duties in this regard. But the country has committed to us the power of revising and reconsidering that agreement ; that is one of the powers with which we are entrusted, and the very object of the hon. gentleman's Bill is to exercise that power. We may exercise it in one direction or exercise it in another. I rose to call the attention of the House to the serious duties which we are called upon to discharge, the value given for all that is received, and to submit to the House whether, when we reach this subject again, we should not consider it from a larger point of view than that suggested by the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to say one word and to make one suggestion on this subject. I have listened with some interest to the discussion. I approve entirely of the underlying principle of the Bill of my hon. friend ; but I am bound to say, from my experience I believe that, do what you please, it will be evaded in many ways, and that the only possible mode of obtaining perfect freedom from the charges made is that suggested by the hon. Minister

of Public Works. However, I would add to that these two considerations: I think it should be limited to roads that have received subsidies from the Government, which will pretty well cover all the railways in Canada of which I know anything; and I would not adopt the suggestion of the member for York (Mr. Maclean) and make the railway companies a further present, but I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that in that case he might well restore the whole indemnity to the public chest. That would make a moderate saving which ought to be saved under such circumstances.

Mr. CASEY. The mileage, not the indemnity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The mileage, not the indemnity. I do not expect to carry out such a reform as that. But the mileage in such cases might very properly be restored. Now, Sir, practically speaking, we have only two railways in Canada, as one may say, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Intercolonial Railway, of course, which is Government property. The Grand Trunk Railway, as everybody knows, stands in our books indebted to the tune of $30,000,000 odd, and we, by gifts of one kind or another have given the Canadian Pacific Railway to the extent of close upon $100,000,000. There is no injustice; on the contrary there is every reason and good ground, as pointed out by my hon. friend, upon broad grounds of policy for adopting the system which prevails in many countries on the continent and elsewhere, of enabling members to travel freely from one part of the country to the other—I won't say in Jamaica cars, but at any rate in reasonably comfortable fashion.

Mr. FOSTER. Pullmans not included.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I do not include Pullmans. If the House desires to remove the scandal which I know has accrued, and which may accrue from the unequal distribution of passes known to exist, the best way to do it is by adopting the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works. I think there is a great deal in that which ought to commend itself to this House.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one or two remarks in regard to something which was said by the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill (Mr. Mulock), and which was emphasized by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Those gentlemen said that these railway companies never gave anything for nothing, that their reason for giving passes to members of this House must be manifest, and in effect that the companies were influenced by the idea that members on both sides of the House in receiving passes would be disposed to take a more favourable view of legislation affecting railway interests that might come before the House. Sir, I do not believe that there is a single member of this House who, if he for one single instant entertained that view and believed these passes were sent him by railway companies with a view of influencing his judgment on their legislation, but would at once return the pass and indignantly refuse to travel upon it. I feel that in saying that I am speaking my own sentiments and the sentiments of gentlemen sitting around me, and I have too high respect for the gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House to think that they would adopt any different course. I would prefer to think, and I do think, that in giving these passes the railway companies are actuated by motives of an entirely different character, because I cannot for one moment understand that they would believe that gentlemen who are chosen by the public to sit in Parliament would be influenced in legislating by any such small consideration as a railway pass. I prefer to think, Sir, that in giving these passes the railway companies are actuated with this idea: That they want to show their appreciation of the very generous and liberal treatment that has been accorded to them by the public of Canada in the past in connection with the subsidies that have been given to them by the representatives of the people in this House of Commons. It is for that reason, I believe that, from year to year, they send these passes to the representatives of the public. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to dissent from another idea that was put forward by the hon. member from Toronto West (Mr. Denison) to the effect, that if this House sees fit to pass legislation providing that it shall be the duty of railway companies to carry members of Parliament free of charge as in France, then we should capitalize the amount of mileage that is paid to members and give it to the different railway companies in proportion to their mileage. I dissent from any proposition of that sort. If the House chooses to pass such legislation, if the House after consideration and discussion, thinks it desirable to provide that all companies receiving Government aid in future, or that have received Government aid in the past, should carry members of this House, and of the Senate free of charge, Parliament has the right to do that. I do protest against the idea that in such a case we should capitalize the present mileage money and divide it amongst the different railway companies in Canada. From every standpoint I believe that this is a proposition that should not be assented to. There is great force, in my opinion, in the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that a man is a better legislator in

Canadian interests who has had an opportunity of making himself acquainted with the Dominion from one ocean to the other. If hon. members in this House had an opportunity of travelling over the country, of seeing the different provinces and of meeting the different peoples, it certainly would have a great effect in removing any sectional or narrow provincial feeling that might exist in their minds, and it would result in making them more broad-minded, and from the information they obtained more capable of dealing with the many questions that may come before the House. If, as a matter of right, and not as a matter of favour, members who cannot afford it, had the privilege of travelling over the country and making themselves acquainted with its various wants, they would undoubtedly be able to more intelligently discuss many of the questions brought up in Parliament. For instance, during the coming summer there is to be a large exhibition held at Regina, in the North-west Territories, and it certainly would be an advantage to members of this House if they could go to that exhibition and see the products of the western country displayed there, and meet the people and become acquainted with those resources of our western country, which they have not been able to realize from personal observation in the past.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I should not have troubled you with any further remarks only for the purpose of making it clear that the reason I object to the second reading of this Bill is not on account of the proposal to take away the mileage from those who get passes, but on account of the other principle, the main principle involved in the Bill itself. I shall not discuss alternate proposals about mileage, and so on, at this stage of the Bill, but I want to ask the House to remember that if they give this Bill a second reading in its present shape they accept the principle that passes are a bribe to legislators, because this Bill makes it illegal to accept passes, and the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill (Mr. Mulock), and the hon. gentleman who seconded it (Mr. Charlton), have made it clear that in their opinion, passes were intended as bribes to members of this House. These hon. gentlemen stated that they did not wish to imply that any member has been bribed by these passes, but if so, what is the meaning of the whole Bill? If passes do not bribe members, what is the objection to our having passes? Those hon. gentlemen say that the objection is, because people will think that we are bribed or something of that kind. If we think that these passes are meant as a bribe, if we think that we are bribed by these passes, then, I say, let us vote for this Bill. But, if we feel on the other hand, that passes are merely such compliments as may fairly be tendered by corporations under the control of this Parliament, and assisted by this Parliament, to men who are making the laws of the country, very well, let us throw out this Bill. At all events, Sir, let us think very seriously before we give our vote to affirm the proposition, and the corollary of that proposition enforced by the speeches of the hon. gentlemen, that passes are given to members in the nature of bribes. I think the House will consider a long time before it declares its adherence to that principle. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) introduced this Bill he told us that it was merely a Bill to prevent members drawing mileage when they travelled on passes. The Bill itself is something totally different from what the hon. member told us it would be when he introduced it. If it were merely what he said it was at first, I should certainly have supported the proposal to give it a second reading and go into committee to consider the mileage question. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that some members will excuse their opposition to the Bill as a whole by their opposition to some of its parts. Perhaps he would include the stand I am taking under that heading. My opposition to the Bill is to its principle, and not to the details with regard to mileage, which I am perfectly willing to consider, which I think is a fair thing to consider, For this reason I support the motion of my hon. leader for adjournment, in order that the House may think over the matter carefully before it commits itself to the whole principle involved in this Bill, and in order that the House may realize what it would mean to pass the Bill to a second reading in its present shape. But I wish to call attention to one remark made by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). He tells us that the railway companies get value from the press for the passes which they give the press, and he believes that passes are offered to members of Parliament for the same reason. Well, Sir, that is a great confession on behalf of the editors and proprietors of newspapers to come from the editor of so great and influential a journal as the one which the hon. gentleman controls; and he must do something for the railway company from which he gets a pass, that he would not otherwise do. If the press are influenced in this way, let the press hold their tongues about the giving of passes to members of Parliament. The same principle might apply all around. If it is an understood thing that every compliment in the shape of a pass implies some unfair return from the man who receives it, then I say let him among you that has never received a pass cast the first stone at the other members of this House, and not those who have been the recipients of passes for years. Discrimination in regard to the granting of passes is another thing. If I thought that a railway company was giving me a pass while refusing passes to other members. I trust I would have self-respect enough to re-

fuse it. I understand that that was done by a gentleman on the other side of the House, which resulted in the practice being made general. But so long as it is the rule, I cannot see that there is any scandal at all in members of Parliament receiving passes, and I hope the House will look at the question without regard to any agitation which is going on in the country, or to the catching of a vote here or there. If we adopt a principle which is equivalent to saying that we cannot take passes without being bribed by taking them, I believe that the people will think that we are and have been bribed by taking them, and I for one do not propose to occupy that position.

Mr. LISTER. I must utterly dissent from the proposition laid down by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), when he states that the second reading of this Bill means that we would confess ourselves guilty of being bribed as members of the House by taking passes.

Mr. CASEY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If he understood me to express myself in those words, I did not mean to do so.

Mr. LISTER. Those were almoset the exact words the hon. member used. I do not think any one can charge that any member of this House on receiving a pass would give any advantage to any railway company seeking legislation at its hands. No man knowing this House would, I think, venture for a moment to make any such statement. But there is such a thing as being careful about the semblance of wrong-doing. There is no doubt that the gentlemen of the press throughout the country, backed up by an influential portion of the population, have for some time made this a prominent question. They have charged that members of Parliament and members of the legislature of Ontario have been seeking passes for which they have given no consideration, and if they have given no consideration, they have no right to receive them. In other words, they have received them for expected favours from the different railway companies throughout the country. There is no doubt that that feeling to a great extent pervades the electorate of the province of Ontario; and it is a question for this House whether it is doing a duty to itself to allow such a feeling to pervade the minds of the electorate, and whether it would not be more dignified for us to say that no passes shall be taken at all, as has been done by the legislature of New York State in the past year by an Act which provides that no member of the legislature shall accept a pass from a railway company, and no railway company shall undertake to give one. It is a question whether we would not be placing ourselves in a better position by putting such a law on our statute-book. The hon. Minister of Public Works has suggested that an amount might be allowed to each member for the actual travelling expenses of three trips backwards and forward between his home and the capital during the session. That would probably be a solution of the matter. It does seem open to objection that members should receive free transportation, and at the same time charge the Government with it. If it is provided as a right that the railway companies shall grant passes to representatives during the session of Parliament, or during the whole year, I believe we shall be asking from the companies nothing more than we are entitled to. As the representatives of the people, it is important, as has been stated by different speakers to-day, that we should get over parochialism and provincialism, and become familiar with every section of this great Dominion; and we know that many members of the House are financially not in a position to do that at their own expense, no matter how much they might desire to do it. I believe the country as a whole would derive benefit from such a law. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in introducing this measure has given the House an opportunity to discuss the question; and I have no doubt, when they come to think over it—for, as the hon. leader of the Opposition says, the Bill is a surprise to many who have not given the subject much consideration—I am satisfied that the House, when this measure comes before it again, will be in a position and a temper to discuss it in a fair and proper manner, consistent with its dignity and with what it has a right to expect from the transportation companies of this country.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I shall not detain the House a moment. I simply desire to state that I heartily approve of the principle of the Bill, and shall have much pleasure in voting for it.

Mr. McMILLAN. A considerable amount of discussion has taken place in the part of the country where I reside with regard to railway passes, and I believe the feeling in that section is that a member of Parliament should not be entitled to receive both his mileage and free railway passes. If I endorse the principle of this Bill, I do not at all admit that, in so doing, I am acknowledging that those who have received railway passes have accepted bribes, because I do not believe that there is a single member of this House whose vote has ever been influenced in the slightest degree by the receipt of a railway pass. There should, however, be some legislation to set this matter at rest. The question was put to me at a meeting in my riding last fall, and I admitted that from some of the railway companies I had a pass, and, from others, I had a part of a pass. I believe it would be well to do away with the mileage altogether, and make it imperative on every railway company to give passes to members

of Parliament. No member who has not travelled to a considerable extent throughout the country can be as good a representative as one who has visited the different parts of the country. I think the principle of this Bill is in the right direction, and when the question comes up of abolishing passes, I shall cast my vote in favour of the Bill. The Bill is in the right direction, and I think the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) is entitled to the thanks of the House for having introduced this measure.

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). I do not think there is any class of men in the Dominion who are more poorly paid than members of Parliament. Members of Parliament have to act generously both at home and abroad, and to discharge the many duties which devolve upon public men, and I have no doubt I state the experience of every member of this House when I say that being a member of Parliament is an expensive job. With regard to the effect on members, of free passes, I have had a seat in this House for over twelve sessions, and, during all that time, have had the privilege of attending the Railway Committee, and I do not think there is a member in this House—I have never known one in my experience—who has been influenced one iota in his vote on railway matters by the receipt of a pass. For my part, I have never swerved a hair's-breadth from what I believed to be my right and duty with regard to any railway legislation, and, therefore, I am not disposed to make any imputations on the conduct of others. But there is a very strong feeling in the country on this question, and I think we ought to meet that public sentiment, at least to some extent. I am quite ready to vote for the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North York, simply because the people of the country seem to think that members of Parliament are in some measure influenced in their votes by the fact that they have been supplied with passes by the railway companies. It is not at all complimentary to us that such a feeling should exist, but the fact is there, and I am quite willing that the privilege of travelling on a pass should be taken from us. With regard to the railway companies, there is one point that has not been touched upon. Some of the companies realize that it is to their advantage to grant passes to members of Parliament. A large number of members bring the members of their families to Ottawa for the session ; they have to take berths in the Pullman cars, and, of course, all this creates extra travel and profit to the lines over which they come, and they come, no doubt, over the lines on which the members themselves have free passes. Then, when delegations come to Ottawa, these, no doubt, accompany their representatives over those lines on which the representative has a pass. So that in giving this privilege to members of Parliament, the railway companies are, in very many cases, really consulting their own interest, and increasing the traffic over their line. I shall vote for the principle of the Bill, and I took this opportunity to say a few words in case I should not be in my place when the Bill comes up again. But when I am here, the principle of the Bill shall certainly have my support.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. member for North York is more than justified by the existing state of the facts in introducing this Bill. I have hardly heard a gentleman on either side prepared to endorse or defend the existing state of affairs. I am sure that whether we think members of Parliament sufficiently indemnified or not, no one desires to take public money out of the treasury by a side wind. If our indemnity is not sufficiently large, let us meet the matter openly and squarely, like honest men, and increase it. If it is sufficiently large, let us not draw from the treasury money for disbursements which we have not made. As a matter of fact, all the members of this House, I think, travel on passes. I, for one, would not have accepted a pass if I had not been informed at the time that it was made general, and given to all the members. I would have put myself in an invidious position if I had accepted a pass which was not made general. There was a time, about three years ago, when these passes were given as favours to individual members. At that time, many refused them, but when they were given generally, as a matter of right, they were taken by everybody. The fact, however, that a large majority of the members used their passes while drawing their mileage allowance is an evil which requires a remedy, but whether my hon. friend has gone too far or not in other directions is a matter for consideration. I am strongly in favour of the proposition that members of Parliament should receive passes as a matter of right. The hon. Minister of Public Works mentioned France, the hon. member for Albert mentioned Italy, and I myself saw, in a very able article in Harper's Weekly two years ago, a list of states having a similar law. There are, at least, three or four of them ; and I think it would be a very good thing if we adopted a similar system. My hon. friend on my right (Mr. Mills) says he believes that the system now prevails in Australia and New Zealand. Whether that is so or not, does not affect my opinion. I do not want a precedent, for I think that such a measure can be defended as right in itself. I thoroughly concur in the sentiment expressed by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) that members of Parliament are not consciously influenced by the posses-

sion of a pass. But there is more than that in the matter. If these passes are given as a matter of favour, and not received by the members as a matter of right, there are many people outside who will believe that the members might be so influenced; and it is as important that we should remove that impression as it is that we should be honest ourselves. We should be above suspicion. I believe—I know—that members I meet with are not influenced in the discharge of their duties by the possession of these passes, but there is a large number of people outside who believe that they may be so influenced. And this feeling will continue if the passes are given as a matter of favour and not as a matter of right. Therefore, I am in favour of the proposition that the $33,000 which is drawn by the members of the Senate and of this House for travelling allowance should be returned to the treasury and saved to the country. But I am not in favour of the proposition made by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that the travelling fees should be capitalized and given as compensation to the railway authorities. I do not see any justice in that, whatever. We have paid, as an hon. gentleman remarked, towards the Grand Trunk, the sum of $25,000,000 by way of subsidy. We have paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, $62,000,000 by way of subsidy——

An hon. MEMBER. And a land grant.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And a land grant, as the hon. gentleman says. Therefore, these two leading and controlling railways can very well afford to give the country's representatives, who come here to discharge their duties, free passes over the road. My own personal impression is that it will be to their advantage to do so. But I am not concerned in that; I think it is a right we have, and I think the indirect results will be beneficial to them and to the country also.

Mr. INGRAM. Judging from the discussion thus far one would suppose that a member of Parliament coming to Ottawa paid no railway fare at all. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to make the statement that every cent of mileage I pay out to the railway company in travelling from my constituency to Ottawa and return. The amount I receive is in the neighbourhood of $70, and that I pay out as I have stated. Therefore, it is not right to say that we pay no fares to the railway companies. There is another point in connection with the free-pass system. It strikes me that it is somewhat a compliment to our constituents as well as to ourselves. How many hon. gentlemen in this House would go from Ottawa to their homes for the purpose of consulting their constituents as to legislation that is brought before this House? Not very many, indeed, would go, unless they had private business of their own. But, by returning home to consult their constituents they very often save their constituents the expense of coming to Ottawa for the purpose of furthering their own business. It is quite true that all our constituents are not wealthy men. It is also true that some of our constituents have business to transact at Ottawa, business that they cannot transact by letter, but only by conversation with their representatives. In such cases, these gentlemen are having a favour conferred upon them. And I cannot see for the life of me, what difference it makes to our constituents whether we travel on a pass or not. So far as the mileage is concerned, if other members paid out as I do, I cannot see how any fault could be found. Those members residing within three or four or five hundred miles of Ottawa come and go frequently between the capital and their homes. But take the case of those living beyond that distance—take our British Columbia representatives, or those from Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island—these gentlemen neglect their business entirely by coming to this House. They have not the opportunity to visit their homes that gentlemen have who live within, say, five hundred miles of Ottawa. They neglect their business, and the indemnity is not sufficient for such members. These gentlemen are, to some extent, indemnified for their loss of business in coming to Ottawa to attend this House, and those who reside within a shorter distance have the advantage of visiting their homes often. So far as concerns the public clamour with respect to the free-pass system, it strikes me very forcibly that some hon. gentlemen are followers instead of leaders of public opinion. If there is one thing more than another that I admire Sir Oliver Mowat for, though I differ from him, politically, it is for the stand he took last session. He is a Conservative in thought and spirit, and, at the last session of the legislature he stood up boldly against an agitation which did not commend itself to his judgment. So, if hon. gentlemen in this House, instead of veering with every wind that blows, would stand upon the platform and defend what they know to be right in principle and practice, there would be less of this agitation, and fewer third and fourth parties in this country, and we should not have the time of the House taken up in discussions of this kind.

Mr. CAMERON. I have only a word to say. I think that discussions of this kind should not be frequent in this House. The original intention in granting mileage, I have no doubt whatever, was that it should be part of the indemnity to the members of Parliament. It was never intended, and I do not think it is intended now, merely to cover travelling expenses, for

every one who has had anything to do with Parliament for a number of years must know that the mileage granted to members of Parliament covers more than actual expenses. The mileage for members of the Nova Scotia Legislature is 20 cents per mile, and from the outset it was considered as part of the indemnity. Those who live at a distance and who have to visit their homes, were, in the judgment of the Nova Scotia Legislature, entitled to some compensation, at least, for the distance which they had to travel more than those who are near the centre of legislation. This has been well stated by my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Ingram). I quite concur with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Albert that every railway company that has been subsidized by this Parliament, should grant free passes to every member of Parliament. I contend that this question of mileage to members of Parliament should be considered apart from travelling expenses, and should be considered a part of the indemnity given to members of Parliament who come here from a distance, because in that case they would have to some extent an advantage which they deserve on account of the disadvantages which they suffer in coming here.

Mr. BAIRD. There is one peculiar feature about this question, and that is that nine-tenths of all the carrying under free passes of members of Parliament in Canada is done by one company. Now, if that company is doing it from a sense of duty, they are doing more than their duty as compared with others, and it is a fair conclusion that the others should be forced by legislation. If it is intended that we are to travel free, let us travel free by force of legislation and not by favour of the railway companies. The distribution of free passes by managers or directors of a company is very much like the distribution of Government patronage, a hard thing to manage. Those who do not receive them have a feeling of jealousy; and I am aware that there are often broad slurs cast upon members of Parliament throughout the country when they are showing their free passes among their friends. Therefore, I feel strongly inclined to favour the principle of this Bill, and I would urge that the legislation that has been proposed, or something in the same line, should be passed.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill seems to me opportune at the present time, from the fact that an agitation has been going on in the country during the last year or two, strongly in favour of doing away with free passes. If I remember correctly, it commenced in some newspapers in different parts of the country, and it was then taken up by the class known as the Patrons of Industry; and their paper, called the "Farmers' Sun," which is, I understand, controlled at present by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), has been very strongly advocating that principle.

Mr. MULOCK. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that the extent of my interest in the "Farmers' Sun," the Patrons' newspaper, is that of a subscriber at $1 per year.

Mr. LAURIER. Fifty cents.

Mr. MULOCK. Fifty cents, or whatever it is.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to hear he is only a subscriber. They might have sent it to him free, thinking he was not well able to pay for it. I am glad to give him an opportunity of setting himself right on this matter, because I may tell him that the impression is abroad in the country that he owns and controls the "Farmers' Sun," and that he is inspiring the articles that appear in it, and that he is endeavouring to cater to the principles that are promulgated by that association. I do not say this in disrespect to the hon. gentleman, but for the purpose of showing the public that he is not actuated by any interested or improper motive. However, I say that the Bill is opportune in view of this agitation obtaining so largely in the country to-day, because there is an opinion prevalent that somehow or other members of Parliament are influenced in giving favours to railway corporations on account of their travelling on railway passes. If that is the prevailing opinion throughout the country, and if there is an appearance of evil in it, there is certainly nothing wrong in passing a Bill to do away with that privilege to the members of Parliament. I think, however, with a great many others, that the Bill goes a great deal too far, because it makes you take a solemn declaration, not only that you have not travelled on a pass, but that you have paid the consideration that the general public are paying for travelling, it may be on railways, it may be on steamboat lines, or it may be on any other lines. Now, I understand there are many men who travel on railways at reduced rates because they are members of the press, like my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). I do not know whether he has the privilege or not. It is true, he says that he gives consideration for it. If so, he must give consideration in one of two ways, either by writing up the road so as to give it a good advertisement in the country, or by defending something in its management in consequence of which it saves money in an indirect way. In that case I assume that he is culpably guilty of something that is wrong, just as a member of Parliament would be if he gave something to a railway company in consideration of the passes he used in travelling over their line, so that the one is no better than the other. We know that commercial men are entitled to travel at reduced rates, but they could not do so, if this Bill became law. Then, some

consideration is usually given to exporters of cattle, who are allowed to travel over railways at reduced rates, but they could not do so if this Bill became law; and, if they were members of Parliament, they could not take the declaration that is provided here they should take. Now, some have said that it would be better if we made it compulsory on the railways to allow members of Parliament to travel free. That is exactly my opinion. I believe to-day that every railway corporation in the country should be compelled to carry members of Parliament free from one end of the country to the other, while they remain members of Parliament. Some say that it should be confined to Government railways. I do not agree with them. It is not the Government railways to which consideration is given, for they belong to the country. We have given very large consideration to the Canadian Pacific Railway; so we have to the Grand Trunk Railway, and to a hundred other railways over the country; and many of them have received aid from the provincial legislatures. They have got consideration from the Parliament of Canada or from the provincial legislatures that mean a great deal of money to them. Why, we give them a charter, and that means a great deal, because it allows them to take away our rights, and to expropriate our property, and to do many things that private individuals have no right to do. From these privileges they receive a great deal of money; and yet in return for it they may give us no consideration. Therefore, I say that, when a railway company, whether it is a private company or is a Government railway, comes to this Parliament for a charter, one of the conditions of the charter should be that every member of Parliament and every member of a provincial legislature should travel over that road free of charge. I agree with those hon. gentlemen who say that it would make members of Parliament more efficient legislators if they were enabled to travel free over the country. They would become men of broader views, they would know better what they are talking about, and they would understand the condition of affairs in different parts of the country much better than they do to-day, because, by reason of their limited means, they are unable to expend that amount of money in travel to enable them to become as intelligent legislators as they ought to be. Then, again, it would be putting all members upon the same footing. Take my hon. and respected friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), who introduced this Bill to-day. Many will say it is a matter of no consequence to him; he is a millionaire, and he can well afford to pay his own fares on railways. He can travel from here to British Columbia, or down to Prince Edward Island, and it is a matter of no consequence to him, because he has more money than he can spend during his lifetime, no matter how much he travels, and will still be able to leave a fair amount to those who come after him. But there are many other members of Parliament whose means are limited, and who would be unable to travel were it not for the advantages they receive from free passes, and, in my opinion, they ought to have the right to travel free on all the railways of the country. Now, I say that if it is the sentiment of the country to-day that some injustice is being done by members of Parliament when they travel over railways on free passes, we should do away with the present system by passing a law giving each member of Parliament the right to travel freely over all railways during the time he is a representative of the people. Many countries that are not so far advanced in intelligence and in independence as Canada, have done that already, and I do not hear any complaint from the railway companies who have to carry them free. Therefore, I say that we should not be far wrong if we took the further step and extended the right to all. Even if this debate is adjourned, I say it is the duty of the Government, or it is the duty of those who are charged with the responsibility of passing legislation in this House, to bring in a Bill making it the right of members of Parliament to travel free over all railways in the country. Then every man will be put upon the same footing, whether he is a millionaire in this House, or whether he is a man that can get reduced railway fares because he is a member of a railway corporation, or a director, or president of a company, or is connected with some transportation lines that will be giving consideraion to railways in return for which they will give him the privilege of travelling over their road free. It will be putting all upon the same footing, and then the man who is unable to pay his fare will have the same advantages as the man who is well able to pay his way, and to whom it will be no hardship if this consideration is taken away.

Mr. CURRAN. I think there is no difference of opinion on either side of the House regarding the proposition that railway passes should not be given to members to influence their vote. There seems to be now a very general idea that the railways of the country who have received public aid should be compelled to give free passes to members of the House. I am led to make this observation by the fact that a very great compliment has been paid to the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Amyot). I remember that hon. member some years ago introduced a measure embodying the same view, and he was heartily laughed at by both sides of the House. There were very few hon. members who were willing to support the idea at that time, but I think nothing could be more desirable than the proposition made, because it has already

been pointed out that hon. members will be enabled to travel over the country and become acquainted with the various sections. When members of the House have visited other parts of the country than their own, and questions come before the House in reference to places they have visited, they will take much more interest in legislation proposed, they having become acquainted with them otherwise than merely by depending on geographical knowledge acquired from books. The idea suggested, and which I ardently hope will be carried out and put in the form of legislation, is a good one, and in the meantime I am satisfied that after this debate has been adjourned it will be possible to reach the minor point, which is perhaps the one more prominently before the public eye at the present moment, and while we do away, as is suggested in the Bill before the House, with the abuse complained of, legislation will be enacted so that members shall not receive money for travelling expenses which they have not actually disbursed, at the same time the broader principle enunciated by hon. members on both sides of the House will be carried into law, namely, that the various railway companies that have received aid from Parliament shall give free passes to members of Parliament wherever their lines run. This being a great step in advance of what has been agitated for in the press, and one which should be carried out without delay.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I closely followed the observations of the hon. gentlemen who spoke before me in reference to this question. I have singled out in their speeches four objections to the giving of passes by the railways to the members of this House. The first objection, and the one which impressed me most, was made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The public sentiment, he said, was adverse to the giving of passes to members of this House. I have, indeed, Mr. Speaker, much respect for the Patrons of Industry, but I must say that so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, there is not much foundation in such a statement, and that there the people do not feel so strongly as in Ontario against these free passes. In the province of Quebec, it is considered that members may be quite honest and independent although receiving free passes from any railway. The hon. member for North Wellington stated that we were entitled to such a rate for travelling expenses, that we were paid our mileage and that, such being the case, we should not get passes from the railways. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, and I think all my fellow members of the province of Quebec will agree with me, I think the amount we get for mileage does in no way compare with our travelling expenses, from our place of living to Ottawa. I will take my own case as an illustration. Sorel, where I live, is one hundred and sixty miles away from here. I get $32.20 for mileage. Each week, I am compelled to go to Sorel for my professional business. When the session lasts three, four, five or six months, there is no member of this House who can fairly assume that $32 is sufficient to cover my travelling expenses between Ottawa and Sorel. And three-fourths of the members of this House are precisely in the same plight as I am. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, hardly two years ago, we have given the best evidence that mileage is no impediment to our thorough independence in this House when our friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) brought up a Bill to cut down the rate of passage on railways to two cents a mile. The Bill was thrown out, and I impugn no member of this House, but I was among those who, in spite of free passes, voted with my friend and colleague from East York to reduce the rate on railways. In my opinion, this matter is merely brought up to catch the votes of the people, and it should not engage the attention of an earnest Parliament. For this consideration, I for one—and I am pleased to think that I am voicing the opinion of my fellow-members from the province of Quebec—shall vote against this motion.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Before this debate terminates it is desirable that the House should hear the views expressed by a gentleman who has been for a long time in public life. This question came before the Ontario Legislature at its late session, and Sir Oliver Mowat gave expression to his views, as follows :—

> Sir Oliver Mowat sympathized with the object of the mover of the Bill, whose desire was to keep the House pure. A good deal had been said about this matter in the last elections, and it was striven to create the impression that the members of the old parties in the legislature were bad. He thought a good deal of that impression had been dissipated from the mind of the hon. member for Frontenac since he entered the House. There was no occasion for the Bill. It had not been shown that any evil had resulted from the system. Passes were not given to those members of the legislature who were friendly to the railways alone, but all received them. They were given as a matter of courtesy. It might be, perhaps, that the granting of passes had worked evils in other countries, but he had the satisfaction of believing that such did not occur in this, nor, he believed, in any British country. He did not know from his experience of anybody being influenced by the receipt of a pass.

I think we might commend this utterance to members of the House.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for the past fiscal year, from the 1st July, 1893, to the 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Trans-Canadian Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Canadian Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. La-Rivière.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being an Act respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. Martin.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 51) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: Perhaps the House will be satisfied if I say on this occasion simply that the amendments contained in this Bill are the result of the working of the code, and in compliance with suggestions received from those concerned in the administration of the law, such as judges and attorneys general. Perhaps the most important clause is the first. It relates to the section of the code concerning gambling houses; and, in the prosecution, a case has excited some attention. Hon. gentlemen may have observed that the provision of the code was defeated by conducting part of the operation across the border, while the gambling house itself was within Canadian territory. It is to meet a difficulty of this kind that the Bill has been introduced. There are also some clauses which were clearly omitted by accident when the code was under consideration, in connection with arrests without a warrant; and when certain sections were dropped, obviously without any intent to drop them. They are of a cognate character to the clause which provides for arrests in the case of thefts of different kinds, and without a warrant. Those, I think, are the chief amendments.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the Bill provide where the criminal is to be placed when he is being tried? Formerly a felon was placed in the box when tried, but an offender charged with a less offence was not. The code makes no provision for this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no clause relating to that, but I shall be very glad to consider one when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. LAURIER. I remember that this was discussed on a former occasion, and it was pointed out that under the old Act offences formerly deemed felonies might be classed as misdemeanours.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to remind the Minister of Finance that he promised the House the other day that before he proceeded to deliver the Budget speech, the Order in Council respecting the Hudson Bay Railway would be laid on the Table of the House. The hon. gentleman cannot forget that in the course of the last discussion on this subject, he not only gave hon. members to understand, but he distinctly told us that before he delivered the Budget speech members would receive not only all particulars respecting the Order in Council, but the Order itself. I observe that the Order in Council has not been brought down yet; and I also observe that the other House has received more privileges than this House. I observe that the Premier yesterday went elaborately into the tenor of this Order in Council. It seems to me that there is no reason whatever why if the Senate should be furnished with this information, it should be withheld from the Commons whose province it is specially to watch financial matters. We shall be very glad to know from

the Finance Minister what can be the object of making this invidious discrimination, and why the Senate should be more favoured than the Commons of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very sorry that the return asked for has not been brought down. Yesterday I particularly asked that it should be made ready, so that it should be on the Table to-day. The papers have been prepared; they are in the Secretary of State's office, and should have been brought down yesterday, but the Secretary of State will send over for them directly and they will be brought down. It was on the Order of Proceedings that they should be laid before the House yesterday, and a similar statement to that made in the Senate, and any other information should be given.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PERRY. I wish to draw the attention of the House to an editorial which appeared in the "Mail-Empire" the 25th of last month, in which it falsified a statement I made in the House having reference to the carrying of mails between the island and the mainland.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the rule which precludes the reading of anything appearing in a newspaper commenting on the debates that occur in this House.

Mr. PERRY. The statement was made that I said the people of the island intended to secede from confederation if a tunnel from the island to the mainland is not built. I made no such statement, and I declare it is a malicious and false misrepresentation. I stated that the people of the island were very loyal to the Government of the day, loyal to the constitution, and I feel called upon, as in some sense responsible for the Liberal party in the island, to affirm that the Liberals in the island are as loyal as any other people in Canada. I hope and trust that no such statement in the future will be made.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the revenue was estimated last year when I delivered the exposition of the Budget, at $36,500,000. The actual revenue which has accrued is $36,374,693, being less than my estimate by $125,307. On looking at the items of increase and decrease in the revenue for the past year, it will be found that Customs realized $19,198,114, being a decrease over the Customs yield for the preceding year of $1,755,889. Excise yielded $8,381,088, being an increase over the preceding year's collection of $13,724. From Miscellaneous there was derived $8,795,489, a decrease of $51,751. The total decrease as compared with the preceding year was $1,793,915. It has been customary for a number of years to read the principal items of increase or decrease respectively, and I shall follow that practice this year. Comparing 1894 with the preceding year, it will be found that in the following lines of articles reductions in duties have taken place:—

Ale, beer and porter	$ 2,654
Animals, living	12,252
Books, periodicals and other matter, N.E.S.	15,217
Brass and manufactures of	20,551
Grain of all kinds	10,735
Bricks and tiles	4,477
Carpets and squares	4,477
Cement	3,894
Clocks and clock springs	4,207
Coal and coke	147,860
Copper and manufactures of	26,060
Cotton, manufactures of	156,775
Drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines	70,261
Earthenware and china	13,110
Fancy goods	21,384
Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of	48,705
Gloves and mitts	12,192
Gold and silver, manufactures of	3,529
Gunpowder and other explosives	10,625
Gutta percha and India-rubber, manufactures of	50,370
Hats, caps and bonnets	31,366
Iron and steel, manufactures of	421,683
Lead and manufactures of	14,569
Leather do	58,828
Metal, composition and other	12,594
Musical instruments	19,622
Oil, except coal, kerosene and products of	19,982
Oilcloth	12,400
Paints and colours	9,440
Paper and manufactures of	72,217
Pickles, sauces and capers of all kinds	15,277
Printing presses	8,365
Salt	3,920
Silk, manufactures of	83,188
Soap of all kinds	6,606
Spices do	5,774
Stone and manufactures of	2,541
Sugar, molasses	2,760
do candy and confectionery	10,153
Tobacco	4,749
Turpentine, spirits of	3,369
Watches and parts of	8,091
Wood and manufactures of	56,550
Wool do	432,515
All other dutiable goods	132,472

On the other hand in the following instances we have received increased amounts over those received on the same articles in 1893:—

Arrowroot, biscuit, rice, macaroni, &c	$ 2,370
Carriages	23,728

Embroideries	$11,340
Fish and products of	4,617
Fruit and nuts, dried	52,569
Fruit, green	63,347
Glass and manufactures of	2,380
Oils, coal, kerosene, and products of	22,537
Packages	9,852
Provisions :—butter, cheese, lard and meats	28,478
Seeds and roots	3,967
Spirits and wines	58,284
Sugar of all kinds	11,894
Tea	8,737
Vegetables	6,523

In the other chief item of taxation, Excise, there has been as already pointed out a slight increase on the receipts of 1894. It will be noticed that the decreases are pretty generally spread over the list of imported articles; the increase being principally in the articles I have named, and not nearly so extensive in their scope. Taking up the Trade Returns, there are two or three points that may be emphasized. The total imports were less than the preceding year by $8,611,047. The dutiable imports were less by $7,094,389. The total imports of merchandise were less.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you including coin and bullion in the total imports ?

Mr. FOSTER. In the total imports, the coin and bullion are included. The total imports of merchandise—there coin and bullion are not included—was less by $6,099,919, but the free imports show an increase over the preceding year of $994,470. In looking for the reasons for the shrinkage or diminution in the Customs revenue, I suppose we will all agree that they may be found under three heads—namely, either reduced consumption, or shrinkage in values, or in addition and in conjunction with that the reduction of taxation which follows in ad valorem duties upon the shrinkage in values. Now, it may have been the opinion of some that a large proportion of the fall in revenue was due to under-consumption, but if you take into account the figures that I gave as to the imports of dutiable goods and merchandise, especially, and also take into account the shrinkage in values which is known and acknowledged, I think we shall easily come to the conclusion that so far as imported goods were concerned in the year 1893-94, as to their bulk or volume there was very little less consumption of them in Canada than in the year preceding. I look, therefore, for the chief cause of diminution in the Customs revenue, as compared with the preceding year, to a shrinkage in values of imported goods, and the consequently lessened amount of duty paid upon the diminished or decreased value. That would be easily apparent. Suppose that dutiable goods to the amount of $70,000,000 are brought in, and that there is a shrinkage of value, compared with the succeeding year, of 5 per cent; if the duties of the preceding year were 30 per cent, the same rate of duty applied to the value diminished by 5 per cent would give you a very considerable fall in the revenue to be derived. It is from this source that, I think, the largest part, by far, of the diminution of the duties from Customs has arisen. If we go to the Excise, we will find in reference to it, that there was a slight decrease in the duty upon the spirits. The following comparative statement gives the transaction in the several articles usually included under this head, the amount taken for consumption, and the duty accrued thereon as reported by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue :—

	Quantity.	Quantity.	Duty.	Duty.	Increase.	Decrease.
	1893.	1894.	1893.	1894.	1894.	1894.
Spirits..... Galls.	2,747,597	2,754,607	$4,139,306	$4,131,387	.....	7,919
Malt..... Lbs.	50,082,751	51,311,206	1,001,655	950,815	.....	50,840
Cigars ..... No.	114,668,809	115,392,857	681,628	689,184	7,556	
Cigarettes..... "	42,870,100	55,143,500	64,305	82,715	18,410	
Tobacco and snuff..... Lbs.	10,900,062	9,837,084	2,379,812	2,364,153	.....	15,659
			$8,266,706	$8,218,254	25,966	74,418 48,452

The duty accrued, as will be seen, has declined somewhat, but sufficient has been received from methylated spirits to counteract this, and to give us, besides, the small increase before-mentioned of $13,725. The diminution of $50,840 on malt was due, of course, to the decrease in the duty on malt. Altogether, the excise shows a slight gain of $13,725, a gain arising from the profits upon the sale of methylated spirits, a branch of industry which is carried on under the supervision of the Excise Department. It has been customary to give a table of the comparative consumption, by population, of spirits, beer, wine and tobacco. It is for this year as follows :—

	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	T'b'co
Average from 1867...	1·087	2·832	·137	2·154
do for 1892-93..	·740	3·485	·094	2·314
do for 1893-94..	·742	3·722	·089	2·264

The detail this year shows for 1893-94 a consumption of spirits of ·742 ; of beer, 3·722 ; of wine, ·089 ; and of tobacco, 2·216, showing, in spirits, a very slight increase, in beer a considerable increase, in wine a slight decrease, and in tobacco a slight decrease. If you take the per capita consumption in 1893-94 and compare it with the average of 1867, it will be found that in the case of spirits, the reduction is equal to about 31 per cent, the decrease of wines is 35 per cent, while there has been a decided increase in the per capita consumption of beer, and a slight increase, not very much, in the per capita consumption of tobacco.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I ask what you call the present population of Canada, in making that per capita statement ?

Mr. FOSTER. The present population would be a little over 5,000,000. I do not remember exactly the odd figures, but it is over five millions The next source of revenue is Miscellaneous, which shows a decrease of $51,751 ; but we must recollect, with reference to that, that 1892-93 showed a very large increase over the preceding year, an increase amounting to $319,775 ; so that the revenue derived from miscellaneous works and investments still stands at about $270,000 more than that of any year previous to 1892-93, during the existence of confederation ; and the whole decrease of $51,751 as compared with 1892-93, is more than accounted for by an abnormal falling off in the revenue from fines, forfeitures and seizures. So that, taking that fact into account, miscellaneous receipts have been larger in the year 1893-94 than in the preceding year, and larger than in any previous year since 1867. Now, that fact is worth noting. As we look through the receipts, it appears that although there was a falling off in the receipts of the Fisheries Department, which, however, were larger this year than in any preceding year except 1892-93, and in the fines, forfeitures and seizures, which are variable, in casual revenue, in cullers' revenue, in gas revenue, in interest on investments, in revenue from insurance, in revenue derived from the industries in the penitentiaries, and in post office revenue, there have been increases ; while in the revenue from public works, which include railways and canals, the loss was only $58,700 ; and yet from this source the revenue remained the highest of all but two years since 1867, namely, the years 1889-90, and 1892-93. Now, the receipts under Miscellaneous may be denominated earnings, coming as they do from our public works, railways, post offices and investments ; and they form a very good index to the state of business and the financial health of the country ; and it is gratifying that in the year 1893-94, when what has been called hard times have been prevalent the world over, and Canada has had to bear a share with the rest of the world, our revenues from these sources have—if you take out the falling off from forfeitures, fines and seizures—been larger than those of the preceding year, and larger than those of any other year since confederation. I come now to the expenditures for 1893-94. They amount to $37,585,025, an excess over those of 1892-93 of $770,972. This might at first glance be cited as an evidence of extravagant expenditure on the part of the Government in a year of financial stress, and a want of prudence and foresight in managing the controllable expenditures. But if we look into the items which have chiefly caused this increase, we shall find that there is another reason for it. Of this increase of $770,972, in expenditure, $405,707 is due to interest on debt, $35,846 to sinking fund, which is a laying up against debt, and $270,889 to subsidies to provinces, which if taken from this treasury go to help the different provincial treasuries. These items all told make a sum of $712,442, which is within $58,530 of the total over-expenditure of 1893-94, as compared with that of 1892-93. But there is another point bearing upon this. Previously, there were certain branches of the service which were earning, and in which the departments were in the custom of selling what they made, buying stock with the receipts, for the purpose of making again, and at the end of the year handing over the balance on hand to the Receiver General. Two years ago it was thought well to stop that system and have appropriations made for every expenditure, and have the receipts on account deposited at once with the Receiver General. Under this head there came methylated spirits, the expenditure on which last year was $88,654, which sum appears among the expenditures of that year, whereas in the preceding it did not appear at all. As we had a revenue for methylated spirits during the year of over $100,000, the expenditure on this account is, of course, not an over-expenditure. The same remark applies to the sum of money which has been placed in the hands of the Department of Agriculture in the form of advances for the purchase and sale of dairy products, for which $36,000 was appropriated last year against $6,000 for the preceding year ; so that although this sum appears among the expenditures and consequently counts as an over-expenditure in the comparative statement, it is not an over-expenditure in reality. It is simply what we may call a returning vote, which goes out and comes back again, which formerly went out and came back without an appropriation, but which last year wes estimated for and became an appropriation. The same is true to a certain extent with regard to

the sum of $74,210, which was expended for binder twine, machinery and stock in the penitentiary at Kingston. That was an extraordinary outlay. Last year there was no income to set off against it; but it was a preparation for income, and up to the 31st of March this year, the sum of $16,400 has been received on account of sales made in the penitentiary, and in the coming season which we have just entered, it is estimated that over $40,000 will be received from these sales. Then, there is a post office over-expenditure of $96,058, and an over-expenditure on account of premium and exchange in connection with the debt of $13,428; but against these are increased receipts of $35,800 from the post office, and $24,000 on account of premium and exchange. Summing up these remarks, the whole result is, that although there was an increase in the expenditure of 1893-94 of $770,972, of this amount $712,442 is statutory, for interest, sinking fund, and subsidies to provinces, and $198,864 is extraordinary for methylated spirits, dairy advances and binder twine machinery, which had formerly not been, but which last year were, included in the Estimates, but against which the sum of $101,000 for methylated spirits, $36,000 for dairy products, and during the course of this year about $56,000 for the sale of stock manufactured at the Kingston penitentiary, operates as a set-off. We find that there has been a decrease in expenditures, in charges of management, in the Fisheries Department, in Legislation, in Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Militia and Defence, Miscellaneous, Mounted Police, Pensions, Police, Railways and Canals, Superannuation, Adulteration of Food, Culling Timber, and in Dominion lands. There has been an increase in interest and Sinking Fund, which are statutory, in the Administration of Justice, which is largely statutory, in Agriculture, owing to the dairy advances, without which there would have been no increase, some increase in Civil Government, Geological Survey, Immigration, Quarantine, Indians, Mail and Steamship Subsidies, Marine Hospital, Ocean and River Service, Penitentiaries, Public Works, Subsidies to Provinces, which are statutory, Customs, Excise, Post Office and Weights and Measures. So that the $36,374,693 of revenue failed to meet the expenditure of $37,585,025 by $1,210,332, which measures the size of that unwelcome visitor, as a deficit has been called. But we must recollect this, that if there is a deficit on the year's operations of $1,210,332, there is included in the expenditure the sum of $2,131,360 for sinking fund, which is so much laid up against debt, so that the result, translated into the vernacular, of last year's revenue and expenditure, is simply this, that with the revenue we met all the expenditure for the services of the country outside of capital, and laid up against the debt $921,028.

Mr. FOSTER.

There is also another consideration that may be noted just here, namely, that although there is a deficit of $1,210,332 we have a net surplus from 1887-88 to 1893-94 of $7,476,843. There is also one other fact of very great significance. It is this: that in the year 1893-94 303,793,677 pounds of sugar were imported for home consumption into Canada. If the rate of duty which was charged in 1890-91 and then taken off, had been imposed on that imported sugar last year, the duty which would have accrued would have been $4,821,205. This would have swept away the deficit and left $3,610,873 to go against the diminution of the debt or for capital. The net result to the people of Canada is this, that while it has cost them $38,324 as an interest burden to carry the deficit, they have saved into their pockets $4,821,205. The expenditure on capital last year, 1893-94, as compared with 1892-93, was as follows:—

	1893-94.	1892-93.	Increase or Decrease.
R. R. & Canals...	$3,612,913	$2,782,490	+ 830,423
Public Works....	102,058	181,877	— 79,819
Dom. Lands.....	149,146	115,038	+ 34,108
	$3,864,118	$3,079,406	+ 784,712
R. R. subsidies...	1,229,885	811,394	+ 418,491
	$5,094,003	$3,890,800	$1,203,203

Our debt on the 30th June, 1894, stands at $246,183,029, which is established as follows:—

		Debt.
Capital expenditure, 1893-94		$5,094,003
Charges loan management		330,353
Deficit		1,210,332
		6,634,689
Less sinking fund	$2,131,360	
Transferred and refunded	1,339	
		2,132,700
Addition		$ 4,501,989
Debt, 30th June, 1894		$246,183,029

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It might be convenient to state here why you charge $330,000 to management last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state that when I come to touch the loan, which I will do shortly. The total addition to the debt is $4,501,989. Adding that to the additions in former years, and we have from 1890 to 1894 inclusive, a total addition to the debt of $8,652,987, which is an average of $1,730,597 per year. But that addition to the debt is not all what would be generally taken in business matters as an addition to the debt. When you make a loan there are three courses you may pursue. You may put your loan upon the market in such a way that you may realize a premium from it. You may put it on the market so that you sell it at par, or you may put your loan upon the market below par—and this last,

on almost all counts, is considered by far the preferable way. But if you put your loan upon the market below par, the amount of discount which you pay, although it is charged to capital, and has been always so charged in our books, is really only the result of what you consider to be the best means of floating your loan. You may incur it, or you may not; and it is, to all intents and purposes, an advance payment of interest, which you would not otherwise pay if you floated your loan at a larger per cent. and, therefore, had no discount. Well, of that class of expenditure on loans, there was $330,353 for the year 1893-94; $139,951 for 1892-93; and $1,122,541 for the year 1891-92. And then there was a transfer for the North Shore Railway bonds, which is simply a matter of book-keeping. They gave us no revenue before though they appeared as assets, and, consequently when they were written off appeared as an addition to the debt; but, nominally, they were assets, and $970,000 is the sum of that transfer. That makes $2,662,845 for these objects. Taking that from the total creation of debt, 1890-4, you have a creation of debt for the public service of the country of $6,090,142, or a yearly average of $1,198,028. Now, the point I wish to make is this: In the first place, the average yearly addition to the debt in these five years is small, being $1,739,597. The amount of capital expended in widening and deepening the canals, alone, in these years, amounting to $8,868,343, or more than the whole amount of the additions to the debt incurred between 1890 and 1894. I now come to the revenue and expenditure for 1894-5:

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, 1894-95.

Total revenue for 1893-94	$ 36,374,693	Total expenditure	$ 37,585,025
Revenue up to 20th April, 1894	29,261,171	Expenditure to 20th April, 1894	25,085,570
Revenue up to 20th April, 1895	26,266,757	Expenditure to 20th April, 1895	25,984,658
Revenue, 20th April, 1894, to 30th June, 1894	7,113,521	Expenditure, 20th April, 1894, to 30th June, 1894	12,499,454
	33,380,278		38,484,113
Add anticipated betterment	419,722		
Total actual and estimated revenue, 1894-95	33,800,000	Subtract anticipated less expenditure	184,113
Expected deficit	4,500,000		38,300,000

There are certain signs of betterment which, I think, justify me in estimating an appreciable increase of the Customs revenue during the period I have mentioned of the current fiscal year. After carefully looking over the matter, I have estimated the sum, in round numbers, at $500,000. But, to bring the result out in round numbers, and avoid multiplication, I have put the amount down at $419,722, which will make the total revenue for the current year, actually accruing, and estimated by me to accrue, $33,800,000, as stated. On the other hand, I have estimated, after looking as carefully as possible into the works that are in progress—and I have been very conservative in my estimate so as not to make the mistake of under-estimating the expenditure—that there will be a reduction of $184,113 in expenditure, as compared with last year. This makes the total actual expenditure, $38,300,000. Subtracting one from the other by an arithmetical process for which we are all competent, we find the deficit expected for the present year, $4,500,000. Now, it may have been noticed that the expenditure for the year up to the 20th April, of the year through which we are now passing, is greater than that of last year, by a considerable amount. I wish to read the principal items of the increase, to show that it has not been an over expenditure that was controllable. The interest on debt, accounts for $179,203; legislation, revision of the voters' lists, $155,566. The undertaking which we made with the British Government, and which we are carrying out jointly with the British Government at Esquimalt, is responsible for expenditure of $143,356. Subsidies to provinces, $178,957. Excise, $64,989—in the item of methylated spirits. This makes a total of $722,072 on these items, part of which are statutory, and, as regards the Esquimalt expenditure, a matter of agreement, and as regards the Excise, chiefly a matter of book-keeping, and the revenue accrues on the other hand, as I have stated. The increase on account of legislation is for the revision of the voters' lists.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long will the Esquimalt expenditure continue?

Mr. FOSTER. I think another year will finish it, or nearly so—that is the extraordinary expenditure; after that there is maintenance of the school of marine artillery, which is jointly kept up. Now, in looking to find the reasons for the decrease in Customs revenue, we have been discussing, I find that the imports for home consumption to 1st April, 1894, were $86,370,739, and to 1st April, 1895, they were $78,126,603.

showing a loss in the current year, compared with last year, of $8,244,136. So that during the current year more will have to be accounted for as to the decreased revenue by lessened consumption ; but yet, taking into account the great fall in prices, which the London "Economist," a very conservative and very reliable paper, estimates at 7½ per cent for the year, taking that into account, it will be seen that so far as volume or bulk is concerned, the consumption of this year has not fallen much below the consumption of the preceding year ; and it is satisfactory to know that up to the date I mention, April, 1895, the exports of Canada have been greater by half a million dollars than the exports of Canada for the same period last year. The chief reason for the reduction in customs collections, then, is the one that I noticed with reference to the preceding year, the great shrinkage in value, and the reduction of duty, a reduction of duty which arises from these causes in the current year namely, the reduced duties of last year, the change to ad valorem from specific in a number of articles, the lessened duties that accrued on the lowered value from the ad valorem duty, and the greater quantity of free goods, goods that were formerly dutiable, but which were placed upon the free list, as compared with the preceding year. Against the deficit of $4,500,000 of the current year, we have also to note the fact that I noted with reference to the deficit of the preceding year. So far as returns go up to date, and an estimate being made for the remainder of the year, the year 1894-95 will see an importation of 310,000,000 pounds of sugar for home consumption. If that sugar had been dutiable at the rate of 1890-91, the duty that would have accrued upon it would have been $4,900,000 ; so that if that duty had been kept intact, and all the other reductions had been made that were made, we would still have had sufficient to prevent any deficit for the present year, and have allowed a small sum over for capital account. So that the account of the people vs. the state in this transaction is simply this, that the people will have kept in their pockets, by the removal of the duty, $4,900,000 which they would otherwise have paid, and that the interest that will be paid for carrying the deficit is but $142,500 ; that is, they will have paid for carrying the burden of the deficit $142,500, and have saved in taxes to themselves nearly $5,000,000. If you take capital expenditure up to the 20th April, 1895, there was expended on railways and canals, $1,967,435 ; on public works, $71,021 ; on Dominion lands, $69,508 ; on railway subsidies, $1,226,613 ; making in all, $3,330,579. It is estimated that to the end of the year there will be an expenditure of $1,669,421, which makes an estimate of the capital expenditure for the year of $5,000,000. Add to that $5,000,000 the deficit of $4,500,000, and you have $9,500,000, from which if you deduct the sinking fund, you will have for the current year an addition to the debt of $7,300,000. Now, Sir, if we take the debt addition from 1890 up to the end of 1895 on this basis, it will amount to $15,952,987. But there is this point to be considered by the House, as it will, of course, be considered by the country, that taking the three articles of glass, anthracite coal and sugar, there have been taken off by the reduction of duties in the way of glass, the removal of duties on anthracite coal and on sugar in those years, the sum of $23,656,270. So that had the duty on glass, anthracite coal and sugar been kept exactly as it was in 1890—or in the case of anthracite coal the duty which was removed a few years earlier—the account would stand thus : that the people would have paid into the treasury $23,656,270 of taxation, which would have extinguished the debt addition of $15,952,987, and left seven and three-quarter millions as available to decrease the public debt. I say, Sir, without fear of successful contradiction, that you cannot find an example in the history of a modern country where, in five years, so large a reduction and removal of taxation has taken place as has taken place in the Dominion of Canada since the year 1890.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What a calamity.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will not treat this matter with levity.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The public will not.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I am quite sure the public will not ; the public will appreciate the statement that is now being made. There are some considerations which, at this stage, I wish briefly to present to the House as to the general condition of the country in the year which has passed, and for better comparison, in the series of years that has passed, during which we may be said to have been passing through a period of depression in trade and in industry. I do that for two reasons : in the first place, for the sake of having a true and clear conception of what has actually been the results ; and in the second place, of setting that true and clear conception against what is given throughout the country in the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposed to us, as being indications of a period of distress arising from a bad trade policy, and bad government management, such as Canada has never before, in their own words, experienced or passed through. Sir, one of the very best indications of the condition of a country is the position that its credit takes and maintains in the money markets of the world. Now, Sir, it so happens that in the very midst of the depression and demoralization of trade which has been visiting the world, and visiting Canada to a certain extent, it became necessary, in October,

1894, for Canada to put a loan upon the London market. That loan was put on the market in the midst of financial and trade depression which had had the effect of loading a large amount of money, an almost unprecedentedly large amount, into the vaults of London, money, Sir, which would not be tempted out of its hiding or hoarding place, except by the very best of securities, and consequently affording the best test of the condition of the securities of a country which came for a loan to that market. At a time when the colonial securities were at their lowest, when the securities of our sister colonies were very low indeed, when Canadian trade was decreasing, and our revenue was diminishing, the monthly statements to that effect being in the hands of the moneyed men in London to be read and known by all, when the value of securities was never so carefully investigated and so keenly weighed, and when good securities stood for something in the period of their best testing time, a loan was put on behalf of Canada on the British market of two and a quarter millions at 3 per cent, at a minimum of 95. What happened? This, that the tenders received for that loan were the most widely distributed and had the widest scope among real, individual, bona fide investors of any loan that has ever been placed by Canada on the British market. No less than 566 different tenders were sent in for that loan. Although two and a quarter millions were asked for, nearly twelve millions of pounds were offered. The highest went at £99 12s. 6d. or nearly par, nearly 50 per cent of it went at £97 8s. 6d., while the average was £97 9s. 2d.; and when you take the discount and cost and calculate the rate of interest, it appears to be 3⅛ per cent, the best loan that was ever placed on the British market by Canada. Now, that counts for something; and the mere recital of that fact will go further than many hours of windy declamation and strong assertion which may be indulged in by the enemies of Canada, or by its professed friends for political and party purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has not, I believe, placed the prospectus of the loan on the Table of the House yet.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I will bring it over. A short time after that, the United States put an issue of bonds on the market, and the rate of interest which those bear and which the United States have to pay is within a fraction, in fact I think it is absolutely, 3¾ per cent, whilst the Canadian loan went on the British market at 3⅛ per cent. If we look at the difference in the circumstances we may find certain reasons why the loan of the United States went at a higher rate than it otherwise might have gone; but the fact remains that a great country like the United States, putting out an issue of sixty millions of bonds, the payment of which was undoubtedly secure, have had to pay 3¾ per cent, while Canada pays but 3⅛ per cent on her loan. Another evidence of the condition of Canada is to be found in its savings.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bothwell says "hear, hear." He does not believe that such is the case—he treats the idea with contempt. But when his colleague was Minister of Finance from 1874-78, he did not treat an argument like that with contempt; he put it forward as a very strong point in favour of a better condition of affairs than some of his opponents argued as existing. The hon. gentleman thinks a great deal of Liberal traditions, of Liberal precedents and Liberal principles as they are exemplified by the present Government in Great Britain, and he has only to read the telegraphic despatches of the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer yesterday to find that he went into an elaborate argument to show that the position of Great Britain was not so bad as had been stated, and the argument on which he relied was the increase in the savings of the people. Without doubt it is an argument which has weight. How does that hold with respect to Canada? Simply in this way, that whilst from 1874 to 1878 there was a decrease during that period of hard times, which may be compared with the period through which we have been passing, of $353,057, or 4½ per cent; yet in the five corresponding years in Canada there has been an increase of $41,271,908, or an increase of 21 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I ask the Finance Minister of what the forty-one million consist? Does the hon. gentleman mean the Government Savings' Bank deposits?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I mean all the savings of the people, Post Office Savings' Bank, the Dominion Savings' Bank, savings in our chartered banks, on deposit, on call or for a fixed time, and of the District Savings' Bank of Montreal

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And loan societies?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not include them in that comparison, although I might do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The failures are also a fair indication of the condition of the country. What do we find to be the result in Canada? In 1890 the failures for the year, according to Dun, Wiman & Co.'s. report, represented liabilities of eighteen million dollars; in 1894, there were $17,600,000, or a decrease of 2 1-5 per cent; the same authority gives the liabilities in 1874 as $7,696,000, and in 1878 as $23,908,000, an increase of 210 per

cent. If hon. members will take a fairer comparison, and take the average from 1874 to 1878, they will find that it was $22,297,000, while the average from 1890 to 1894, was only $15,690,000, there being a yearly average in excess during the period from 1874 to 1878 of $6,500,000 as compared with the period from 1890 to 1894. We can also take up the condition of trade, and I am here to say that the condition represented by the results arrived at, from a careful comparison of the course of trade in Canada during the last five or six years, is eminently favourable, and is one of which we have no reason to be otherwise than proud. Let us take the trade of last year. It shows for last year an export increase to Great Britain of $4,500,000, to France of 100 per cent, although the amount is not very large----

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Still it is an increase, and I am very sorry to find the leader of the Opposition has nothing but ridicule to pour on any attempt to increase our trade with France. Surely he must have forgotten the province from which he comes. There is an increase in exports to Germany from three-quarters of a million to two millions; there was also an increase with Spain, Italy, Belgium, Newfoundland, the West Indies, South America, China and Japan, Australasia and other countries; and the only decrease in our exports last year was to the United States, a large decrease, and to Portugal, and a very slight decrease with our trade with Holland. I say that hon. members may look over the history of our trade returns and they cannot find in any previous year a state of things showing such a universal and widely extended increase in our exports to the different countries with which we trade as is found in the statement I made of our trade of last year. As to our imports, there is an increase in our trade with Germany, Spain, Italy, Newfoundland, South America, China and Japan, and Switzerland, and remarkable to say, there is a decrease in our exports to the United States of $8,000,000, and a decrease of imports of $5,000,000, being $13,000,000 in all, but which will be remedied somewhat, I have no doubt, when the era of extremely low prices passes and the effects of lessened tariff, owing to the legislation of Congress last year, are felt. There is an increase with our trade of Germany from $4,576,000 to $7,887,000 in a single year, or an increase of over 72 per cent. Sir, it will be found that in 1889, which was about the time that this wave of depression commenced to flow over the world, the exports from Canada were of a value of $89,000,000. You will find them last year one hundred and seventeen and a half millions, an increase of twenty-eight and one-half million dollars ($28,500,000) for that period. What more? The exports last year were, by value, $117,500,000, the largest of any year since confederation, with the exception of 1893, when they were one hundred and eighteen and a half millions ($118,500,000), but if you take the decrease in price into consideration, it is evident and cannot be gainsaid, that the volume and bulk of exports last year was the highest since confederation. Take imports, if you please. In 1889 they amounted to one hundred and nine and a half millions ($109,500,000); they amounted last year to one hundred and thirteen millions ($113,000,000), an increase in the period of three and a half millions ($3,500,000), not taking into account the decreased prices, and consequently there was an increased volume or bulk. Now, I say that the volume of trade in 1894, taking exports and imports, was as high as in any preceding year in the history of confederation, and I say that if prices had been equal to what they were five years ago even, that these trade returns of last year would be in value what they are in bulk and volume: the largest of any of the years during which the Dominion has been carrying on its business. There is another indication, a very good indication, the indication which is shown by the great carriers of the country. Take the railroads and the shipping, and what do we find? We find that from 1889 to 1894, the railway mileage has increased from 12,628 to 15,620, the mileage travelled from 38,800,000 to 43,700,000, the passengers carried from twelve and one-fifth millions (12,200,000) to fourteen and a half millions (14,500,000), the tons of freight carried from eighteen millions to twenty and seven-tenths millions, and the earnings from $42,000,000 to $49,500,000. And comparing the earnings, the freight carried, and the passengers carried this last year with the two preceding years below which they come, they still fall short of these two years by an exceedingly small amount compared with which the decreases in the United States are far and away above the decreases that have occurred in Canada. If you take the coasting vessels and the tonnage trade of the country, what do you find as well? You find that there has been a constant increase in the tonnage of vessels in and out, exclusive of coasting. In 1890 it was 18,446,000 tons, in 1892, 18,692,000 tons, and in 1894, 20,353,000 tons. Certainly, the tonnage is increasing, and if it goes and it comes, it is fair to suppose that it is carrying backwards and forwards. If you take the tonnage of coasting vessels in and out, the same increase is shown, namely, 22,797,000 in 1890, and 26,560,000 in 1894. Sir, you can take something else to show what has been operating during these five years that some look upon as a peculiar time of stress and trial in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But they are deluded.

Mr. FOSTER. A good many of them are deluded. Some of them see their delusion and others are so blind that they cannot see it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister sees it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The per capita of Customs collection in 1888-89 was $5.01 per head, while the per capita of Customs collection in 1893-94 was $3.82 per head, or a reduction of $1.19 per head of the people in the amount that they have paid for Customs comparing 1889 with 1893, and yet the imports in 1893-94 were larger than the imports in 1888-89. Taking the per cent of imports dutiable and free for home consumption, in 1888-89, it was 21·65 per cent, while in 1893-94 it has been reduced to 17·13 per cent, a decrease of 4½ per cent in the rate of Customs impost during these years. Take the actual duties collected on $109,673,447 of imports in 1889, namely, $23,784,523, and take the duties collected upon the $113,000,000 in 1893-94, which amounted to $19,379,822, and you have a saving upon an importation larger by three and a half millions, amounting to $4,404,701 in Customs imposts alone. That reduction has been going on in taxation. That has not been coming out of the pockets of the people, and it is due to the fact of the reductions in taxation that we made when the revenue was buoyant, and it is therefore so much remitted to the people. Take this one other consideration. If the same percentage of Customs, 21·65, which was collected in 1889-90 had been collected every year since then, there would have been paid in Customs duties $125,112,895. As it is, there was paid in $108,588,092, leaving a saving to the people of $16,524,803 by the reduction in the tax rate from 21·65 to 17·13. Taking leave of this, which I call the absolute view of the condition of Canada, let me summarize it in brief in this way. In five years the imports have increased in value by $3,500,000, and they have increased in volume by a large amount, of course, owing to the decrease in value. The exports have increased in value by $28,000,000, and in volume, of course, much more, and are in 1894, as I said, the highest in value since confederation, with the exception of 1893, and the highest in volume of any year in our history. We have net surpluses during that period from 1890 to 1894-95 of $7,476,843. We have taken off taxation on sugar alone, $14,000,000; we have taken off taxation on two other articles to the amount of three and three-quarter million dollars, and we have taken off a large amount on items generally in the tariff, the revision of which took place last year. We have increased the debt by $8,600,000. The interest on the public debt, however, has been increased by only $100,000, I mean the net interest; while the per capita net interest has fallen from $1.86 to $1.79. No banks have fallen in that period in Canada through the stress of hard times, not one. Our industries have been well maintained. Want and poverty have been practically unknown in Canada, and comparatively the Canadian people have outridden the storm with vessel less battered and sails less tattered than any other country in the world. And in the very midst of the financial and business tempest, Canada ran her flag of credit in the very centre of London up to the very highest notch from which it has been unfurled from the time the Canadian provinces united. The tide, I believe, has now turned. Prices are recovering, confidence is growing, trade is increasing, the demand of the consumer is strengthening, revenue is beginning to mend, as I have pointed out; and working on her well laid basis of rich and varied resources; with the wide facilities for transport with which Canada is splendidly equipped, with a sound fiscal policy, a careful, prudent, financial management, Canada is today emerging from the temporary and not very dark clouds of depression into a brightness of prosperity which shall surely surpass any period in her previous history. Now, Sir, there is another view which may be taken of trade. You may look on this matter relatively. You may compare Canada with other countries of the world—and let me ask your attention while I do that, very briefly. If you look over the great trading countries of the world—Great Britain, France, the United States, the Australian colonies—what has been the history of their trading during these five or six years of which I have been speaking? Briefly, it is this: Great Britain's exports of domestic manufactures in 1890 amounted to £263,530,585; they have steadily decreased, until, in 1894, they amounted to £216,194,239, a falling off of £47,336,346, or $230,370,217. The imports into Great Britain have fallen off from £420,691,997, in 1890, to £408,505,718, in 1894, a fall of £12,186,279, or, in round numbers, $60,000,000. The exports of France have fallen in the same period from £150,136,000 to £131,001,000; and those of Germany have fallen from £166,405,000 to £158,000,000. The exports of the United States have fallen from $1,015,732,011, in 1892, to $869,204,937 in 1894; and the exports of the Australian colonies have fallen from £72,500,000, in 1891, to £65,000,000, in 1893. The imports of France have fallen from £177,476,000, in 1890, to £164,779,000, in 1894; those of Germany have fallen from £208,105,000, in 1890, to £198,000,000, in 1893; those of the United States have fallen from $827,402,462, in 1892, to $654,994,622, in 1894; and those of the Australian colonies have fallen from £72,000,000, in 1891, to £53,000,000, in 1893. Reduce these figures to percentages, and

you have this surprising fact: That in Great Britain the decrease in exports from 1890 to 1894 has been 18 per cent; in France, 13 per cent; in Germany, 5 per cent; in the United States, 15 per cent; and in Australasia, 10 per cent; while, in the same time, the exports of Canada have increased 22 per cent. The imports of Great Britain have fallen off 3 per cent; those of France have fallen off 7 per cent; those of Germany have increased 2 per cent; those of the United States have fallen 21 per cent; and those of Australasia have fallen 26 per cent; while the imports of Canada as to value, are exactly where they were in 1890. There is another point of view which we may take—that is, to compare Canada with herself, which is a more satisfactory comparison, so far as the truth goes, though it may not be so pleasant to all of us. From 1874 to 1878 there was a period of acknowledged depression in this country. It has often been spoken about since that time. It has formed a subject of comment from many a hustings and platform, and has been written upon occasionally by the editors of newspapers. But, of late, one set of speakers, and one set of newspaper editors have begun to say and to write that the period from 1890 to 1894, in depression and hard times, and general badness in Canada, far eclipses the period from 1874 to 1878. Let us go to the law and the testimony. In April, 1874, the Finance Minister of that time made his Budget speech in this House, standing about where I do. In that speech, looking back and taking leave of 1872-73, he spoke of it as "the last year of plenty," with a surplus of $1,600,000. Of 1873-74, in the midst of which he stood, he said :

> We have stood still, but we have not retrograded. Although we may fairly expect that our people will grow rapidly in wealth, we cannot look for any great increase in their numbers. To avoid serious deficits, a very large amount of additional taxes will be necessary.

He provided for $3,000,000 additional taxation, and in that year, 1873-74, his expenditure went up by about $4,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He says he was not responsible for it; but that is what the Public Accounts show. His additional $3,000,000 of taxes brought his surplus down from $1,600,000 to $888,775, in the year 1873-74, and to $935,644, in 1874-75. His capital expenditure amounted to $10,000,000, and his addition to the debt to $8,476,502, in 1873-74, and to $7,683,000, in 1874-75, and his trade fell $17,000,000. In February, 1875, he made his second Budget speech. He dandled his diminishing surplus upon his financial knees, and prophesied that next year it would be no smaller. He excused the falling imports by proving that diminution was not retrogression—a fact which he must bear in mind at present. He comforted commercial men by hoping that they would find "new fields of trade which would partially compensate them for that which we have for the present failed to obtain from our friends on the other side of the line." In February, 1876, he spoke again, commencing by saying :

> It would be both idle and dishonest on my part to attempt to conceal from the House that the circumstances under which we meet are such as to deserve our very gravest consideration. It is, unfortunately, too true that we are now passing, and have been passing for several months, through a commercial crisis of great and almost unparalleled severity. * * * * There are cases of great hardship existing in the country.

We were, he said, in the midst of "a commercial squall or tornado, if you will"—$20,000,000 less trade for the previous year; $700,000 more expenditure imminent; face to face with a greater fallen trade, a greater loss in revenue, and a greater increase of expenditure. He could only console himself with the comforting intimation that though "depression has overtaken the manufacturing and commercial interests of the country," yet shrinkage in value was a matter which it was impossible "for him or any other Finance Minister to guard against in advance"; and that "as they (the people) get better bargains for their money than before, it is, on the whole, an advantage, and not an injury to the people"; and, therefore, that "what is bad for the revenue is, on the whole, good for the country." Driven by his opponents as to his trade policy, he declared :

> It does not matter whether your market is four millions or forty millions or four hundred millions, over-production will always produce distress. Nor does it much matter for that particular purpose whether free trade or protection is the policy.

And with these excuses, and these platitudes, he marched on to the doleful tune of a two-million deficit, a twenty-seven million drop in trade, a three-quarter of a million increase in expenditure, and an eight and a half million addition to the debt. In February, 1877, he came to the front again, and declared "that the year 1875-76 was one of an exceedingly critical character, which would be long remembered in our financial history." Well it might be. Trade was diminishing, and went on to diminish. Revenue was decreasing, and gave no hope or anticipation of rising again. The only things that were rising were the taxes and the debt, and they were rising with dizzy rapidity. Still, the Finance Minister at that time was hopeful. He pitched his song to a cheerful key, and said "there was good reason for supposing that we had seen probably the last of the depression." He marshalled the facts of increased circulation, deposits in the savings banks, life insurance growth, exports, and

the consumption of sugar and tea, as being reasons why the country was not in so bad a condition after all. He then praised his loan, bearing four per cent interest, issued at ninety-one and costing 4·75 per cent, laid on further taxation of about half a million dollars, ventured the prediction that the ship of state was weathering the storm, and drawing moderately close to clear water, and proceeded to bask in the after-glow of past deficits, and to warm himself by anticipation in the coming effulgence of the one and a half million deficit that was dawning upon him. In 1878 he opened with a financial jeremiad such as had never before been, and never again will, I hope, be indulged in by a Finance Minister.

It is nearly four years since, as Minister of Finance, it became my unpleasant duty to point out to the House the grave financial difficulties which beset our position, and the necessity of submitting to considerably increased taxation if desired to provide for the liabilities we had incurred. Unhappily, grave as were the forebodings I then expressed the depression which actually took place surpassed the extent of that upon which I had calculated. It is not often in the commercial history of any country that we are called upon to chronicle so great a reduction not merely in the total volume of our trade, but also in the revenue derived therefrom, as we have seen within the last two or three years.

He declared that the volume of trade had been reduced by $50,000,000, and the customs revenue by $3,000,000. But, worse than that, he declared that the natural growth of trade has been retarded $30,000,000 to $40,000,000 more and the revenue correspondingly; and when he again gave notice of a deficit, and when his announcement was greeted by laughter and smiles from more than one in the Chamber, he rebuked them with great gravity for their unseemly levity in smiling at the mention of a deficit. That is the picture, as painted by the Finance Minister of that period himself, from 1874 to 1878. He announced the deficit of one and a half millions for the year 1876-77, an addition to the debt of $8,700,000, and laid down the weapons of his warfare in 1878, with a deficit of over a million in esse and another of nearly two millions in prospect, with expenditure increased by one million and the debt by another seven millions. After all I have quoted, we may hope that now, when we have just passed through a commercial depression, but one which, I contend, was not so severe——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Passed through?

Mr. FOSTER—Yes, for I believe firmly we have passed through that depression and turned the corner, and that from this time on, affairs will mend. I do not give my own authority alone for that. Not at all. But there is not a financial paper in the United States, there is not a responsible newspaper in Canada, commercial or otherwise, which does not every day contain editorials and statements in its news and financial columns, giving exactly the same forecast and prediction. To sum the whole matter up, and I put it in the form of a table which can be easily used for ready reference, take the two periods of 1874-79 and 1889-94:

1874-79.		1889-94.	
Exports fell	$ 18,000,000	Exports rose	$ 28,000,000
Imports (H. C.) fell	46,000,000	Imports (H. C.) rose	3,500,000
Decreased duty collected	1,500,000	Decreased duty collected	4,400,000
Taxes increased by tariff	1,500,000	Taxes decreased by tariff	6,000,000
Percentage of duty increased	4 p.c.	Percentage of duty decreased	4·5 p.c.
Debt increased	40,000,000	Debt increased	8,650,000
Net interest on public debt increased.	1,500,000	Net interest of debt increased	100,000
Net per capita interest increased	$1.34 to $1.59	Net per capita interest decreased	$1.86 to $1.79
Credit, index per loan at 4 p.c	4·75	Credit, index per last loan at 3 p.c.	3·16
Net deficits	5,500,000	Net surplus	7,500,000
Average of failures	22,100,000	Average of failures	15,500,000
Increase in failures, liabilities	210 p.c.	Decrease in failures, liabilities	2¼ p.c.
Remission of taxes	Nil.	Remission of taxes: sugar, coal, glass	18,000,000
Savings decreased	4·5 p.c.	Savings increased	40 p.c.

After taking discounts, commission, and all charges into account—a large list—he put upon the market in London a loan at a net rate of interest of 4·75, which the country has been paying ever since. The last credit loan marks for the second period, 3·16 per cent. The net deficits in the first period, was five and a half million dollars; the net surplus of the second period is seven and a half million dollars. The average failures in the first period amounted to twenty-two and one-fifth million dollars, and in the second period, fifteen and one-half million dollars. The increase in failures and liabilities on account of failures, in the first period, was 210 per cent; the decrease in the second period was 2¼ per cent. The savings decreased 4½ per cent in the first period, and increased 40 per cent in the second period. There was no remission of duties in the first period, but a constant laying on of burdens. In the second period, the remission on coal and sugar and glass amounts to $18,000,000. Now, I shall ask the attention of the House for a moment to the position of our debt, and I wish to

put upon record a simple and brief statement, so that any one who reads that statement may not fall into the error that the whole of the debt, as it exists to-day, has been incurred by the Dominion for Dominion purposes, and I wish as well to show briefly the purposes for which the debt has been incurred. There was assumed for the four provinces, in 1867, $77,500,000 of debt. There has been assumed for the provinces, since—and that is something with which nobody quarrels, because it is a subsidy to the provinces to help the provincial governments to carry on their legislation, relieved them of the necessity of imposing heavier taxes—there has been assumed since then an additional debt of $31,930,148, making a total of $109,430,148 assumed on behalf of the provinces. The total net debt on 30th June, 1894, amounts to $246,183,029. Deducting from this the amount assumed for the provinces, and you have a net Dominion debt, from 1867 to date, incurred by the Dominion for Dominion purposes, amounting to $136,752,881. This gives a yearly average of a little over five million dollars. What have we to set against that? Upon the Intercolonial, more than 1,000 miles in length, the capital expenditure has been $44,966,424. On our canals, the great waterway and artery of the central part of this Dominion, at the expenditure on which nobody cavils—nobody would be content as a Canadian if these canals did not exist, and if they were not deepened and improved to suit the needs of commerce—on our canals we have expended $41,709,038. And the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was reviled and abused and looked upon as the most desperate scheme that sensible men ever conceived and placed before a body of legislators, but which has approved itself, which has shown its utility, which has established its essential necessity to this country, so that to-day you can find no two opinions as to the advisability of completing that road and as to the wisdom of the policy of constructing it—upon that work we expended in capital $62,604,535. This makes a total of $149,279,997. That is to say, on these three works alone, the commercial arteries and veins of this country, we have expended $12,527,116 more than the whole debt created by this country since confederation, outside of provincial allowances. Besides that we have the Dominion lands opened up. We have the public works that have been built, we have the parliament and public buildings; we have the Prince Edward Island Railway; we have the Northwest Territories purchased and opened up and other services and works representing in connection with railways and canals, a grand total of capital expenditure of $166,369,288. Thus you will find that $28,616,407 more than has been added to the Dominion debt has been expended on capital account for the services of this country. Now, Sir, that is a plain statement of the debt as it stands, and, taking that into account and the assets, the first three items that I have mentioned, if there were no more, there is sufficient justification for the assumption and maintenance of a net debt of $137,000,000. When you come to another view of the case there is something more to be said. If you will take the actual interest, you will find that whereas in 1868 we paid 4·51 per cent, in 1894 we paid 2·91 per cent. The net interest paid per head, 1868, was $1.29; in 1873 it was $1.31; in 1878 it was $1.58; in 1889, $1.86; and in 1894 it was $1.79, or 7 cents less than in 1889. The cheapening of money, the lowering of the rate of interest makes the burden of the debt smaller in proportion to the size of the debt, so that at the present time, with our credit, we can carry almost twice the amount of debt that we could have carried in 1867, and have the per capita burden no more. The net interest paid in 1888-9 was $8,843,539, and in 1894, $8,994,788, only about $100,000 of an increase. Standing at this point and looking out upon the future, we are confronted with certain obligations and we should not be fair to ourselves, if in making a financial statement we did not include these obligations. I propose to do so. We have obligations current to the amount of $6,543,400; being in the shape of subsidies to the International Railway Company, to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company, to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, to the China and Japan Service Steamships, and to the Australian Service Steamships, which are provided for by yearly appropriation and which amount to $6,543,400. We have railway subsidies under contract of $2,257,059; also railway subsidies granted, but not under contract, which the department tells me will probably come under contract, amounting to $2,587,257. Then, to finish the St. Lawrence Canal system, widening and deepening the canal according to the demands presented by the Minister the other day, we must spend $6,000,000. But as I am taking this from the 1st of July, 1895, I estimate that $5,000,000 will have to be spent after that time. These canals must be finished independent of any consideration of the party in power, as this work is a part of the policy of both parties. This makes a total of these liabilities of $9,844,316. These are liabilities that are current or probable. Now, Sir, that makes outside of what has been and will be provided for in the yearly appropriations, $9,844,316, which will accrue within a period of years not very far distant—within three, four or five years at the farthest. Taking it at four years, that gives an expenditure of $2,461,000 per year on capital account, or very little more than the amount we lay up out of consolidated revenue to make a sinking fund as against the public debt. There is

also a subsidy by special Act to the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway of $250,680, and a transport subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railroad $1,600,000. These fall in the list of contingent liabilities, which, when they accrue will be charged to railway subsidy account. Besides these there is the statutory provision for the Fast Atlantic Service, which, however, when the liability accrues, must be satisfied from consolidated revenue fund, assisted, if necessary, by economies in other services, and which, therefore, will not necessitate a call upon capital, occupying as it will a similar position to the China and Japan and the Australian services. And what I desire to do, what I think it good policy to do, what I am going to strive as earnestly as I can to do, is this: to make the revenue cover current expenses and to bring the capital expenditure, over and above the consolidated revenue surplus, if there be any, to be equal to or not greater than the yearly sinking fund, which, while it will allow a capital expenditure of not less than $2,500,000 from this on, would not increase the debt a single dollar. If that policy can be carried out—and I believe it can be, and that with a generous appropriation as well to the public services—we shall occupy a position which, instead of causing fear, instead of being used to frighten the people of the country into panicky political action, is solid and stable, and one into which any financial man looking dispassionately would say was sound, and clean, and healthy from the point of view of the financial investigator. Now, Sir, we come to another point, the revenue and expenditure for 1895-96. The revenue for 1894-95, as actually accrued and estimated to accrue, will be say $33,800,000. The estimated betterment of revenue for 1895-96—and this is proof of my faith in better times, and I do not think it can be called other than a fair, conservative estimate—is $1,200,000. That is, on the taxation as it exists to-day. That would make a revenue for 1895-96 of $35,000,000. Now, Sir, when——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better divide that last amount, as is customary. State what amount is expected from Customs, and what amount from Excise.

Mr. FOSTER. I have simply lumped the amount, and have not with me the figures of the three items of which this is the total. The Estimates for 1895-96 have been laid before the House. It was the desire of the Government, a desire, I think, which they shared cordially and unitedly that so far as possible under the present condition of things, and until an equilibrium could be established between revenue and expenditure, the expenditures for the coming year should be cut down to as low a point as possible under the present condition of things, consistent with the efficiency of the public service. Now, Sir, an investigation of those estimates will show that there are certain estimates which are statutory, and which we do not vote, and consequently which we cannot change. There are others which we control, such as the revenue collecting branch, but which is only controllable to a certain limited extent, because, if you collect customs, collect excise, collect post office fees, collect fares on your railways and canals, you have to maintain those services in a state of efficiency equal to the advancing needs of the times; so that though you may prune somewhat on those services, they are a set of services which are not under very lively control by the Minister of Finance, or by the Government to any great degree of curtailment. Now, that class of services taken out, and the fixed charges taken out, there is left at the present time not a very large amount for the pruning-knife, and even there you have to be very careful as to how you exercise your economies in order not to destroy or cripple services which are necessary for the country. How is it to-day? For interest on debt, for charges of management, for sinking fund and for Dominion subsidies, which are beyond our control, there is an estimate for the year 1895-96 of $17,131,855. For the collection of the revenue there is an estimate of $9,378,313, and that is a decided cut upon the expenditure of last year, making $26,510,168 for those two sets of charges. That leaves you about 10 or 11 millions of leeway, on expenditures which you may say are controllable. Now, with reference to those, a glance at the Estimates will show that there have been increases in not a single one of them, with the exception of Trade and Commerce, which is an infant department, and even with the slight increase that it has had this year, that department has not grown to undue proportions so far as its clerical work is concerned. Well, Sir, outside of that, Penitentiaries have been cut down $36,000—I am reading round figures—Civil Government, taking into account even the large increase of statutory allowances, has been cut down $30,000; Legislation, $200.000; Arts and Agriculture, $3,400; Quarantine, $33,000; Immigration, $70,000; Pensions, $814; Militia, $263,398; Railways and Canals, $183,058; Public Works, $875,325. In the item of public works we have for a number of years been expending on an average about $2,000,000 per year. When the revenue was buoyant and the treasury was full, we were generous in our appropriations for the public works of the country; and the history of this Government during the time it has been in power since 1878, will show, I think, on the whole, a broad-minded and generous sustenance of the public works of the country, and a disposition to aid them so far as it could possibly be done. My hon. friends smile when there is a little talk about public works, but if I

have a memory which is at all to be relied upon, I think, when my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, accompanied by my hon. and stalwart friend from Nova Scotia, and my hon. and only a little less stalwart friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) and one or two others, made a pilgrimage through the North-west and British Columbia, there was no stopping place at which they did not regale the ears of those who were eager to hear them, with the question : Is there any place around here in need of public work ? and if the reply was in the affirmative, then the people were told, I think you ought to have it, and if the Liberal party gets in, you may look to be fairly treated. On Mail Subsidies there has been a reduction of $32,000 ; Ocean and River Service, $57,000 ; Lighthouse and Coast, $67,000 ; Fisheries, $20,000 ; Geological Survey, $15,000 ; Indians, $85,000 ; Mounted Police, $155,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is that saving effected ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is effected by a reduction of the force, a reduction that will not affect the efficiency of the force so far as the legitimate needs of the country are concerned. The reduction has been rendered possible in two ways : in the first place, the cost of living is constantly decreasing. Years ago when the beef supplies and the like of that had to be taken long distances, the cost was large. Now all this is raised in the country itself, and the cost therefore has diminished. The force is well managed, and the number of men which, up to this time, has been in the neighbourhood of 900, it is proposed to reduce by a number sufficient to bring down the yearly expenditure to the sum which is mentioned in the Estimates. There will still be left a force, I think,—I speak under correction—of about 700 men, and armed as they never were before, with improved rifles and Maxim guns, which makes a smaller force much more effective than even a larger force was without those arms.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not observe an explanation of the reduction on militia.

Mr. FOSTER. That would probably come better on the Estimates when the Minister himself is here. I read the amount, $263,000. In Customs collection there is a reduction of $50,000 ; Excise, $21,000 ; Culling Timber, $25,000 ; Railways and Canals, $21,000 ; Post Office, $18,000 ; Dominion lands, $20,000 ; making a reduction in the Estimates this year, compared with the Estimates as voted last year, of $2,387,648. Now, on the statutories arising from causes that I have mentioned, increased interest on the public debt and management of the debt being the chief one, and the subsidies to provinces, there is an increase of $697,722.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the land board at Winnipeg abolished ?

Mr. FOSTER. We do not abolish the land board at Winnipeg, but we introduce economy into it, and lessen the expenses of the board of management. We have, therefore, a net decrease of $1,600,000, on a total estimate of expenditures, statutory, fixed and controllable, which is as far as the Government felt it possible to go and keep the services on a footing of efficiency. In some of these there can, I think, be very little if any more reduction. It is possible that in some of them a still further reduction might take place. In the item of Civil Government, I have no hesitation in saying that the expenditure is pretty large. We have reduced that this year by a considerable amount, and I am sure I am not speaking beyond the book, when I say that it is the intention of the Government thoroughly to look into the matter, and to make economies where it is possible to make them as regards civil government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to remind the hon. gentleman, before he goes to another subject, that he promised to state what Supplementary Estimates would be required for the service of the present year. He promised, in fact, to bring them down.

Mr. FOSTER. I did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be better, before he goes off the Estimates, to let us know what they are.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell my hon. friend what they are, but I have made my estimate for the expenditure of this year on the basis of the Estimates that we shall provide.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You promised it.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I promised it, but I cannot do everything in a few days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Promise is one thing and performance is another.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then, I understand, there will be Supplementary Estimates in connection with next year ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already stated that there would not be any. Coming back to the revenue and expenditure for 1895-96, I have stated that the revenue expected was $35,000,000 ; the estimate of expenditure is placed at $36,834,458. It is not the rule that the actual expenditure comes up to the full

limit of the Estimates voted, and I have given myself a little leeway in the estimate of expenditure for the next year, which I have placed at $36,700,000. With a revenue of $35,000,000 and an expenditure of $36,700,000, there will be a deficit on the operation of $1,700,000. Now, while it is true that during the past year, whilst the brunt and stress of the depression was sustained by the country, whilst business had everything it could do to struggle manfully, as it did, and fairly successfully with its disadvantages, whilst the people themselves were economizing, it was not thought wise to do anything to add to the burden of the times by imposing increased taxation. And so, as regards the deficit of the past year, and the deficit of the present year, a larger one, it was not proposed, and is not proposed, to replace it by exacting additional taxes from the people. But it becomes a different matter when, having had two deficits and starting out upon the year in advance, with the turn in the tide and the betterment which is visible, I think, on all sides, it becomes a different matter, I say, and a subject for very close and careful consideration whether it is advisable, in point of good financial management, in point of keeping intact the credit of the country, which above all things we must maintain, and keep it up to the present high standard—it becomes a grave question for consideration whether we should go out into another year facing a large or even a considerable deficit. The Government has considered that question, and it has come to the conclusion that it is not the wisest thing to do; that what we have to do as a Government, that what we must do as a House, and in that course we must presume that the country will sustain us, is to establish an equilibrium between expenditure and income, to establish an equilibrium between expenditure and income in the easiest way we can possibly accomplish it, and do it for the sake of benefiting the finances of the country in the future, as the maintenance of our credit is of far-reaching consequence. When the revenues were buoyant and we had large surpluses, this Government dealt with the services of the country generously, and many say lavishly, but that we dealt with the services of the country generously nobody can deny. The Government had surpluses of revenue, and they said, We will carry on the services of the country, but at the same time out of those buoyant revenues we will relieve the people from a portion of the taxation. And they did it. In 1890 and 1891 the tax on raw sugar, as we in the House well know, was taken off, and that benefit was conferred on the people of the country, a benefit which will fully appear when I read the figures of the imports since that time, and make a calculation of what would have accrued at that rate of duty. In 1891, under the new tariff, there were imported fourteen million odd pounds of sugar, the duty on which, taking an average of the old rate, would have been $227,474; in 1892 the quantity was 327,000,000 pounds, the duty on which would have been $5,200,000; in 1893 the quantity was 252,500,000 pounds, the duty on which would have been $4,000,000; in 1894 the quantity was 303,000,000 pounds, the duty on which would have been $4,821,000; in 1895 the actual import and the estimated receipts on the same basis would have shown, imports, 310,000,000 pounds, the duty on which at the old rate would have been $4,919,700. That relates to the article of sugar alone, the tax on which was paid certainly out of the consumers' pockets, it being a tax not on an article grown in the country, but on a raw product brought in, the tax on which must be paid by the consumer of the article. If hon. members will add these items together, they will find that the remission of sugar taxation in those years, including the current year, aggregates $19,175,333. Some one may fairly say, that if the duty had remained at the old rate, there would not have been so large an importation. Cutting off whatever proportion you please, you will still have an amount of from $15,000,000 to $19,000,000 removed from the people's shoulders. This has been operative during the time when we had surplus, and also during the time when the people, especially during the past two years, having been passing through a period of depression, and what have been called hard times in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, the country, I think, will not quarrel with the Government if, when the time has come when we think it best for the credit of the country and its general good, to secure an equilibrium between expenditure and revenue, when we show our bona fides by cutting down the controllable expenditure of the country to the extent of $2,400,000, and we have just done our duty in that regard—I think the country will not complain, and this House will not complain, if we ask the people in the year that is to come not to pay back to us an equivalent of the old rate of duty on sugar, but to give us one-third of the amount of duty placed on it before 1891, thus securing to the people a remission of two-thirds of the taxation on sugar for the future, and asking them simply for a return equivalent to one-third of the old impost. So it is proposed to place one-half cent per pound on raw sugar, and to increase the protection upon refined sugar and the articles into which sugar largely enters proportionately, and only proportionately, to the increased tax of half a cent on raw sugar. That on the imports which will probably come into the country this year will give $1,200,000 or $1,250,000. That is not quite all we want. We must be care-

ful if we are going to place taxes on the people for the avowed purpose of filling up the gap between revenue and expenditure, not to make the mistake which my hon. friend opposite made, when he put on a large taxation, but yet did not fill the gap. We must add enough to restore the equilibrium, we must be sure that it will be enough, and we must take a little more than we estimate at the present time to be enough in order to be certain that what we propose to do shall be fully and thoroughly done. So that a little more is necessary, and I propose to impose a slight additional tax upon distilled spirits. The excise duty on distilled spirits is now $1.50 per gallon, and I propose to add 20 per cent per gallon, thus making the excise duty $1.70. The Customs duty on spirits is now $2.12½ per gallon, and I propose to make that $2.25, an increase of 12½ cents. That, I think, will bring into the revenue about $500,000 or $600,000, which will give us $1,700,000 or $1,800,000 increased revenue. This will, under the estimate I have prepared and submitted to the House, fill up the gap, restore the equilibrium, and bring us out at the end of next year with a clean sheet, and if times improve fairly well, may bring us out a little to the good, which certainly will not be deplored by the country. To show the bona fides of the Government in doing their share, and of this House in submitting to its share of the betterment, not only have two and a half millions of dollars been taken from the controllable estimates of the country for the year, but we propose as well to intermit for the succeeding year what we have been in the habit of giving with a generous hand namely, the aid by way of mileage subsidies to railways to be constructed. From 1884, when the policy was first adopted, until the present time we have expended over $12,000,000 in payments for these railway subsidies; that is an average of about $1,200,000 per year. There are these running and current which I have spoken of, which we will gradually wipe off the slate: but for the coming year it is felt that it would be imprudent to add to the list of our liabilities by bringing down any railway subsidy Bill granting mileage subsidies for the construction of railways in the country. These then, briefly, sum up the position which the Government assumes, and the action which it recommends to this House, an action which it believes is dictated by prudence and by a desire not to overburden the country, but at the same time to keep its public services well supplied, public services which in a time like this, with our first-rate equipment and first-rate facilities, we may fairly dispense with increasing for a year or two, while times are as they are. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to thank you and the House very heartily for the forbearance with which you have listened to my rather long exposition. I have here the resolutions, they have just been put into my hands, and I would rather revise them before I definitely lay them upon the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well; you can lay them on the Table at eight o'clock. We will call it six o'clock now.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Bankers' Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Sir Donald Smith.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the St. John River Bridge Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the James Maclaren Company (Limited).—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Deschênes Bridge Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Canadian Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Featherston.)

Bill (No. 33) to grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, and to change the name of the company to the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 38) to incorporate the Hamilton Distillery Company (Limited).—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. McKay.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, all that I shall have to do at the present time is simply to mention the resolutions which I propose to place before the committee. As I intimated in the remarks I made this afternoon, there is to be imposed and levied on distilled spirits an additional excise duty of 20 cents per gallon, and the first resolution makes provision for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you got the resolutions printed?

Mr. FOSTER. They are in type-writing, not printed. The second resolution simply repeals the sections of the present Tariff Act which are to be rearranged. Then follow the resolutions with reference to the addition of 12½ cents per gallon on imported spirituous liquors. Then, there are a certain number of articles into which sugar enters more or less largely. As the duty is increased upon sugar, it becomes necessary to make a corresponding adjustment with reference to these; and, as nearly as possible, I have made just the proportional increase. Condensed milk, which was 3 cents a pound, will be 3¼ cents. Condensed coffee, and such like goods, will be 35 per cent instead of 30 per cent. Sweetened biscuits, which were 25 per cent, will be 27½ per cent. Fruits, which were 2 cents a pound, will be 2¼ cents. Fruits, preserved in brandy or in spirits, which were $1.90, will be $2.00. Paints and colours, ground in spirits, and spirit varnish and lacquers, which were $1, will be $1.12½. Jellies, jams, and preserves, which were 3 cents, will be 3¼ cents. All sugar, above sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars, will be 1 14-100 cent a pound. Sugar not above sixteen Dutch standard, will be ½ cent a pound. Glucose, or grape sugar, which is 1 cent a pound, becomes 1¼ cent. Sugar candy, and sweet things, which were 35 per cent, become ½ cent a pound, and 35 per cent. Syrups and molasses of all kinds, which were ½ cent a pound, become ¾ cent. Molasses, which was 1½ cent a gallon at the standard test, becomes 1¾ cent. Then follows a resolution with reference to beet root sugar. For several years before the abolition of the sugar duties we had operations carried on in beet root sugar making; and when the duty was removed from raw sugar, a bounty, equivalent to nearly 2 cents a pound, about the equivalent of the duty on raw sugar, which was taken off, was granted to beet root sugar, and that has been continued from time to time. It is proposed to continue that for two years; but, instead of giving 2 cents a pound bounty, it is proposed now to give 1 cent a pound by way of bounty, and ½ cent by way of duty, making the total aid to the beet root industry, 1½ cents a pound. The following are the resolutions:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend Section 130 of Chapter 34 of the Act 49 Victoria (the Inland Revenue Act), as amended by Section 4 of Chapter 46 of the Act 54-55 Victoria, by repealing such section and substituting in lieu thereof, as follows:—

130. There shall be imposed, levied and collected on all spirits distilled, the following duties of excise, which shall be paid to the collector of Inland Revenue, as herein provided, that is to say:—

(a.) When the material used in the manufacture thereof consists of not less than ninety per cent by weight, of raw or unmalted grain—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and seventy cents;

(b.) When manufactured exclusively from malted barley, taken to the distillery in bond, and on which no duty of customs or excise has been paid, or when manufactured from raw or unmalted grain, used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or of excise has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and seventy-two cents;

(c.) When manufactured exclusively from molasses, syrup, sugar, or other saccharine matter, taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and seventy-three cents.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act 57-58 Victoria, Chapter 33, "An Act to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs" by repealing the following mentioned items of the Schedule "A" to the said Act, viz.: Nos. 7, 31, 32, 55, 80, 81, 82, 152, 392, 393, 394, 396 and 397, and No. 708 of the Schedule "B" to the said Act, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:—

7. Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water, for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when at a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at a rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, but all such liquors shall be computed as of the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, as follows:—

(a.) Ethyl, alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine; gin of all kinds, n.e.s.; rum, whisky and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p.; amyl alcohol or fusel oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naptha, pyroxylic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.e.s.; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon.

(b.) Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients as being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, n.e.s., two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(c.) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in

bottles or flasks containing not more than four ounces each, fifty per cent ad valorem ; when in bottles, flasks, or other packages, containing more than four ounces each, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon and forty per cent ad valorem.

(d.) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(e.) Vermouth containing not more than thirty per cent, and ginger wine containing not more than twenty-six per cent of proof spirits, eighty cents per gallon ; if containing more than these percentages, respectively, of proof spirits, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon.

31. Condensed milk, three and one-quarter cents per pound.

32. Condensed coffee, condensed coffee with milk, milk foods and all similar preparations, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

55. Biscuits of all kinds not sweetened, twenty-five per cent ad valorem; biscuits of all kinds sweetened, twenty-seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.

79. Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages, two and one-quarter cents per pound, the weight on which duty shall be payable to include the weight of the cans or other packages.

80. Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, two dollars per gallon.

82. Jellies, jams and preserves, n.e.s., three and one-quarter cents per pound.

152. Paints and colours, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, one dollar and twelve and a half cents per gallon.

392. All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, one cent and fourteen hundredths of one cent per pound ; sugar, n.e.s., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete, one-half cent per pound ; the usual packages in which imported to be free.

393. Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and corn syrup, or any syrups containing any admixture thereof, one and one-quarter cents per pound.

394. Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, including sweetened gums, candied peel, and pop-corn, one-half cent per pound and thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

396. Syrups and molasses of all kinds, n.o.p., the product of the sugar cane or beet root, n.e.s., and all imitations thereof or substitutes therefor, three-quarters of a cent per pound.

397. Molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of cane sugar from the juice of the cane, when imported in the original packages, from the district where produced, in the country where the cane was grown, and which has not been subjected to any process of treating or mixture after leaving the country from which originally shipped, the packages in which imported, when of wood, to be free—

(a.) Testing by polariscope, forty degrees or over, one and three-quarter cents per gallon.

(b.) When testing by polariscope less than forty degrees and not less than thirty-five degrees, one and three-quarter cents per gallon, and in addition thereto, one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

Resolved, That it is expedient so to amend the Act 54-55 Victoria, Chapter 31, as amended by the Act 55-56 Victoria, Chapter 8, so as to provide that under such regulations and restrictions as may be made by the Governor in Council there may be paid to the producers of any beet root sugar produced in Canada wholly from beets grown therein between the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, and the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, a bounty equal to seventy-five cents per one hundred pounds, and in addition thereto one cent per one hundred pounds for each degree or fraction of a degree of test by polariscope over seventy degrees, such bounty in no case, however, to exceed in the aggregate one dollar per one hundred pounds.

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the Duties of Customs and of Excise on articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after the third day of May instant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think every hon. gentleman who has had a seat in this House for a period of three years and upwards must have been very much struck by an extraordinary and unprecedented omission in the speech of the hon. gentleman. For the first time, certainly for the first time since he has been in the House and occupied his present position—I may say for the first time for the last sixteen years—a speech has been made on the Budget, and it has contained no laudation of the National Policy whatever. The poor, old fetish has been laid on the shelf, and none so low as to pay it reverence now. And I do not wonder at it. Like some other things with which the hon. gentleman is acquainted, it has served its turn, it has been the ladder by which the hon. gentleman and certain other parties have climbed to preferment, and now, I suppose it is going to be ignominiously kicked down. There is another very curious thing in the hon. gentleman's speech. Heretofore, ever since Sir Leonard Tilley came to the rescue of Sir John Macdonald, their doctrine has been that they made the people rich by imposing taxes. But now, there is a new departure. A change has come over the spirit of the hon. gentleman's dream, and he takes great credit for making people rich by taking taxes off. And there is a vast deal more to be said for his latter than for his former doctrine. Then there is another very curious admission—curious to me, but not so curious to those who have not been as long in the House as I have—it is the involuntary admission wrung from the hon. gentleman by the necessity of making a case. According to the hon. gentleman, the present crisis is a mere trifle compared with that which prevailed from 1873 to 1878. He is not altogether wrong about that. But it is passing strange that the distinguished gentleman who preceded him and surrounded him did not discover it before. It is true that the position, not of Canada, by any manner of means, but the position of the commercial world, notably the United States, was infinitely worse from 1873 to 1878, than it is to-day. So far, I agree with the hon. getleman. We had an infinitely

worse storm to weather, and we did weather it without creating anything like the deficit which the hon. gentleman has created.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better wait until he hears what I have to say. Probably he does not know much of the financial history of Canada for the last twenty-five years, but before I have done he will have gained some information. Sir, during those three years of financial crisis which the hon. gentleman now tells us was worse than the one we are now passing through, our total deficit amounted to $4,500,000, whereas, this afternoon, the hon. gentleman has informed the House that he expects to have that identical sum as his deficit for the one year. There is another circumstance which it may be worth while to recall to the hon. gentleman. The whole of that deficit of $4,500,000, we extracted out of the pockets of our neighbours on the other side of the line; and let me further tell the hon. gentleman that there is every reason to believe that had he and his colleagues conducted the negotiations which were so ably conducted by Sir Albert Smith, with the aid of my hon. friend beside me, the chances are that Canada would not have received any of that four and a half million dollars, but, as happened in another transaction, would have had the pleasure of paying her own costs. Of these matters, I may have a little to say hereafter, as also concerning one statement which it would be unparliamentary to call impudent, but which is undoubtedly a most absurd and misleading statement, and that is the statement that these men, whose very creed and doctrine was that the way to make the people rich was by piling taxes on them, had materially lessened the burdens of taxation. Before this debate is through I intend to prove—and if I were not to undertake it, there are fifty good men and true on this side of the House able and willing to do so—that the actual taxation taken out of the pockets of the people is $60,000,000 a year, as against $20,000,000 per year, which was all we ever exacted. The hon. gentleman boasts that he lessened the sugar duties. Well, if he did, it was not because of any goodwill of his or his colleagues to the people of Canada, but at the dictation of Mr. McKinley, and because the American Government had abolished them altogether. And, Sir, I noticed one curious fact. The hon. gentleman stated that he had made a saving of $4,900,000 a year on the sugar duties from 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not make any statement of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I will have to wait until we get "Hansard," but I think every man here understood him to claim that saving.

Mr. FOSTER. What I did do was to give the savings each year from 1890 to 1895.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you made that $4,900,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember what the average was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what the hon. gentleman will find he said when he reads the report of his speech, unless he has occasion to revise it. I find in the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1890, that all the duty we got was $2,800,000. If that be the case, there is a marked difference between the computation of the hon. gentleman and the actual results. I am not going into minute calculations until I get the details of his new taxes before me, but I observe that the hon. gentleman is constant, in this respect, at any rate, to his old love, that in the matter of sugar he proposes to take $3,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the people, and only allow $1,200,000 to go into the treasury. The hon. gentleman boasted that in these five years the savings of the people had increased $41,000,000. It is not always a good sign, let me tell him, to find that the savings of the people have accumulated in banks. It is sometimes an evidence that the people find themselves so deprived of legitimate opportunities for investment that they are glad to take three to three and a half per cent rather than put their money into legitimate enterprises. The hon. gentleman took good care to say nothing of the reduction of $200,000,000, and upwards, which has taken place in the last few years in the value of farm property in Ontario alone. If he had been actively concerned in these matters from 1873 to 1878, he would have remembered that whatever might be the distress that prevailed in those years, whenever there was a farm in the market for sale, in the greater part of the province of Ontario, at any rate, there were a half a dozen buyers. To-day, the reverse holds, there are too often half a dozen farms for sale and not one buyer, and although there may be millions lying idle in the savings banks and other banks, the owners cannot be persuaded to invest their money in the purchase of farm property. However, I am not here for the purpose of bandying charges with the hon. gentleman. I desire to discuss, and to discuss at length, a much more serious qusetion, the present position of this country. I do not care to recall the jeers of hon. gentlemen opposite at deficits in times past. I do not think we will hear so much of these either on the hustings or in the House for some time to come. But I have this to say to the hon. gentleman, that there are now two distinct and separate subjects for discussion. I propose to deal with those apart. One of those concerns the existing financial situation, and the

methods of dealing with it. The other is the fiscal policy of the Government, and its results. Now, I have never contended, and the hon. gentleman was perfectly right in that, that it was in the power of any Government, by adopting a particular fiscal policy, to avert disaster. Disaster may come whether you have a free trade policy or a protective policy; but I always contended that while a Government could not, by its legislative action, avert disaster, a Government might, and very often does, to an enormous extent, intensify it. Sir, the fiscal and administrative policy of the Government, I will admit, are not necessarily connected together. The one may be good and the other may be bad. And the reverse may occur. But, generally, you find that the two go together. A wise fiscal policy usually means a prudent administration; an unwise fiscal policy usually means directly the reverse. Nobody who has watched the affairs of Canada for some time back will suppose that there is any marked difference between the fiscal policy and the administrative policy of Canada. At present they are unlovely in their lives, and I trust they will not be divided in their approaching death. No policy could well be more flagrantly unjust than that of which the hon. gentleman has often been the exponent, nor could any administration of public affairs be more deliberately or purposely corrupt than we know, too well, has been the administration of the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member. And now, Sir, first of all, I desire to ascertain what is our real position? What is the deficit? The hon. gentleman admitted under stress of circumstances that the deficit amounted, he thought, to about four millions and a half. That is to say, Sir, if things go well, if the hon. gentleman gets as much in the next two months as he did in the same months of 1894, if he does not spend as much in the next two months as he himself estimated he would be likely to spend, and particularly if he gets a little money out of his new taxation, why then possibly the deficit may not exceed $4,500,000. Well, Sir, that is a possibility. I do not know whether he will succeed in anticipated a little revenue; I do not know whether he will succeed in pushing off a few payments until next year; but what I do know is that the hon. gentleman's estimates, even without the additional estimates which he has not yet given us, are $922,000 more than the sum actually expended in 1893-94. We all know that we wound up the year 1893-94 with a deficit of $1,210,000; and we know that the failure in revenue down to the 1st of May, which the hon. gentleman did not give, amounts to $2,838,788, while our expenditure up to 1st May exceeded our expenditure for the last year by $705,413. Now, Sir, these figures—and this is at least as good as the hon. gentleman's hypothesis—show that there is to-day an actual ascertained deficit of $4,754,529. However, Sir, I am not very greatly concerned about that, whether the deficit be four millions and a half, as he says it will be, or whether it be four millions and three-quarters, as the public returns would seem to indicate it is. Whether it may be one or two, or three hundred thousand dollars, more or less, by the 1st of July, is not a matter of very great moment. It is sufficient for us, to know that by the hon. gentleman's own admission—and he certainly did not exaggerate the chances the deficit amounts to four and one half millions. Now, Sir, I want to call attention to what has become of the last loan. I am not going, at this moment, to discuss the loan itself. I think the hon. gentleman made a good loan, but I think he made a grave error of judgment in not borrowing at the time—in view of our liabilities—a considerably large sum. I think he might and ought to have borrowed, certainly three, and perhaps, four millions back. As I shall show presently, he has exposed himself to the necessity of going to negotiate another loan in a short time, and perhaps, under less favourable conditions. That loan netted the hon. gentleman say, $10,700,000. He knows, and admitted here to-day, that our capital expenditure is $3,273,000 to date. He had a deficit of $1,210,000 that he had to pay; there were temporary loans of $2,433,000; we have a deficit of $4,500,000 or $4,754,000—which you will—and we have further expenditures up to 1st July, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement of $1,600,000. So that apparently all the loan has been spent, every penny of it; that is, more than every penny of it is pledged. The hon. gentleman has a certain amount of money in hand, I know; but all that money will be required to make both ends meet before the end of the year, without making any provision for the extra charges which accrue and become due on capital account. And then, Sir, I come to another point on which the hon. gentleman laid some stress, and on which I desire—and the House desires, I think—a good deal more information than he was pleased to give us. Now, Sir, here again the hon. gentleman may correct me if I am in error. I took down the statement of liabilities which he gave. It did not appear to me to conform with the statements made across the floor of the House by his colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, or with the statements that appear in our public accounts. According to his statement the total expenditure on capital account for the next four or five years would be rather under $10,000,000—nine millions odd, I think, were the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. Fifteen millions and over, according to the figures I gave.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman—I will accept the correction, of course. But certainly that

amount does not consort exactly with the statement he made in another part of his speech, that the amount that would go to sinking fund would be amply sufficient to meet all the expenditures on capital account for the next four or five years.

Mr. FOSTER. I may put the statement in such a way that the hon. gentleman will see. I divided the liabilities into two. About $6,000,000—if I recollect aright—were liabilities in the shape of subsidies current which the estimates would provide for each year, as they have done in past years. That is, they would be met out of consolidated revenue. Then there were the subsidies and expenditures that have not been so provided for, railway subsidies and others; making nine millions odd to be met from capital. There are six million dollars in round numbers, that run over appropriations that are made in the Estimates each year, and have been running for the past three or four years, and they mature between this and 1908. Then for capital expenditure, there are nine million dollars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And we have not been paying out of our ordinary revenue any such sum during the last two years, we have not been paying any of these sums which ordinarily go to capital account out of our ordinary expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Steamship subsidies do not go to capital account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What steamship companies?

Mr. FOSTER. The Australian steamship subsidy, the China and Japan steamship subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, those are the things which make up the six millions?

Mr. FOSTER. Those and some others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I will just give the hon. gentleman's statement as I make it, and he can correct it. The Minister of Railways, in reply to me the other day gave the total railway subsidies which we had to provide for at $8,729,000. That, I presume, is correct. The hon. Minister gave the estimated cost of St. Lawrence Canals; those are clearly a capital charge.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it may be a question whether railway subsidies ought to go to capital account. The St. Lawrence canals are to consume, at least, $6,000,000. The hon. gentleman will see that has nothing to do with mail subsidies or anything like that. Now, I assume, judging from the past—and that is the only way we can judge—that the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway account is likely, in the next year or two, to run up to about a million dollars. I shall be very glad if they do not, but looking to the past, I am afraid we have little ground for hoping to escape with less than $1,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman has entirely omitted an important factor, he has omitted the fact that there is a certain Trent Valley Canal now again put under contract. It was asserted a year or so ago that this was likely to cost $5,000,000. Are we to understand that is eliminated from his programme? I do not so understand the Minister of Railways, who, the other evening told us that one contract for $500,000 had been let on account; and if those figures of mine are correct, then, apart, from the $6,000,000 which the hon. gentleman spoke about—there is about $20,729,000 to be provided for—unless, of course, as I say, the Trent Valley Canal is entirely abandoned. If it be, let us understand it so. But that was not the statement made by the Minister of Railways, that was not the statement made to us last year, that was not the belief entertained by the inhabitants of several constituencies through which the canal passes. Nor did the hon. gentleman, so far as I understand him, say anything to us at all about such enterprises as the Chignecto road. Am I to understand that is abandoned, or does that remain a liability pending?

Mr. FOSTER. I presume that is no liability.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then does the hon. gentleman intend it shall become a liability at any future time?

Mr. FOSTER. Don't ask too much, now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think now we have a right to know. Now is the time when we ought to know, when we ought to be informed as to all these contingent liabilities. What about the Chignecto road? What is it to cost? $80,000 a year, or $100,000 a year, or $120,000 a year?

Mr. BOWERS. $170,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that a contingent liability or not? The hon. gentleman says it is not a liability now, but we have a right to know whether he intends to exorcise the ghost and get rid of it altogether, or is it to rise up again in judgment against us, either before or after the next general election?

Mr. FOSTER. Don't invoke it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand there are parties here now anxiously inquiring about the Chignecto road, and we ought to know. Nor did the hon. gentleman, who came here having promised to make a full and ample statement, so far as I notice, say one word about a certain statutory liability of $750,000 a year for the Atlantic Fast Service. What of that? Is that a

liability, present or contingent? What has the hon. gentleman got to say about that?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a present liability, certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, the hon. gentleman had better take it off the statute-book, or it may become one, and he had better do it quickly. The hon. gentleman had, no doubt, a difficult task this evening, and, therefore, I am not surprised that these little trifles of Trent Valley Canals, Chignecto Roads and Atlantic Fast Services, which, after all said and done, do not mean more than one and a half millions added to our annual expenditure at the outside—I am not surprised that they have not attracted his attention as much as they have ours. But there are other things that we have a right to know about. What has the hon. gentleman to tell us about the contribution to the Hudson Bay Railway? Is that a contingent liability? Is that a liability which is to accrue? Are we to pay that or are we not? Surely the hon. gentleman will see the propriety, when we are estimating our liabilities, of letting us know. What has the hon. gentleman to say about that Hudson Bay Road? Is it a liability contingent? Is it a present liability, or a future liability, or a deferred liability?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman's speech. Let him go on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it is pertinent to the proposition. The hon. gentleman told us he would make a full, free and frank statement—those were his words—within a very few days. Now I ask for a full, free and frank statement, and particularly on so important a question as a grant which may ultimately come to involve ten times the amount, as he knows. What has he to say about the Hudson Bay Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. That will be for Parliament to determine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the leader of the House cannot tell. Does not the hon. gentleman know that Parliament can vote no money grants, except at the instance of the Crown, on a statement conveyed to us here by a minister of the Crown? Now, I think, in all conscience, after the pledge which the hon. gentleman gave us, he can hope to gain nothing by invoking—I won't say invoking—but he can hope to gain nothing by concealing their intentions. Surely we have a right to know, when we are here in debate on the financial state of the country, what our liabilities are. It is very evident that if the statement be correct, if the Chignecto Road be not entirely removed, if the Atlantic service be still a statutory obligation, and if we have got the Hudson Bay road to provide for—I say it is very evident indeed that the hon. gentleman has enormously understated the existing present liabilities of the country. Well, Sir, I will give the hon. gentleman time. I hope that with reflection——

Mr. FOSTER. All will come out in time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—the proper time to acquaint the Parliament of Canada with all the liabilities which Canada owes, is when the Minister of Finance makes his financial statement.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman puts it in that way, so far as that railway is concerned, the hon. gentleman and the House have been informed of all the liabilities, and he knows perfectly well what liabilities have been incurred. If any other measures are to be brought down by the Government in the course of the session, the hon. gentleman will then become acquainted with them; but the hon. gentleman has no right to stand up in his place to-night and, because he is discussing the Budget, want to know before hand all the measures that the Government are going to bring down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am in my right, the House is in its right, the Opposition is in its right, in demanding that the Government should not conceal things from us, in demanding that the Government should tell us what the obligations are. The hon. gentleman, Sir, made a formal pledge here three or four days ago that he would make a full and honest statement of all the obligations of the country at this time.

Mr. FOSTER. You have got it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, on a question which involves two millions and a half directly, and which may involve $25,000,000 for ought we know, the hon. gentleman has not a word to say. Well, Sir, the country will judge who has kept his promise to the country and to the House. Now, what is the general result? The general result is that we have a deficit ranging from $4,500,000 to $5,000,000; that our cash in hand is barely adequate to meet our current needs, and hardly that, remembering, as I pointed out the other night, that over and above bills payable, we have in addition some $40,000,000 borrowed at call, from the people of Canada, for which we ought to keep a respectable reserve. It is very clear that instead of having $9,000,000 of ascertained liabilities, and a number of items scattered here and there which are to be paid within the next half dozen years, our ascertained liabilities are something like $20,000,000, not including those statutory charges to which I have alluded, and which would amount to very nearly a million dollars a year more added to our fixed charges for many years. Now, Sir, the Minister proposes two things, he proposes to make certain additions to the taxation, with

which I will deal at a later period. He proposes certain retrenchments, a few of which, perhaps, may be good as far as they go, but which I am afraid we must characterize rather as sham retrenchments than real ones. One thing at any rate is certain, and it is worth noting, one of those points which, as the hon. gentleman said, it is well the House should bear in mind. There are some increases and there are some reductions, but the increases have most unquestionably come to stay, while as to the reductions, I fear they are essentially of a temporary character. Why, Sir, I look at the Public Works, and I look at Militia, and I find that of his $1,600,000 of reduction, $1,325,000 occur in these two branches alone. Well, we have had some experience in the past as to the value of the hon. gentleman's promises of retrenchment and economy, and as to the extent to which his colleagues allow him to carry out his promises. But who is there to tell us that next year we won't see huge supplementary estimates brought down, and that we won't see all these things very much as they were before? Sir, the hon. gentleman, in talking of these Estimates, took occasion to say that there was not much fear, he thought, of their being equalled. Now, Sir, that may be true, possibly, in a certain sense. It may be true enough that the total volume of the Estimates after the Supplementary Estimates have been added, are not exceeded during the current year. But I have here the original Estimates for 1893-94, and it is worth while calling the attention of the House to them. They amounted to $36,560,000. That was the original estimate, which he says is rarely spent. I think the Public Accounts will show that while the estimate was $36,500,000, he spent something like $37,500,000. I think the expenditure of last year, unless my memory is wholly at fault, was not less than that sum.

Mr. FOSTER. It was less than the estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No. I do not mean to say, however, that it was not less than the ultimate estimate. We are not dealing with that question. The present question is, can the hon. gentleman's original and main Estimate be depended on? Here is one sample: Estimates amounting to $36,500,000, and an actual expenditure of one million more than the hon. gentleman's main estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. But it was a great deal less than the total Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be less than the aggregate Estimates, because the hon. gentleman had the very bad practice, which he has promised he is not going to repeat, but which I am afraid will require some strong collateral guarantee to be produced here to ensure that he will keep his promise in the long run, of having his main Estimates largely below his ultimate Estimates for a given year. Then another grave question on which we may have a great deal more to say before the session closes, is as to what is the condition of the Intercolonial Railway. We know perfectly well that it is possible always in conducting a railway so to manage it as to appear to make both ends meet, but at the expense of materially injuring the permanent character of the work. We have had a rather bitter experience on the Intercolonial Railway as to its capacity for sinking more capital from time to time, and while I shall make no positive statement, not having the knowledge myself, I am bound to tell the House, and I have it on authority which I do not think it entirely safe to disregard, that there is very great danger that a large amount of capital may be required from us before we are many years older to place the Intercolonial Railway in as good a condition as it was a few years ago. What I point out is this: To all appearances the funds are out, to all appearances the hon. gentleman must borrow again, to all appearances the hon. gentleman's loan must be repeated, either in the shape of a temporary loan, which I suppose he could make, of a few millions in England, or in the shape of a permanent loan, and that before he is twelve months older. Sir, the hon. gentleman did me the honour to contrast the deficits of 1876, 1877 and 1878, with the deficits which now exist. But he took extremely good care not to tell the House the reasons why those deficits existed at all. I will tell the House. Those deficits of 1876-77 and 1878 existed because, in opposition to our strenuous protests, in opposition to the most vigorous denunciations we could make, the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald in 1873, under very peculiar circumstances, which I will not wring the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite further by alluding to, increased the public expenditure by $4,000,000, not providing one cent of taxation to meet it; and because at the same time (and it was admitted by Sir Leonard Tilley in his Budget speech, which I have under my hand), they further added $60,000,000 to the public liabilities, for the greater part of which we had to provide and for which they made no provision whatever. The hon. gentleman talks of the fact that the net debt increased under our Administration. When you inherit liabilities of $60,000,000 which your predecessors inflicted on the country and for which they made no provision, how is a succeeding Administration, I should like to know, to avoid adding six or eight millions annually for some years to come to the existing debt? Now, Mr. Speaker, as to one expectation on which the hon. gentleman laid great stress, and that is as to the expectation of better times. Well, Sir, I hope, and every member in this House will hope, for pri-

vate reasons if not for public ones, that this expectation may be realized. But allow me to tell the hon. Finance Minister that there are no very solid grounds on which he can base his financial calculations in this regard. The immediate prospects, I am afraid, are very uncertain indeed. They will depend on causes wholly beyond the hon. gentleman's control. They will depend, in the first place, and he knows it well, on the trade conditions in the United States; and it is worth while observing how ready those hon. gentlemen are now to admit that the prosperity of Canada is most intimately connected with the prosperity of the United States, that it is very hard indeed for Canada to prosper when the United States are depressed, that if a wave of depression sweeps over the United States it almost invariably within a short space of time sweeps over Canada too, and which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman has not seen quite as clearly as he should have done, and that, although such a wave may not overtake us quite as soon as the United States, it is very apt to remain a little longer with us. That is one cause over which the hon. gentleman can exercise no control. Another cause is this. The prosperity of Canada, which is chiefly an agricultural country, depends, as everybody knows, largely on the prices of food products, meats and cereals. Those will be regulated by competition, over which we have no control. We have had to face the competition of India, and the competition of the Argentine Republic; we are now threatened with the competition of Australasia, and by a refinement of generosity the Government of Canada are contemplating making considerable grants for the purpose of enabling Australian farmers to compete more favourably at our expense in the great markets of the world and with Canadian products. I desire to be on friendly terms, heaven knows, not merely with all our brother and sister colonies, but for the matter of that, in trade matters with the whole world, if I could; but it is not part of the policy of the Liberal party to tax the people of Canada for the purpose of benefiting people whose products enter into direct competition with ours. Now, Sir, one thing is very certain, although the hon. gentleman does not appear to understand it, but I think that some of his financial advisers should, and I think they ought to have made him aware of the fact. We have heard a great deal of the surpluses the hon. gentleman has possessed in times past—on that point I shall have a word or two to say presently—but it is clear that for many years back the people of Canada have been, to a very great extent, living on capital, and the hon. gentleman—and this ran all through his speech—has mistaken, as many others have done, the results of spending huge sums of borrowed money for increase in our legitimate income. Sir, the two things are very widely distinct. The hon. gentleman boasts, boasts very loudly of all the former surpluses that he has had. He seems to think that the existence of a surplus half a dozen years ago is ample warrant for having a deficit to-day. Well, the hon. gentleman, no doubt, being a professor of literature, is a student of Shakespeare. Let me remind him of a certain passage there:

> Oh, who is there can hold a fire in his hand
> By thinking on the frosty Caucasues,
> Or wallow naked in December's snow
> By dreaming of fantastic summer's heat,
> Or cloy the hungry edge of appetite
> By bare imagination of a feast?

Or to bring it down nearer to the level of the Minister of Finance. Who is there—

> Can to a surplus turn a deficit
> By saying: Some poor clerk had thus it writ.

as the Minister of Finance did in the "Official Gazette" a little while ago. Now, Sir, how are these surpluses obtained. That is a question to ask the House, and that is a question my friends had better ask the electors, too. They were obtained in two ways. They were obtained partly, at least the surplus revenues were obtained by the outrageous taxation imposed by the Government; taxation which always took two dollars for one, which often took ten dollars for one, out of the pockets of the people; and they were obtained also partly by a system of perpetual loans. That is a very important factor in our position. The hon. gentleman has talked largely and loudly of the increased deposits, but not a word out of the hon. gentleman's mouth, not a whisper from the hon. gentleman's lips about the vastly increased indebtedness of Canada as compared with the period between 1873 and 1879. The hon. gentleman has now and heretofore wholly ignored that most important fact. What is the present indebtedness; and, mind you, by the indebtedness of Canada, I do not mean barely and solely the indebtedness owed by Canada in her Federal capacity; I mean our Federal debt, I mean our provincial debt, I mean our municipal debt, I mean our private debt due abroad, and I mean also the sum due by us for railway bonds and obligations. Now, I have been at some pains to find out as correctly as I could—the statistics do not allow of my doing it altogether—what that amounts to, and I venture to say to the House that if you take into account railway bonds and stocks as well, that the total present indebtedness of Canada, the collective indebtedness to parties abroad, must be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $800,000,000 to $1,000,000,000, and the annual amount of interest $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 a year. That is a very important fact, indeed: it is a fact which the Finance Minister has wholly ignored, but it is a fact which I am afraid in the future we will not find it quite so easy to ignore. Then the hon. gentleman, in another part of his speech, tells us that we are so very much better off

than other people. Well, if it be true that we are very much better off than other people, it is a very poor consolation for us to find ourselves in the position we are now in. However, I have grave doubts that the hon. gentleman's statement is correct. I know quite well that there are many parts of Canada, possessing great natural resources, where the people possess very considerable amounts of accumulated wealth, and I know perfectly well that in those parts the pressure of hard times and the consequences of the depression has not been felt as much as it has elsewhere. But, Sir, taking it as a whole, I know two things. I know that the great mass of the people of Canada, and notably the agriculturists, were vastly better off between the years 1873 and 1878 than between the years 1890 and 1895; and I have the strongest grounds for believing that were a fair and honest account struck, were you to place on one side all the evidences that the hon. gentleman has given of accumulated wealth, and on the other the increase of our debt, to which I have alluded, and the shrinkage in the value of our farms and town properties, it is clear that Canada would come out hundreds of millions of dollars the worse, on an honest calculation as a result of the last twelve years. Sir, one thing is true. Canada does possess and always has possessed a considerably better banking system than our neighbours, and that enables Canada to bear or break the force of the blow at first. But, Sir, the real difference is this: The one case is chronic and the other is acute, and we have been slowly bleeding away for years and years. In the case of the United States, when a crisis comes it is very sharp, I grant you, but it lasts for a comparatively short time. Now, Sir, to my mind, the case really lies in a nutshell. Two processes have been going on for these many years. One of these processes has been a huge expenditure of borrowed money during the past 12 or 15 years. Take it altogether, and bearing it in mind that I am speaking of the collective expenditure, I am speaking of the expenditure on railways and by municipalities, I am speaking of the money which has been borrowed and brought into the country by loan companies, and I am speaking of the moneys borrowed by private persons and corporations, and I say, taking it altogether, there is very strong ground for believing that it was on an average about $30,000,000 a year. Now, that no doubt did cause large importations of dutiable goods. As every one knows, when money is borrowed it is not sent over to Canada in hard coin, but it is sent over in money's worth in the shape of goods, and usually dutiable goods, and no doubt for years and years that brought a large revenue. To-day we are called upon to pay the interest, and the 10 or 12 million dollars a year, which we have to pay through the medium of the Government, is only a small part, only a part, at any rate, of the total sum of interest which Canada has to pay. Sir, had we got value for our money, had that money been invested in works which were really useful and which really added to the productive powers of Canada, the case would not have been so bad. If it would have been possible for us to have borrowed $800,000,000 or $1,000,000,000, if you will, and we should have been able to pay the interest largely out of the profits arising from those works. But it is only too well known to any one who knows anything of Canada, that an enormous amount of money which was borrowed has been wasted, aye and worse than wasted, for a very considerable part of it has gone to debauch and corrupt the people of Canada. Now, I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman—it is a matter in which I am entirely in accord with him—I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, express himself in high approbation of that very reliable and conservative newspaper, the London "Economist." I want to call his attention to a very late issue of that reliable and highly Conservative newspaper, under date 23rd March, 1895, and here is one item which he would do well to note as one among the many proofs of the great general prosperity which Canada is now experiencing and has experienced from 1890 to 1895. Curiously enough, Sir, this article, which relates to the depreciation of North and South American securities, starts from 1890 and comes down to the present day; and this is what is says: That a careful examination, comparing the market values of to-day with those of five years ago, shows that the loss to English investors in Canadian railway securities amounts to £16,750,000 sterling. Rather more than $80,000,000 loss, according to the London "Economist," that reliable and conservative newspaper, accrued to the holders of Canadian railway securities within five years—the five years which the hon. gentleman chose to select as having shown how well Canada had prospered; and here, Sir, is a little sentence to which he and his friends would do well to pay attention:

> Moreover, and this is not pleasant to say, the Canadians have not been overscrupulous in their dealings with the mother country. A number of "wildcat" railway schemes have been exploited at our expense, while in some cases investors have suffered from the fact that the undertakings in which they have placed their capital were regarded as aliens, entitled neither to consideration nor fair management.

Surely, Sir, the London "Economist" cannot have been listening to the statements of the Opposition as to the Caraquet railway and a great many other roads of a similar character, here and there, which have contributed to make our railway securities stand far less well in the London market

than we desire to see them. Then, Sir, there is another cause which has contributed very considerably, and that is the great waste which has undoubtedly occurred under the operation of the National Policy. At the direct instigation, if not of the hon. gentleman, at all events of his predecessors, a number of unfortunate men in this country were induced to put their all into enterprises which it was belived would enrich themselves as well as the public. We know too well that there is scarely a town in Ontario which cannot to-day point to two or three monumental ruins where some $100,000, $200,000, or $300,000, of capital are entombed, never, I fear to be resurrected. That was one process which was going on, and notably during the time when the hon. gentleman thought we were doing exceedingly well. Then, there was another process to which I thought he would have alluded to-day, as it would have afforded him a fair reason for some of the things he had to justify or excuse. Simultaneously with the borrowing of these enormous sums of money on which we have to pay interest, there was a great fall in the income of our agriculturists. Scarcely a single farm product, except perhaps cheese, brings anything like as good a price to-day as it did in 1878. Many of them bear scarcely half the value in the market that they did then. My computation is that the loss in the income of our agriculturists to-day is fully $20,000,000 a year as compared with their income of a few years ago. I will not go back even so far as 1878. Why, Sir, every man knows that wheat of the very best quality, not to speak of barley and other grains, has to be sold in our markets for scarcely half the price which was freely obtained fifteen or sixteen years ago; and, while that may not be entirely the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite, still it must be borne in mind that, while on all occasions they are ready to take credit to themselves for every cheapness, no matter how obtained, in manufactured articles, they wholly and entirely decline to be responsible for any reduction in the price of grain. Let them be just, Sir; and if they claim to be the authors of this increased cheapness of other commodities, let them stand before agricultural audiences and admit, as they are in honour bound to do, that they are equally responsible for the enormous fall in the prices of agricultural products. And here, Sir, I may pause to say a word or two with respect to this matter of surpluses. In the first place, I have never admitted, and I do not now admit, that the hon. gentlemen's book-keeping has been such as to entitle them to claim credit for anything like the amount of the surpluses which they have put down. But it is a very remarkable fact that all the time that these surpluses were piling up, our debt was likewise increasing very fast. I will go back a little further than the hon. gentleman did, and take the period of 1880. I find that our net debt increased in that year $9,500,000; in 1881, $3,000,000; in 1883, $4,800,000; in 1884, $23,700,000; in 1885, $14,000,000; in 1886, $26,700,000; in 1887, $4,000,000; in 1888, $7,000,000, and then it came down to a mild $3,000,000 in 1889. It is almost juggling with words, Mr. Speaker, to say that the hon. gentlemen opposite are entitled to any great credit for the increasing surpluses, while all the time—surpluses to the contrary notwithstanding, and making all allowances for the sum that went into the sinking fund—our net debt went on increasing at such a rate that in ten years it was $90,000,000 more than it was when I left office. Now, I am not disposed at present to raise the question of the amount of additional taxation which has been taken from the people over and above what goes into the treasury. That may be more fittingly disposed of later on. But a point which I have to make—and I think it is well worthy of our consideration—is that when the hon. gentleman talks so glibly of the certainty of better times, he forgets to inform the House of three important facts—first, that he has a large amount of undischarged liabilities; next, that the country collectively has a great deal more to pay than it had a few years ago; and, unfortunately, that the collective income of the country is very much less than it was. The hon. gentleman looks for a quick rally. Well, I would be very glad to believe that he is right. It is very much to our interest that there should be a quick rally; but I would like to know if he expects an immediate rally in the prices of food and grain, and if so, why? If he does, I could understand the reason on which he bases his expectation of better times. I did not hear him assign one solitary reason for expecting that there would be any great improvement in the prices of our agricultural products. If the hon. gentleman does expect any such improvement, I would like to hear him say—and I will give him the floor with pleasure for that purpose—why he does expect it. Does the hon. gentleman expect to see new sources of wealth develop, and, if so, where? It is possible, in a country so large and so imperfectly explored as ours, that new sources of wealth may be discovered, from which we may receive considerable additions to our national income; but, if the hon. gentleman has discovered such new sources, he has given us no more information about them than he has given about his intention with regard to the Hudson Bay Railway. My counsel to the hon. gentleman is this, that he had better not prophesy unless he knows; he had better accept the situation as it is; he had better not count too fast or too surely on any great amount of betterment. He had better take things as they are revealed in the Public Accounts to-day. I can hardly think the hon. gentleman justified in predicting an immediate recovery as

probable, and I would just call the hon. gentleman's attention to this. The hon. gentleman alluded, and it was natural that he should, to the period of deficits which existed under our Administration. Now it is worth while to observe that within the last thirty years there have been several periods of deficits in Canada. I took occasion the other evening to mention the fact in reply to my hon. friend beside me, that although he was literally correct in saying that the Finance Minister had achieved the biggest absolute deficit, he had by no means achieved the biggest comparative deficit that has been known in old Canada. I have here a statement of the deficits which prevailed in old Canada from 1858 to 1865. In 1858—and I suppose the hon. gentleman knows who was Premier in 1858 ?

An hon. MEMBER. Who supported him ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had not the honour of being in Parliament in 1858, and I have no objection to tell my hon. friend opposite that I had the honour of being elected to Parliament, as an independent member, in 1863, nor had I given any adhesion whatever to Sir John Macdonald. On the contrary, all I said in his favour was this, that he was too clever a man to be absolutely proscribed. However, we will come to 1863 presently. In 1858, there was a deficit of $3,375,000 on a total income of $5,270,000, being a deficit of just 65 per cent in said income, so that I was pretty well justified in stating that the Finance Minister might take comfort from illustrious example. In 1859, the same distinguished gentleman had a deficit of $1,500,000, which was equivalent to exactly 22 per cent. In 1860, there was a deficit of $1,973,000, being equivalent of 26 per cent. He kept up the 26 per cent to 1861, and raised it to 28 per cent in 1862. It fell to 10 per cent in 1863, under the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald, and thereafter gradually diminished. The point I wish specially to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to is this, that he had better not conclude too hastily that all these deficits will disappear at once. That has not been our past experience. On the contrary, deficits have usually lasted for a considerable period of time, and I would not advise him to depend on any betterment or to be content with the somewhat inadequate provision which he seems to think sufficient for present purposes. Therefore, I think that the hon. gentleman is doubly bound —bound by his own promise, bound by the condition in which the country is to-day,— to give this House a most full and complete statement of the liabilities for which he expects to have to provide. That, Sir, I must again formally demand. I say, and I leave the matter for his calm reflection, that before this debate closes, we should in all conscience know what is the total amount of our liabilities, what are his intentions with regard to such projects as the Chignecto Ship Railway, the Fast Atlantic Steam Service, and the Hudson Bay Railway. As I understand, he is pledged not to bring down any railway subsidies this year. He does not propose to engage in any Government works other than those of which we have had notice. If he does, all I can say is that he is trifling with the House, and I think with his own character and reputation. If, after the statement he has made, he allows this Budget debate to close without giving us full information on those points, he is now deliberately misleading the House. As I said before, the Opposition in this matter are in their clear right ; and I am bound to say that if the Opposition deserves censure, they deserve it for having in past times allowed the Government to bring down, at the very fag end of the session, Estimates involving large appropriations of money which had not been referred to in the financial statement, and for having allowed those subsidies to go through the House without proper discussion. Such practice was wholly in defiance of all sound principle, English precedent, and constitutional rule. Now, I have never declared, and my hon. friends have never declared, that we were disposed to oppose all grants because the Government propose them. But I do say that the hon. gentleman is bound, in every possible form and shape, to tell us before this debate closes, absolutely and exactly what are the financial liabilities of the country and for what sums the Government intend to ask the concurrence of Parliament. Now, as I am aware that the hon. gentleman must get his motion through, and at any rate as we have not had yet an opportunity of inspecting his proposals—I have not even seen them but only heard them read—I do not feel disposed to discuss the proposals at present. And therefore, particularly as the House has listened with extreme indulgence to me and has had a very long and interesting discourse from the hon. gentleman, lasting two hours and a half, I would prefer to move the adjournment of the debate rather than proceed with the somewhat voluminous remarks which I fear I will have to inflict on him with respect to the enlarged duties.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been the usual custom to continue the Budget debate from day to day, and I would like my hon. friend to consider whether that would not be the better rule to observe. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has adjourned the debate, and when it takes place again it would be more convenient to carry it on from day to day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will consider that on Tuesday.

Mr. FOSTER. We might think that over.

Mr. LAURIER. We could not agree to this at present. I doubt very much whether

we could approve of the suggestion because it would interfere with private members legislation, notices of motion, etc. The hon. gentleman is aware that by following the practice of former years, almost the whole of private legislation was thrown over to the following session, and I have heard a great many complaints on that score. The debate had better be adjourned to the usual Government day, Tuesday next, and in the meantime we will think over the matter.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Arthur Rupert Dickey, member for the electoral district of the county of Cumberland, N.S., introduced by Mr. Foster and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence.—(Mr. Dickey.)

INSURANCE ACT.

On the Order for introduction of Bill to amend the Insurance Act (Mr. Foster),

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe on the paper a Bill to amend the Insurance Act. Are any material changes or only slight changes proposed?

Mr. FOSTER. No material change is proposed; the Bill is to alter the time allowed to certain companies for making their returns.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LAW.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) asked the leader of the House the other day a question in regard to a return of papers in relation to the Manitoba School law, and pointed out that the judgment in the case of Barrett had not been brought down. If the hon. gentleman referred to the reasons for the decision, I would call his attention to page 2 of the blue-book, which covers all the papers asked for last session. The hon. gentleman will see there that the decision is given in the case of Logan, and the judges say at the end that the same reason applied in the case of Barrett. If the hon. gentleman wants the formal judgment, we can have a copy prepared and laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no desire to obtain the formal judgment, but I wish to see the reasons given. If the reasons are in the blue-book which the hon. gentleman holds in his hand, they do not appear in my copy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is last year's blue-book.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I went to Mr. Botterell's office to see if I could get a copy containing the reasons, and was informed that the copy I had was the only one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No doubt, unless the text was read very carefully, the hon. gentleman would not detect the place where the judgment comes in, as it is continued in the same type as a memorandum which preceded it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I also asked whether the replies of the Supreme Court of Canada or to the questions put to them by the Privy Council could not be laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Those are covered by the address already passed by the House this session.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will they be brought down?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They will be included.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take the opportunity of inquiring whether the Minister of Finance proposes to bring down the Supplementary Estimates for the present year, to-night?

Mr. FOSTER. Not to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were promised for Friday.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not work on Sunday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They should be forthcoming, unless they are voluminous and extensive.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Trans-Canadian Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Canadian Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. La-Rivière.)

"THE OLD CARLING BREWERY."

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. McMullen) asked, 1. What is the nature of the agreement under which the Government occupy the property known as the "Old Carling Brewery," and situated on Pall Mall and Waterloo streets, in the city of London? 2. What is it used for? 3. Have the Government purchased the property? 4. Have the Government made any agreement to purchase? 5. Have the Government leased the property? 6. If leased, how long does lease run? 7. What compensation is paid? 8. Have the Government expended any money on the property beyond the compensation for lease, and if so, what amount, and under what agreement with lessor? 9. Is the Government aware of the fact that this property until lately belonged to Sir John Carling, a member of this House?

Mr. DICKEY. 1. Under lease from John Christie, London. 2. Used for military stores, also cavalry and artillery stores, and quarters for superintendent of stores and district paymaster. 3. No. 4. No. 5. Yes. 6. Ten years. 7. The rent is $720 per annum. 8. $1,000, fitting the building to make it suitable for store purposes. Agreement with the lessor. 9. No.

MILITIA DRILL, 1895.

Mr. LISTER asked, Is it intended to have the annual drill and militia camps this year?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes; that is the present intention of the Government.

FISHERY OVERSEER, JOSEPH P. KINNEY.

Mr. BOWERS asked, 1. Does Joseph R. Kinney still occupy the position of overseer of fisheries for the western part of Nova Scotia? 2. If not, has he been discharged, or did he resign? 3. If he resigned, has he been superannuated? 4. If discharged, for what reason, and who has been appointed in his place? 5. What counties comprise the district supervised by the new incumbent, and will his duties be the same. 6. What salary is paid to this officer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. No. 2. His services have been dispensed with by Order in Council. 3. Answered by above. 4. Irregularities and neglect of duty. Mr. L. S. Ford, of Milton, Queen's County. 5. Queen's, Lunenburg, King's, Annapolis, Digby, Shelburne and Yarmouth. His duties will be the same as those of his predecessor. 6. $700 per annum.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Lowell) asked, 1. How long has the collectorship of the port of Niagara Falls been vacant? 2. Will the appointment be made before the end of the present session of the House? 3. Who has been promised the position?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. Since 14th March, 1894. 2. Probably. 3. No person has been promised the position.

SIZE OF LOBSTERS.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make any change in the law regarding the size of lobsters that may be caught in the waters of the Bay of Fundy this season, in accordance with the prayers of the numerous petitions to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1894, and which the petitioners set forth were for the preservation of this fishery?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the intention to make any change in the regulation regarding the size limit of lobsters.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—THREE RIVERS.

Mr. GUAY asked, 1. What is the yearly salary paid to Mr. Benjamin Vanasse as collector of customs at Three Rivers? 2. Is part of the Custom-house building at Three Rivers let as a private residence? If so, to what persons, and what is the amount of the rent? 3. In that case, also, who is responsible for the payment of charges for fuel, light and water rates?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. $1,100. 2. Two rooms in the Custom-house at Three Rivers are occupied by the collector of customs, no rent being paid. 3. No subdivision is made of total payment made by department for fuel, light and water rates of the various departments.

PONTIAC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Did the Government receive, in the month of January last, reports or letters complaining of the condition of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway? If so, what action was taken by the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government did receive a letter from Mr. Pangborn complaining of the condition of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway. An engineer was

despatched over the road to make a further inspection which he did, and reported that though some renewals of ties and timbers in culverts would be required this season, that the road was in a safe condition for traffic.

CONVEYANCE OF MAILS BETWEEN LAKE ETCHEMIN AND STE. ROSE DE WATFORD.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (Translation) asked, 1. Whether the contract made between the Postmaster General and Joseph Lamontagne for carrying the mail between Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford, and commencing on 1st July, 1894, has been cancelled? 2. If so, why has the said contract been cancelled? 3. If the contract has been cancelled, has it been awarded to another person, and were tenders called for? 4. What is the price stated in the new contract?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) 1. The contract made by the department with Joseph Lamontagne for carrying the mails between Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford was signed on July 1st, 1894. Later on it was cancelled, after due notice of three months: on December 1st, 1894. 2. This cancellation was for the purpose of allowing the department to accept the offer of a bi-weekly service on the same route, for $75 a year, the contract with Mr. Lamontagne only providing for a weekly service at a cost of $47.50 a year. 3. The contract was awarded to another person without tenders being called for. 4. The price stated in the contract referred to is $75 a year.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AT CHAUDIERE CURVE.

Mr. GUAY asked, How many employees of the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière Curve, in the county of Lévis, have been discharged since 1st April, 1895? What are their names, and what positions did they hold, and for what reasons were they discharged? Is it the intention of the Railway Department to take them again into its service?

Mr. HAGGART. The services of three employees of the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière Curve have been dispensed with, since the 1st of April, 1895. Their names are Louis Lemieux, George Demers and Louis Lambert, and they were all employed as car repairers. As there was not sufficient work to warrant employing them, their services were dispensed with. They will be re-employed as soon as there is work for them to do.

THE PRINCESS PIER AT LEVIS.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repair, during the summer, the pier called "The Princess Pier" at Lévis? Have tenders been invited for this work? Has the Railway Department already made inquiries of certain parties as to their prices for the timber required for repairing the pier? If so, who are the parties, and what are the prices asked?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the intention of the Government to repair, during the summer, the pier called "The Princess Pier" at Lévis. Tenders were invited for the white pine and rock elm; also, for the pine deals required for these repairs. The white pine was awarded to Charles Veilleux, South Quebec, at $22 for twelve pieces, thirty feet long, sixteen inches by sixteen inches; $22 for fourteen pieces, twenty-five feet long, sixteen inches by sixteen inches; $22 for fourteen pieces, twenty feet long, sixteen inches by sixteen inches. The rock elm was awarded to Etienne Dussault, Lévis, at $40 for twenty-five pieces, eighteen feet long, six inches by twelve inches; $40 for twenty-five pieces, twenty feet long, six inches by twelve inches; $40 for forty pieces, six inches by twelve inches, twenty feet and upwards. The pine deals were awarded to John Culligan, Jacquet River, N.B., at $7.50 per thousand feet, board measure. The lowest tender was accepted in each case.

THE ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Will the Dominion electoral lists be revised during the present year, as required by law?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The lists have been very recently revised, and, for the present, the revision is completed. It is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill during the present session, legalizing the new revision of the lists.

STATISTICS OF IMPORTS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, The total amounts of dutiable goods imported and entered for consumption up to first days of April, in 1894 and 1895? The amount of duties collected thereon in each year?

Mr. WALLACE. The total value of imports for the nine months ending 31st March, 1894, was $94,341,482; entered for consumption, $86,370,739; amount of duty collected, $15,302,862. The total value of imports for the nine months ending 31st March, 1895, was $80,987,079; entered for consumption, $78,126,603; duty collected, $13,278,856.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the House allow me to call the attention of the Controller of Customs to the fact that the question put by my hon. friend has not been answered? What was asked for was the amount of dutiable goods imported.

What the hon. gentleman has given is the amount of goods entered for consumption, which is quite a different thing.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the department has a record of that up to date, but if it has, I will bring it down to-morrow.

McGREGOR'S CREEK, CHATHAM.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) (for Mr. Campbell) asked. Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact that the sheet piling constructed by the Government on the south side of McGregor's Creek, in the city of Chatham, county of Kent, Ontario, is giving away, and thus endangering the buildings adjoining it? Is it the intention of the Government to have the same repaired at an early date?

Mr. OUIMET. The intention of the department was called to the fact mentioned in the hon. gentleman's question, and the matter is being attended to by the department.

EMPLOYMENT OF CULLERS.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) (for Mr. Campbell) asked. 1. How many cullers are employed at Montreal and Quebec? 2. Are they paid by fees or salary? 3. What remuneration do they get? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to close up the offices in Montreal and Quebec? If so, what provision will be made for the retiring cullers?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There are eight square timber cullers and one stave culler at Quebec. There is one general culler at Montreal. The square timber and stave cullers are paid by salary, the general culler by fees. The square timber and stave cullers receive $700 per annum. The general culler's salary, in 1893-94 reached $457.48. To the fourth question, the answer is, yes, in its present form. $200, or less, as length of service and other circumstances may justify.

SUPERANNUATION—PAYMENTS BY CHARLES THIBAULT.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Legris) asked, What was the amount paid by Charles Thibault as contribution to the Civil Service superannuation fund, during the years when he contributed thereto?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount paid by Mr. Thibault was $286.79.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Whether the Minister of Public Works caused to be published the following despatch in "La Presse" newspaper:—

Ottawa, April 5.—You are authorized to deny, as being absolutely false, the rumour published in the "Herald" that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper demanded from his colleagues that remedial legislation should be postponed until after the general elections, if such legislation was rendered necessary by the refusal of Manitoba. In the latter case it will be presented with the shortest possible delay in order to secure the passage of it.—J. A. OUIMET.

2. Whether the Minister of Public Works is correctly reported to have said at the nomination at Verchères that:

The Conservative Ministers are unanimous in giving a sequel to the Order in Council to pass a remedial law, not because they are Catholics or Orangemen, but because it is required by the law of the land. That is how we are, we Conservatives. Some have left our ranks, more will leave, but it will not prevent the Government from carrying out its purpose. That is what I had to tell you in the name of my colleagues. You have but one course dictated by duty. If you cannot rise above local or party considerations, you must bear the reproach. If ever there has been a solemn occasion it is the present one, and I repeat my appeal, not for my sake, but for the sake of our country, our race, our language and our institutions. I ask you to forget party ties and to think of your God.

3. Whether, in these statements of the Minister of Public Works, the policy of the Government is correctly announced and defined?

Mr. OUIMET. My answer to the first question is, yes. To the second question I beg to give the following answer:—I did make a speech on nomination day at Verchères, upon the Manitoba school question. I gave a correct history of the whole case, and stated then that the policy of the Government was to be guided by the law and the constitution of the country, and I did ask all to support us in that determination. The policy of the Government was correctly defined in that announcement. If the hon. member for North Simcoe desires further information upon that matter he will get it by a perusal of the divers Orders in Council upon the same subject, and I would specially advise him to read the Minute of Council of the 19th March last, the remedial order of the 21st of the same month, and the speech made in the Senate by the hon. premier on the 22nd April last.

Mr. LAURIER. What about the speech at Verchères?

Mr. McCARTHY asked, Whether, if the remedial order which the Governor General in Council has passed with reference to the Manitoba question is not executed by the legislature of that province, this Parliament will be invested with authority or jurisdiction to pass or enact a law or laws to carry out the decision of the Governor General in Council embodied in the said remedial order?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I read that question, it appears to me capable of two constructions—first, as a question of fact, and, second, as a question of law. If it is meant to be a question of fact, it is irregular, and should not be answered, as being a hypothetical question, asking what will happen if something else happens. If it is, as it possibly is, to ascertain the opinion of the Government as to the legal aspect of the matter under certain circumstances, waiving the objection which, perhaps, might apply to hypothetical questions, I would adopt the language used by eminent counsel representing Manitoba in the argument of the Manitoba school case before His Excellency in Council, where he said:

> Up to the time of the complaint being made to the Governor in Council, the power is absolute and unlimited, section 1 being eliminated, in the legislature of the province. From the time that the jurisdiction of the Governor in Council is invoked and the time the remedial order is passed, the province still has the power, and still remains with the power from the time that order is disobeyed. If that event should happen——

And here I cannot go the whole length of the learned counsel:

> --and we have reason to know from what was said at the opening of the other day, that that event is likely to happen, then there would be concurrent legislative powers until the Parliament of Canada exercised its legislative power.

I think Sir John Thompson spoke of it in his speech as parallel legislative power. I do not know whether my expression or his is the happier, but I think you understand what I mean; in other words, the legislature of Manitoba might, this session, refuse to pass remedial legislation, and then there would be authority, in the Parliament of Canada to pass it, and until the Parliament of Canada passes it, there would still be power in the legislature to pass it. They might repent and pass it the next session, if they please, or even the same session. They might not deal with the matter until this Parliament dealt with it. So that this power and authority, which, I understand, you may, under certain circumstances, exercise, is a power and authority which, under the events which have happened, may arise, and if it does arise, it is a legislative authority to be exercised like any of the other legislative authorities conferred by section 91 of the British North America Act.

CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, 1. Is it the intention of the Government to abolish the Cullers' Office at Quebec? 2. If so, is it their intention to grant pensions to the cullers still in the service, and what will be the amount of such pensions? 3. If it is the intention to grant such pensions to the cullers now in the service, do the Government purpose to cause like pensions to be granted to those cullers who were discharged some years ago, when the staff was reduced?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is, excepting the supervisor, who will be chief inspector. The Act 52 Victoria, chap. 18, sec. 3, authorizes the reduction of the cullers, and the granting of annuities not exceeding $200. Those struck off previously have been granted annuities as there provided. It is proposed to extend this section to the remainder of the staff, thirteen in number, unless they become inspectors under the Inspection Act.

PAPINEAUVILLE AND CHENEVILLE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Who has the contract for the carrying of the mail between Papineauville and Chêneville, in the county of Ottawa? Does the contractor sub-let the contract? What other offices does said contractor hold under the Government? When was the contract for this mail service last given? Were tenders invited? Who tendered, and what was the amount of each tender? Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why not? When does the present contract expire? Is the present contractor the postmaster of St. André d'Avellin? If so, what salary does he draw as such, and what amount is paid to him as contractor? Is he also the revising barrister of Labelle? If so, how much has been paid to him as such, up to date?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the first question, Hyacinthe Noé Raby. 2. Contract is not sub-let; service is performed by Mr. Boyer; the contractor has right to employ any suitable person as courier. 3. The Post Office Department has no information on the subject. 4. Contract was last given on 1st July, 1891. 5. Tenders were not invited, as former contract was renewed. 6, 7, 8 and 9. Answered by reply to question No. 5. 10. 30th June, 1895. 11. The contractor is at present postmaster at Ste. André d'Avellin. 12. Salary, including forward allowance, is $256 per annum. 13. Contract rate is $239 per annum. 14 and 15. Post Office Department has no information on these questions. Present contract has been renewed with the existing contractor from 1st July, 1895.

DARNLEY BASIN BUOYS.

Mr. YEO asked, Whether buoys were placed in the channel leading to Darnley Basin, Malpeque, Prince Edward Island, and whether range lights were placed to assist the navigation of said channel during the summer of 1894, as promised? If

not, why not? Is it the intention to put buoys and range lights there early in the present season?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In regard to Darnley Basin buoys and lights, the agent of the department at Charlottetown was instructed on the 10th September last to arrange to place a range light to work with the main light on Fish Island, and if it prove satisfactory, four spar buoys are to be placed in the channel. No report has been received from the agent as to whether the range light has proved satisfactory.

SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Government should engage the services of one or more competent British veterinary surgeons to examine into and report upon the health of Canadian cattle herds, with a view to obtaining such evidence as will convince the British Government that no danger of infection will be incurred by the admission of Canadian cattle into Great Britain without slaughter at the port of debarkation.

He said: Since November, 1892, a great deal of interest has been taken in the scheduling of Canadian cattle in the English market. The embargo not only attracted a great deal of attention in Parliament, but has also aroused a great deal of interest among the dealers and shippers in our own country. As the order was issued late in the season, November, 1892, it was hoped that the representations of our Government, especially of the Agriculture Department of Canada, coupled with the protests made by a number of leading Scotch farmers, would have had the effect of causing the embargo to be removed before the opening of the shipping season. But, from that day to this, notwithstanding all these efforts, it is still maintained, and the representations of our Government and the Scotch farmers made have been received, if not with contempt, certainly with suspicion. Now that the reports of 1894 and 1895 are in the hands of members, I do not intend to delay the House but a very few minutes, but I would like to draw attention to the investigation which took place in 1894 before the Board of Agriculture in England. This board was assisted in their investigations by the Right Hon. Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., and Dr. J. Burdon Sanderson, F.R.S., as assessors. They called as witnesses a number of the most eminent veterinary surgeons to be found in that country, and they took evidence upon these six heads of inquiry:

1. The appearances ordinarily present in undoubted cases of pleuro-pneumonia (a) as described in the standard text-books of recognized authority, and (b) as met with in the experience of the witnesses.

2. The appearances present in the "Toronto" and "Mongolian" lungs.

3. The degree of resemblance or of variation as between the appearances of the "Toronto" and "Mongolian" lungs, and the appearances stated to be present in undoubted cases of pleuro-pneumonia.

4. The possibility of error in the differentiation of pleuro-pneumonia from other known lung diseases of cattle.

5. The duration of the disease in the "Toronto" and "Mongolian" cases, and the possibility of its being occasioned by exposure and hardship in transit.

6. The general conclusions of the witnesses as to the nature of the disease in the "Toronto" and "Mongolian" cases.

After taking this evidence, which was somewhat voluminous, they arrived at the following conclusion:—

(1) That there is a close resemblance, amounting to practical identity, between the post-mortem appearances of the "Toronto" and "Mongolian" specimens and those presented in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; (2) that the approximation of the appearances in those specimens to those presented in the case of pleuro-pneumonia is very much greater than in the case of any of the known diseases affecting the lungs of cattle; and (3) that none of the appearances recorded in the Canadian cases can be regarded as foreign to pleuro-pneumonia, or as indicative or suggestive of some other disease hitherto unobserved.

If this evidence be looked into, it will be found that some of the most eminent witnesses, notably Professor Macqueen and Dr. Woodhead, gave evidence very contradictory to this conclusion. They believed that the disease was not contagious pleuro-pneumonia. I may say that Sir. Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, asked permission to attend this examination, but he was told by Sir Robert Meade, the permanent Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, that this was not practicable. That, taken in connection with the very strong evidence given by some veterinary surgeons, under examination, point to the fact that the conclusions were arrived at before the evidence was taken. I might further point out that the whole matter was then placed before some of our veterinarians and they arrived at a good deal the same conclusions. I might point out, summarizing this matter, that the Agriculture Department in Canada, taking the evidence as they find it, report as follows:—

(1.) That a disease which appears from lesions in the lungs, to have a particular type alleged by the Board of Agriculture to be pleuro-pneumonia, has been found in the case of about a dozen animals out of 193,860 slaughtered at the port of landing since the fall of 1892 and it may be added out of a total of 1,393,589 neat cattle shipped from Canada since 1880.

(2.) That the persistent and reiterated demand by the Board of Agriculture of the Canadian Government to furnish further information of such disease, based on expert examination of lungs after slaughter of animals, cannot be complied with, for the reason that such disease cannot be found in Canada, notwithstanding diligent and repeated veterinary search, this fact leading to the confident belief that it does not exist in Canada, and to the conclusion that it is absolutely

impossible to furnish the Board with any further information in relation to it by the discovery of cases in Canada.

I would like to go on to lay before the House three other clauses of this report :

(9.) That in all the many thousands of Canadian animals slaughtered in the United Kingdom not a single case of old or encysted pleuro-pneumonia has been found, a condition which is believed would be impossible, if the disease, as alleged, prevailed in Canada.

(11.) The conclusion of the Board of Agriculture in their Minute, that such disease exists in Canada and that it is contagious pleuro-pneumonia of a special type, but not different in its "contagious and fatal effects" from the commonly accepted type known in Europe and elsewhere, is altogether irreconcileable with the fact that it cannot be at all found in Canada, and that it has never, in any part of the Dominion, ever been known ; that no trace of it even has been nor can be discovered. This declaration is made after very earnest special search by veterinarians employed for that purpose by the Canadian Government.

(12.) That the continuing of the restrictive order requiring the slaughter of Canadian cattle at the port of arrival, for the reason of alleged presence of the disease of pleuro-pneumonia in Canada is not supported, and it is believed cannot be, by any proof of its existence.

I take it that there can be no doubt that the Canadian authorities and the Canadian people generally are satisfied that we have not contagious pleuro-pneumonia in Canada. But, from the course pursued by the Board of Agriculture in England, something more, it appears to me, is requisite. Now, it is true that our Department of Agriculture, in 1892, made an offer to the Imperial authorities asking them, if they considered it advisable,

To send out one or more veterinarians for any further elucidation of the facts, on the authority of persons employed by themselves, the undersigned would advise that the offer made in 1892 be repeated, and that he be authorized to pay their expenses from his department appropriation, applicable to such service.

That was renewed in 1894 ; but it has not been accepted by the Imperial authorities. So it appears to me that the Department of Agriculture here has used a great deal of diligence in the matter ; that they have carefully guarded and looked after our interests so far as our cattle trade is concerned. But it does appear to me that one more step could be taken ; that instead of asking the English Government to send out these veterinary surgeons, the department here should choose the most eminent among them, bring them to Canada, and have them go from place to place examining our cattle at the shipping ports and inland shipping points, to go to the farms—to go from one end of this country to the other making a complete examination, slaughtering cattle if necessary, and wherever found necessary. This, it appears to me, would be a rather more aggressive step than any yet taken, and it appears to me that it is about the last step the authorities here can take in order to gain the removal of the embargo placed upon our cattle in 1892. With this object, I move, seconded by Mr. Sproule, the resolution I have placed in your hands.

Mr. SPROULE. I second this motion, not because I imagine that any additional information can be obtained upon this question that has not already been given to the British Board of Agriculture. Nor do I mean, by seconding the resolution, to imply that either the intelligence or integrity of our own veterinary surgeons is defective or that the information they could get would not be as good as might be got by any British veterinary surgeon. I second the motion because I think the step proposed might be taken without any disrespect to our own veterinarians ; and it might be taken with the advice and consent of the British Board of Agriculture—because I apprehend that without that it would avail but little—and it might result in convincing them that pleuro-pneumonia does not exist in Canada. I am quite aware of the fact that an offer was made some time ago by our High Commissioner, and the answer was given that it could not be regarded as suitable. I have here the letters that passed, and I find in one of them Mr. Gardner, after discussing the elaborate inquiry by the board when he was asked to allow English and Scotch veterinary surgeons to be associated in the examination there, proceeded :

There would have been no objection to the presence of Sir Charles Tupper or representatives of the cattle trade during the examination, if any desire to that effect had been expressed.

To that the High Commissioner replied :

Mr. Gardner states that I might have been present at the inquiry if any desire to that effect had been expressed. I may remark that I did express a wish to be allowed to take part in the inquiry, but was informed by Sir Robert Meade, the permanent Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, that this was not practicable. Mr. Gardner, in his letter, confirms Sir Robert Meade's statement, and it will be readily understood in these circumstances I must in any case have declined to be present.

In other words, the British Board of Agriculture said it would be out of place for them to allow any outsider to share the responsibility which rested upon them in the discharge of their duty. It was referred to again by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, when he said :

If the Board of Agriculture should consider it advisable to send one or more veterinarians for any further elucidation of the facts, on the authority of persons employed by themselves, the undersigned would advise that the offer made in 1892——

—that was when the first offer was made to the British Board of Agriculture to send out its own veterinary surgeons to make an examination——

—be repeated, and that he be authorized to pay their expenses from his departmental appropriation applicable to such service.

Now, I have noticed only recently in the newspapers a despatch from England stating that the subject had been under consideration again, and the question was asked in the House of Commons whether Mr. Gardner, the president of the Board of Agriculture had considered the advisability of removing the embargo. His answer was that all efforts heretofere had not been sufficient to convince him that there was no evidence of pleuro-pneumonia in Canada, and, therefore, he saw no reason why they should remove the embargo. It appears to me quite plain from the evidence given then, taken in connection with what has been said on this subject from time to time by the same gentleman, that there is no intention on the part of the Government of removing the embargo, and there is no likelihood of the British Board of Agriculture making that recommendation. I assume it is kept there for the benefit of the English and Scotch farmers, who feel, perhaps, very seriously the keen competition in their lines of trade that was made by the Canadian people before this embargo was placed. I take it to be only another evidence that the British people today are rather in favour of some species of protection, though they may not desire to call it protection for the English farmer, that will prevent the competition which has heretofore existed. Now, I do not wish to imply, by seconding this resolution, any want of confidence in either the ability or the integrity of our own veterinary surgeons, because I believe we have men here of great ability and of as high integrity as any men that can be found in the British Isles. We have men here who have applied themselves to the task as assiduously and as attentively as any men who can be found in any part of the world; therefore, I do not wish to imply any reflection upon them by seconding this resolution. But, as I said before, if the British Government could be induced, with the concurrence and consent of the British Board of Agriculture, or the president of that board, Mr. Gardner, to send out veterinary surgeons of their own selection, who would ascertain the actual facts in relation to this question, and induce them to remove that embargo, I think it would be worth our while to make the attempt.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With regard to the resolution which has just been moved by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), and so ably seconded by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I have to say that the Government, as well as the House, are indebted to those hon. gentlemen for the information which they have so carefully prepared, and for the thoroughness with which they have looked into the whole question of cattle embargo. So far as this motion is concerned, the Government, however, have to take this position: We are perfectly satisfied of the healthfulness of Canadian herds; we are absolutely sure that pleuro-pneumonia does not exist among Canadian herds; we are perfectly certain of our position in that regard, and we have demonstrated our willingness and our anxiety, at all times, to have every possible inquiry made by the British Board of Agriculture with regard to the existence of the disease. Ever since 1882, the Government have been anxious that the British Board of Agriculture should select, from the most eminent of their veterinary surgeons, parties to come here and thoroughly examine, with all the skill and scientific knowledge they possess, into the condition of Canadian herds. That offer was not accepted by the British people until 1892; and in the latest memorandum which the Minister of Agriculture prepared for Council, which memorandum was passed by Council, the offer is renewed in these words:

That if the Board of Agriculture of Great Britain should consider it advisable to send one or more veterinarians for any further elucidation of the facts on the authority of persons employed by themselves, the undersigned would advise that the offer made in 1892 be repeated, and that he be authorized to pay their expenses from his departmental appropriation applicable to such services.

It will be seen from that memorandum that the Department of Agriculture in this country have invited the British Board of Agriculture to send their best experts here to examine into the case, that we have not only offered them every facility, but we have offered to pay the whole expenses in connection with their visit. Now, it appears to the Government, and I think that view will be regarded as very reasonable by this House, that an opinion obtained by an examination of our herds by parties appointed by the British Government themselves, would have a great deal more weight than an opinion obtained from even the most skilled surgeons in England, supposing they were selected by the Canadian Government, and their movements were directly under our control. The position of the department is, I say, that we have afforded every facility for the examination of our herds: we claim that these herds are healthful; that it has never been demonstrated that they are not healthy; that it has never been demonstrated that pleuro-pneumonia exists in this country; but that if the British Board of Agriculture pretend to persist in their idea that it does exist, we are anxious to afford their experts, appointed and selected by themselves, every opportunity for the examination of our herds. We are not only still anxious that they should examine our herds, but we are willing to pay the expenses our-

selves of such examination. I think, Sir, that the Canadian Government and the Canadian Department of Agriculture cannot be asked to go further. While I appreciate the very good motives which prompted the motion of my hon. friend from South Ontario, seconded by my hon. friend from East Grey, I fancy the House will agree with me that the Government have made the kindest and fairest offer to the British Government in that regard. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DISFRANCHISEMENT OF PROVINCIAL OFFICIALS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved :

That it is expedient to amend the Electoral Franchise Act so that it shall not be lawful for any person to vote at any election for a member or members to represent the people in the Parliament of Canada who, at any time within two years before the day of such election, was an employee or an appointee receiving pay or emolument, a holder of a commission for the expenditure of money, or any one in the receipt of wages, emoluments or payments of any kind, other than for contracts let by tender or public auction, of or from any of the provincial governments of Canada or any department thereof or any authority under them which have enacted or may hereafter enact a disfranchisement, as to the election of members to their legislative assemblies respectively, of employees, appointees receiving pay or emolument of or from the Federal Government.

He said : In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I am following on the line of the motion submitted during the last session of Parliament. I prefaced my remarks at that time with the assertion that I did not believe in this kind of legislation, this disfranchisement of a British subject in any portion of the Dominion of Canada. I lay that down as a general rule so far as my belief is concerned. But there are circumstances that arise when general rules are not to be regarded, and in order to prove that general rules are right, we must at times have exceptions. I think an exception to that general rule has now arisen from the course of circumstances pursued in the different provincial legislatures throughout Canada. This resolution has not, as some of our newspapers have asserted, necessarily a particular bearing on Nova Scotia alone, but it has a bearing not only on that province, but on Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba, on those provinces that have enacted similar disfranchising legislation. The reasons that have been put forward for enacting such legislation in the different provinces somewhat vary. The legislation in Ontario, I presume —I have heard nothing to the contrary—is that they wanted to protect the civil servant, and to relieve him from any embarrassment pertaining to his office. Perhaps some hon. members from Ontario may know reasons somewhat contrary to that ; but so far as I can learn, that is the reason which prevailed at the time of the passing of the Act for its adoption. While the Act was passed for those generous, those laudable reasons, it worked well for the Government in power, and it came to be used for other purposes. In Nova Scotia the reasons given for its adoption were entirely foreign to all reasons that it was for the protection of the subject. I will quote some of the reasons adduced. In 1871, an Act was passed disfranchising all Dominion officials from voting for members for the Nova Scotia Legislature. The Attorney General of Nova Scotia of that day gave this as a reason for passing the Bill, namely :

Honourable Attorney General said the simple reason for passing the present Bill was that the servant was always under the authority of his master. The man who paid another wages had a right to control his actions as a general rule, and this applied more particularly to persons in subordinate situations, such as the officers in the Custom-house and railway departments and in the other departments mentioned in the Bill. It was for the protection of these men that the Act was passed.

The Attorney General was somewhat canny. He gave that as the reason ; but it was not the real reason, because the Provincial Secretary afterwards gave the true reason that day. The Attorney General continued :

It was assumed that these men were Nova Scotians, and would not wish to be driven to the hustings to vote for Canadian interests against the interests of their own country.

The Bill was intended to protect them from the tyranny of their masters. It was the interest of the country that the House should be swept clean of all Canadian influence. Before the session closed such laws should be passed that every person who had the smell of Canada upon him would be excluded from this House. * * The members of this House would be taught that they could not serve two masters. The Bill would simply prevent any person in the employ of the Canadian Government, which was foreign to this country, from being walked up to the polls and voting whether he liked it or not.

The Provincial Secretary urged, among other reasons, the following :

The Government took it for granted that Dr. Tupper (now Sir Charles) would protect himself for the Dominion election, and in all probability the officers of the local government would be included in the measure passed in the Canadian House. The anti-confederate party were overlooked altogether. If Dr. Tupper could have the power, he would deprive every anti-confederate of a vote.

Mr. LAURIER. Who was Provincial Secretary ?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Mr. Vail.

Mr. LAURIER. And who was Attorney General.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The Attorney General at that time was Mr. Smith, after-

wards Judge Smith. That law disfranchising Dominion officials was passed in 1871, and it had a very sweeping effect. It did not affect only a few scattered individuals, but in the different counties in eastern Nova Scotia men were disfranchised by blocks. Where there were Government railways, in the counties of Northumberland, Colchester, Pictou and Halifax particularly, also in Antigonish and Hants, honest electors were disfranchised in blocks ranging from 200 to as high as 600 in the different counties, they being Dominion officials. Had it not been for the enactment of this disfranchising Act, Attorney General Longley, when he ran in the county of Annapolis in 1886, would not have been elected, as he only received a majority of 13 votes, and there were between 30 and 40 Dominion officials disfranchised in that county, while in the county of Halifax the number was as high as 600. Last session I gave a statement showing the railway employees in Pictou and their addresses, who were disfranchised by this Act. In Prince Edward Island, where a similar Act is in force, the disfranchising clauses have a very similar effect, for there is a Government railway in that province employing a very large number of officials, and they are disfranchised in blocks in the different counties, showing that it is not altogether for the benefit of those free and independent electors that those Governments disfranchised Dominion officials, but it is for the purpose of keeping themselves in power in the different provinces. The same condition, to some extent applies in the province of Quebec, and also in Ontario and Manitoba. In Nova Scotia attempts were made to repeal the Act in 1872 and 1882, and long discussions took place with respect to it. The Government of the day stated that it was the wish of the Dominion officials that they should be disfranchised, that they did not wish to vote, that they were in favour of the Government of Nova Scotia, and if they went to the polls they would have to vote as their masters dictated. In order to contradict that view, petitions were prepared and signed by the railway employees, asking the legislature to repeal the Act and give Dominion officials a right to vote as free and independent men, as British subjects; but it was not granted. In 1882, when the Conservatives were in power, it was sought to repeal the Act, and its repeal was carried in the Lower House by a majority of 28 to 7. But when it got to the Upper House, which was by a large majority Liberal, it was thrown out and consequently the Act remained as it is to-day. In 1883, Mr. Townshend, now Judge Townshend, then in opposition, moved to repeal the Act, but Mr. Fielding, the present Premier of Nova Scotia, thought that the proposed amendment would place the officials at the mercy of the Government, and that in many cases they would be compelled to vote against their consciences. Mr. Fielding did not go so far as the Attorney General, who in 1871 said: That everything that had a smell of Canadian about it should be excluded from that House, and Attorney General White at that time said:

> The Act preventing officials from voting was passed for the purpose of preventing any undue influences by the Dominion Government.

And it remained as it was, and it remains so to this day. Then in 1894—that was last session of the legislature of Nova Scotia—this Act was sought to be repealed, and the Liberal Government of the day sought to defend it, and I will quote the reasons given by Attorney General Longley to show why it should be retained on the statute-book. I quote from the debates of the House of Assembly, 1894:

> Dr. McKAY, leader of the Opposition, moved the second reading of the Bill to amend chapter 4, R. S., of the election of members to the House of Assembly. He explained that the Bill had for its object the removal of the disqualification of Dominion officials in election of members to the House of Assembly. The injustice done to that intelligent and important class of the community was so manifest that it was unnecessary to make any lengthy observations. These citizens contributed largely to the maintenance of public institutions, and were in every way worthy of enfranchisement. There were about 1,500 Dominion officials disqualified from voting under the present provincial law.

I think Dr. McKay is in error there. There are more than 1,500 disqualified; there are over 2,000 disqualified by reason of that law in Nova Scotia. He continued:

> Such a disqualification of such a large number of intelligent citizens was almost as bad as disqualifying a whole county.

Then Mr. Longley regretted, and so on, that the motion came up, and he said:

> The law in question had been placed on the statute-book as long ago as the year 1870, and had been attended with good results.

No wonder he should think so, because the Attorney General was probably thinking about his election in 1886 when he spoke of the good results that attended the passing of this disfranchisement law. He continued:

> This legislature had passed that law after similar steps had been taken by the legislatures of other provinces. The main object in passing the law was to obtain absolute independence between the provincial and federal legislatures.

They quoted the province of Ontario in order to excuse them for passing this Disfranchisement Act.

> It was, therefore, proper that the legislature of Nova Scotia should ensure the free and independent action of the electorate.

That is a pet phrase with the hon. the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, "the free and independent action of the electorate," but he is one of the most narrow-minded

Liberals that you will find in the Dominion of Canada. He continued :

The law had worked soundly and well, and none but offensive partisan officials would ask for its repeal.

The matter was very fully discussed then and there were a great many arguments brought up by the members of the Opposition during last session in order to repeal this Act. Mr. Fielding did not go quite so far as the Attorney General in giving his reasons why this Act should be retained on the statute-book.

Hon. Mr. Fielding said that the interference of the Dominion Government in provincial elections was not in itself complained of——

He had some little conscience.

—but it was the method of interference which was justly complained of. When members of the local government took part in federal elections, they discussed Dominion issues, and it was the perfectly legitimate thing for Dominion Ministers to ask the people of any constituency to defeat provincial governments on their provincial policy. But that was not the way the federal Ministers interfered. They stood on the public platform and begged the people to defeat the local government, not upon its policy, but simply because its defeat was, in their opinion, necessary in the interests of the Dominion Government.

I think I will show before I am done, Mr. Speaker, that it was perfectly right and proper for a Dominion Cabinet Minister even to ask the people to defeat the local government, because in defeating the Liberal governments it kept a horde away from the treasury of the Dominion. Mr. Fielding goes on to say :

One of the Dominion Ministers, speaking at Pictou in the provincial campaign last year, said that these provincial elections were of vast importance, because they were the first skirmish to be fought in connection with the federal campaign. * * *

Dominion officials were made to feel that if they voted for the Liberal party, they were placed at a disadvantage, and in all probability an increase of salary would not be given them.

How solicitous he was for the poor Dominion official, as far as his salary was concerned. These, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons given by the Liberals of Nova Scotia for the passing of that Act, and the reasons given by the Liberals of Nova Scotia for the retention of that Act as the law of the province. In 1893 they sought in Prince Edward Island to follow the example of Nova Scotia. In 1892 the resolution was first brought up in the Prince Edward Island House, and it finally culminated in a Bill in 1893. Mr. Peters then was the leader of the Opposition, and he introduced a resolution :

To consider the advisability of passing an Act to amend the Act respecting the elections of members to the legislature, by providing that persons in the employment of the Government of Canada shall not be entitled to vote at the election of members of either branch of the legislature of this province.

In the course of a long speech he gave the following reasons for his Bill :—

We are, and we ought to be, complete masters of the situation. We should brook no interference from the authorities at Ottawa. If the Dominion Parliament choose to come down and say we want to reciprocate and take away from the local officials their voice in Dominion politics, let them come down and pass the Act, and I, for one, will say, All right.

He was determined to have no interference from Ottawa whatever, and he cut off all voters who received any pay from the Dominion Government. The Government of Prince Edward Island saw the Government of Nova Scotia and went them one better, so far as the disfranchisement of Dominion employees was concerned. They disfranchised every Dominion official in Prince Edward Island, whereas the Government of Nova Scotia did make some few exceptions, but very few. It is a significant fact to which I would call the attention of the House, that immediately after this sweeping disfranchisement of Dominion officials in Prince Edward Island, the Government of Prince Edward Island imposed a taxation upon the island of over $100,000. They imposed this taxation after disfranchising a large number of these officials. Some hon. members may say : But you are arguing against your own resolution. Well, to a large extent I am. I do not believe in the law ; I believe it is an iniquitous law ; but in order to bring some people to a proper realization of their iniquity, it has to be brought home to them, and in no way can any such iniquity as that be brought home to those people other than by retaliation, and it is an entirely retaliatory measure to which I seek to call the attention of this House to-day. If the reasons given by the Liberals of Nova Scotia in 1871 for the passing of that Act, and the reasons given by the Liberals of Prince Edward Island for the passing of their Act, and the reasons given by the Liberals of Nova Scotia at different times for the retention of their Act were good, then I say the reasons I put forward for the passing of this Act to disfranchise all local government officials are better than good.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Inasmuch as the hon. gentleman argues that those reasons were bad, these are also bad, therefore——

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Not at all. I will give the hon. gentleman better reasons. I wonder if the members of this House remember the call that was given to Quebec in 1887 by the leader of the Quebec Government of that day. It was a call for a conference at Quebec ; and who attended that conference ? The leaders of the different Liberal Governments throughout the

Dominion. Premier Fielding and Attorney Longley were there from Nova Scotia. Sir Oliver Mowat was there. A representation from Prince Edward Island was there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I beg pardon. Mr. Hodgins was there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Unfortunately, the Liberals were not in power in the province then, and there is no such man in the island at all as Mr. Hodgins.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Hudson, then. Is there not a man in the island of the name of Hodgins or Hudson ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. No representation went from the island to the conference at Quebec.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Perhaps I am wrong ; but at all events, that Quebec conference had its effect on Prince Edward Island, as I will show you before I finish. All who were present signed the resolutions of the conference, and they were sent broadcast throughout the country. And what were those resolutions ? Instead of giving them in their entirety to the House, I will only quote one portion of them, in order to show the point I desire to make. The reason that conference was called was beyond a doubt because the various Liberal provincial governments wanted to make a great raid upon the Federal treasury. The different Liberal governments had been extravagant. They had spent money and they had borrowed money, and they wanted to cast the responsibility of incurring direct taxation upon other shoulders than their own. They wanted to cast that responsibility upon the Federal authorities, and they entered into a solemn compact—an organized conspiracy, as it were—to assist the Opposition to the Federal Government to obtain the reins of power, when they expected that they would receive certain concessions from Mr. Laurier's Government. They took up the question of the federal subsidies and allowances to the different provinces. The province of Ontario was receiving $1,196,872 ; by the Quebec conference it was proposed that she should receive $1,778,662. The province of Quebec was receiving $959,252 ; by the Quebec conference it was proposed that she should receive $1,307,221. Nova Scotia was receiving $380,000 ; by the Quebec conference it was proposed that she should receive $542,457. New Brunswick was receiving $207,000, and by the Quebec conference it was proposed that she should receive $436,986. The province of Prince Edward Island was receiving $159,762, and by the Quebec conference it was proposed that she should receive $187,112. It was proposed by the Quebec conference that Manitoba and British Columbia should receive $270,000 and $148,000 respectively. Now, they had a solemn conclave with reference to this matter—so solemn that it was largely secret. The speech of Mr. Mercier and the speeches of the other members of the different Liberal governments who were present were not fully reported. Reporters were excluded purposely. It was only certain portions of the speeches that were delivered to the public ; but this much has been delivered to the public, that the different provinces should receive large increases in the way of subsidies and allowance from the Federal Government. Although Mr. Peters was not in power at that time, and although there was no representation from Prince Edward Island, yet that province saw the point and took advantage of it at once ; for in 1893 what did Mr. Peters do ? After he passed the Disfranchisement Act, by which he placed himself in a position to give all the assistance possible towards getting his great Liberal chief, Mr. Laurier, into power, in bringing down his taxation resolutions, he made a speech in which he said :

> Note that great convention held at Ottawa last summer, when 2,500 persons from all over Canada met to form a Liberal policy which will carry the party into victory. (Cheers.) What do you think a victory of the Liberal party in Canada would mean to us ? It means that this province, which for years has been denied fair-play, would receive it. Not many years ago all the great leaders of the Liberal party met together at the Quebec conference.

Although there was no Liberal delegation at that conference, Mr. Peters took particular care to know what was going there, and to take andvantage of the resolution passed by the conference. He went on :

> You all remember how they agreed on a scheme which, if carried out, would give to this province a largely increased subsidy. You are aware that we send from this island one of the foremost Liberal politicians of Canada. (Great cheering.) And, when the great change comes, instead of Prince Edward Island being a little unrepresented province, it will have as its champion a man who will fill a place second only to that of the Premier of Canada. (Applause.) We will then receive justice. Questions such as our winter communication and claims of different natures which have been shelved time and again, will be pressed by the man who is always ready to thrust and thrust home.
>
> I trust that time may soon come when all questions of taxation will be looked upon as a thing of the past.

He was then, you will understand, proposing to a large extent direct taxation :

> Or, if you are taxed again, it will be for something which has not yet entered into our minds. Gentlemen, I ask, are the people of this island ready to fight once more the great battle of Liberalism, when the Liberal party shall be triumphant and the question of taxation which I have brought before you to-night, shall have become a thing of the past ?

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that there was in his mind at the time the desire of the return of the Opposition to power in the Federal Parliament, in which case there would be no need to tax the province of Prince Edward Island, because she would then be the recipient of a largely increased subsidy from the Federal Government: so that nothwithstanding how deeply the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may deplore that these shreds and patches of the maritime provinces have cost a mint of money to the Federal Government, still, when his leader comes into office, he will have to submit to this policy, he will have to support the raid on the Dominion Treasury on behalf of little Prince Edward Island, and come down handsomely with an increased subsidy. Mr. Peters, although he was not at the Quebec conference and although he did not send a Liberal delegate to that conference, was not slow to see the advantages that were held out by it to Liberalism in Prince Edward Island, and took care to thrust and thrust home himself, under cover of this promise of Mr. Mercier and the other delegates at the conference. What occurred immediately afterwards? In the year 1891, we had an election. Although a great many Liberals attended the Quebec conference, all the Liberals in Canada were not there; and some of the Liberal leaders in the maritime provinces were not prepared to risk everything on that election in order to get their party into power in the Dominion, and insisted on obtaining an explicit promise that the resolutions of the Quebec conference would be adhered to. What was the result? We have heard of a telegram to this effect having been sent by Mr. Mercier to Mr. Laurier: "My support depends on your answers to this." and of Mr. Mercier receiving this reply: Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolution of the Interprovincial conference and has promised to give effect to them when he comes into power. The Attorney General and the Premier of Nova Scotia got their reply. Mr. Peters got his reply. And like the Assyrians, we heard them:

> Coming down like a wolf on the fold,
> And their cohorts were gleaming with purple and gold.

And although that may not be strictly applicable to the Liberals who came down in the election of 1890, we know that they came down in 1891 with their paper and gold and did their best to return to power Mr. Laurier and the present Opposition. The whole cry was that the depleted treasury of the different Liberal Governments should be reimbursed and again made solid by the carrying out of the resolutions of the Quebec conference. Mr. Peters put himself in the direct way of gaining all the advantage he possibly could by reason of the Quebec conference. Now, if there is wanting any good reason for passing a law to curtail the power in federal politics of the different Liberal governments, I think I have given it here. They have pledged themselves to make a direct onslaught on the federal chest as soon as they get into power. Outside altogether the retaliatory portion of my resolution, I contend that there are direct good and valid reasons why we should protect our country from the onslaughts of these people.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You cannot get anything out of the chest now.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I do not wish to make any extended remarks upon this matter. I have shown the object of my resolution and believe that I have shown its title to the favourable consideration of this House; and if it be favourably considered, I expect to introduce a Bill founded upon it during the session.

Mr. McISAAC. It is rather strange that the first hon. gentleman to place himself on record in direct opposition to the advice given by the hon. Finance Minister in his Budget speech is the hon. member for Annapolis, who has just spoken. The Finance Minister deprecated the idea of our making any attacks upon gentlemen outside of this House. The hon. member for Annapolis is the first one to offend against this counsel by making an attack on the Provincial Secretary and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia. For the last thirteen years the hon. member and his associates in Nova Scotia have been making daily attacks upon these two gentlemen; and the net result of their efforts has been that at every election during that period these two gentlemen have obtained increased majorities in almost every constituency in the province. The hon. gentleman has told us that if the measure he now proposes had been law, the Attorney General would not, in 1886, have been returned in Annapolis, which means that Dominion officials must vote Tory. But he forgot to tell us that two elections have since been held and that the Attorney General of Nova Scotia was returned for Annapolis in each of these elections by a largely increased majority. He also forgot to tell us that there have been three elections in Nova Scotia since 1882, and that on every occasion Mr. Fielding and Mr. Longley and the Liberal Government of that province obtained the increased confidence of the electorate, including the county represented by the hon. gentleman himself. He has stated that the result of this Bill is the disfranchisement of hundreds of people in some counties of Nova Scotia. But he has forgotten to tell us that the result of the proposal that he lays before this House will be not merely to disfranchise hundreds but to disfranchise, probably, twenty-five per cent of the voters in

the province of Nova Scotia. The Act disfranchising Government officials in the province of Nova Scotia was passed in 1871, as the hon. gentleman has stated. He would have this House believe that the object of passing that Bill in Nova Scotia at that time and continuing it ever since was hostility to the Conservative Government in power at Ottawa. But he forgot to tell you that, for five years there was a Liberal Administration under the late Alexander Mackenzie in this Dominion, during which time there was also a Liberal Administration in the province of Nova Scotia; yet during that time the legislature of Nova Scotia never raised its hand to repeal the Act; thus clearly showing that the object and intention of the Nova Scotia Liberals was to keep the Act on the statute-book, regardless of whether a Liberal or a Conservative Government might rule at Ottawa. The hon. gentleman has also stated the fact that during the time when the Conservatives were in power in Nova Scotia from 1878 to 1882—and be it remembered that only during these four years has a Conservative Government been in power in Nova Scotia at any time since confederation—a Bill was passed by the Assembly to repeal this Act of the Nova Scotia Legislature, but it was thrown out in the Legislative Council. That is quite true. But the hon. gentleman has forgotten to tell this House that that Bill was introduced by a private member, and that it was passed by the Assembly in the last year of the administration of a Conservative Government as stated by the hon. member. If this Act was regarded as such an iniquitous measure, is it not strange that an Administration led by Mr. Holmes and the late Sir John Thompson would allow four years to pass and never introduce a Bill to repeal it, and that it should be left to the last year of the Administration for a private member to introduce such a Bill, only to have it thrown in the Council? Why did not the Government, during these four years, introduce it as a Government measure? It is well known to everybody that a Bill introduced by the Government would win far more consideration than one introduced by a private member. Is it not strange also that though, during these four years of Conseravtive rule, only the one attempt was made to repeal this Act, and that during the last session of the Administration, almost every session since then, the Liberals being in power, the Opposition have tried to repeal the Act? Does not this show that they did not really want to repeal it. The hon. gentleman has also forgotten to say that that Act disfranchises provincial as well as Dominion officials. Let me read the clauses of the Bill:

It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at an election for a member or members to represent the people, in the General Assembly of this province, who at any time within fifteen days before the day of election was in the receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as an employee in the Post Office, the Custom-house, the Inland Revenue Department, the Lighthouse service, on the Government Railways, in the Crown Lands or the Local Public Works and Mines.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to extend to any elector who may have contracted to furnish materials of any kind for the Government railroads or to perform any other specific contract in respect of the same, or to any person who may have been employed by the day temporarily to repair the railroads, or to any way office keeper or mail courier under the Post Office.

But what is the nature of the hon. gentleman's resolution?

That it is expedient to amend the Electoral Franchise Act so that it shall not be lawful for any person to vote at any election for a member or members to represent the people in the Parliament of Canada who at any time within two years before the day of such election was an employee or appointee receiving pay or emolument, a holder of a commission for the expenditure of money, or any one in the receipt of wages, emoluments or payments of any kind, other than for contracts let by tender or public auction, of or from any of the provincial governments of Canada or any department thereof or any authority under them which have enacted or may hereafter enact a disfranchisement, as to the election of members to their legislative assemblies respectively, of employees, appointees receiving pay or emolument of or from the Federal Government.

You will see the distinction between these two. The hon. member for Annapolis says that the Bill which he proposes is a retaliatory measure. And so it is. The hon. gentleman from his standpoint asks this House to accept the infamous proposition that two wrongs make a right. He has attacked in every mood and tense the Nova Scotia law which disfranchises certain officials of this and of the provincial governments, or others who are in government employ fifteen days before the election, and he asks us to agree in the disfranchisement of every man who is employed by the local government in any capacity whatever at any time within two years before the election. If a man has a five or ten dollar road commission in any part of Nova Scotia, or earns one dollar within two years of the election according to this proposal, he is to be disfranchised, and this the hon. gentleman proposes to do, forsooth, for the purpose of retaliation. I certainly shall be surprised to learn that there may be found in this House one hon. gentleman who will go to the extent of endorsing the proposition the hon. gentleman has laid before us. Sir, their is another point. The officials of the province of Nova Scotia are not partisan appointees, as are the officials of this Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McISAAC. Hon. members may laugh. I will give them time to laugh and then I will explain. And more, I will

give names. The chief officials of the Nova Scotia Government, as of the Government at Ottawa, are the officials in the several departments. I can name the principal officials in the province building at Halifax, and I believe that I can show that notwithstanding that a Liberal Government has been in power ever since confederation, with the exception of one period of four years, and that it has held power uninterruptedly for the last thirteen years, a majority of the deputy heads of the departments are to-day Conservatives, and if the hon. gentleman challenges me, I will give names now. In the Department of the Commissioner of Works and Mines, Halifax, Mr. Gilpin, the Deputy Commissioner, is a Conservative. In the Department of the Attorney General, who has been attacked by the hon. member for Annapolis, the Deputy Crown Lands Commissioner, the highest official in the department, is Mr. Austin, a Conservative. The Queen's Printer, Mr. R. T. Murray, is a Conservative. The first assistant clerk in the Provincial Secretary's office is a Conservative. The Provincial Engineer of the province of Nova Scotia is a Conservative —at least he is claimed by them as much as by the Liberals. The Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Lawson, is a Conservative. The deputy in the Education Department, in the province of Nova Scotia, is a Conservative, and the last appointment, and one of the most important in the gift of the province, that of Superintendent of Education, went to a Conservative.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). They could not find a Liberal fit to fill the place.

Mr. McISAAC. They could find scores of good men, but the Government honestly believed that the present incumbent was the best man available. The new superintendent comes from a county represented by the Minister of Justice, and those acquainted with Nova Scotia politics, know what a Pictou County Tory is. This is one of the most important positions in the gift of the Government. It is filled, and, I may say, well filled by the present superintendent, who is a Conservative. If the Nova Scotia Government were of the character the hon. member for Annapolis would have us believe, they would certainly have filled this and other important positions from the ranks of their own party and would not retain Conservatives in positions. Should the hon. gentleman's resolution pass and be followed by the Bill which he proposes to base upon it, for my part, I shall fear it very little. Of the officials whom it would disfranchise, there are about as many Conseravtives as Liberals. But it is the avowed principle of the thing, and because of the principle, retaliation, I oppose it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). How about the principles of the local Bill ?

Mr. McISAAC. That Bill was enacted in 1871, it has remained upon the statute-book up to this time, and the friends of the hon. gentleman in Nova Scotia, when they were in power, and when they were out of power, were not able to wipe that law off the statute-book, because it was considered by the great majority of the people of Nova Scotia, as well as by the officials themselves, to be a law in their interest. Sir, there may be one good result from this resolution, if it passes, it may relieve the Government of some embarrassment. Sometimes they get into conflicts with the provincial governments when they happen to be Liberal. This proposed amendment is a retaliatory measure ; the hon. member for Annapolis asks this Parliament to pass a retaliatory Act to compel the Nova Scotia Legislature to repeal their Act. Did it ever occur to him that this is a game that two can play at ? That if this Parliament does pass such an Act, the legislature of Nova Scotia, the legislature of Prince Edward Island, and the legislatures of all the other provinces can retaliate ? And when they do retaliate to the extent that he proposes in this Bill, and disfranchises every Dominion official and employees who, within two years of an election, get a dollar from the Dominion Government for any service, how, then, will the friends of the hon. gentleman in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, find themselves placed ? I ask him, therefore, to look at the question in this light, and see how it strikes him. But it may be a precedent which the Government may find very convenient when they get into a conflict with a provincial government. It would be a good lever for compelling the provincial governments to get down on their knees and do the bidding of this Government, although it might conflict in some respect with what is termed provincial rights. It may be that the Dominion Government would like a pretext for withholding subsidies from the province of Manitoba, or from some other province, until this Act were repealed by the legislatures of those provinces, or, perhaps, until Manitoba, for instance, would pass remedial legislation. That would be a grand idea on the part of the Dominion Government, and I think that is the only merit, if it be one, that is possessed by the proposition of the hon. member for Annapolis. I say again, that this Bill of which the hon. member for Annapolis complains, has not created any trouble in Nova Scotia in the past, and it is useless for him to come into this House and attack the Attorney General and the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia. Similar attacks upon them in the province itself have been, heretofore, futile, and I assure him that any attack which he or his friends may make upon those gentlemen, either in this House or out of Nova Scotia, will be just as

harmless and just as futile as similar attacks have been when addressed to the electors of Nova Scotia in the province itself.

Mr. TISDALE. I am somewhat surprised by some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in accusing the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) for attacking hon. gentlemen who are not members of this House. Surely the hon. gentleman, as an old parliamentarian, at all events, ought to know that the hon. gentleman for Annapolis has followed the fair spirit of public discussions in this House, in reading quotations from the speeches of the hon. gentlemen to whom he alluded, giving their reasons for passing the law he was attacking. Now, if that is unfair, if that is improper, it shows how hard pressed the hon. gentleman must have been in attempting to answer the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis in introducing this Bill. I leave it to the good-sense and good judgment of both sides of the House now—because I wish to be fair in regard to this part of the subject—because it is rather a serious thing to charge a member on either side of the House with being unfair or attacking anybody outside of the House, and particularly members of another legislature. Now, I say that the hon. member for Annapolis was not only in order, not only was he extremely courteous, but he quoted fairly, and confined himself entirely, so far as those gentlemen were concerned, to the statements upon which he based his motion. It is true that he went further than that, and named them, but I think he was moderate in his deductions as to the objects which underlie the legislation which they had been instrumental in passing. That is quite a different thing from an attack upon the hon. gentlemen themselves. He was neither personal, nor was he unfair, even in a political sense. So much for that. Now, as I understand the hon. gentleman, one of the strong parts of his attempted defence—because I must confess that I was disappointed at a gentleman coming from Nova Scotia who had not a better defence, if the law is defensible at all—one of the strongest points he attempted to raise, was the prevention of interference by politicians or supporters of either the local or federal Government, in elections; that is, he contended that the legislation was defensible for the reason that it prevented employees of the general Government from interfering in local elections. Now, if the legislation was of a nature fairly to ensure that, it would satisfy the minds of reasonable men that that was the intention of the legislature, and there would be a good deal in that point. But I have to tell him—and I have to admit that I know little of the provinces down by the sea—that up in Ontario the effect of any legislation passed by the local House has not been of that character; and I have some evidence in my hands that proves the contrary. I suppose that all the members here from the province of Ontario know a gentleman named Preston, who used to be a capital political organizer for the Liberal party in Ontario, a very able one, they claim, but, on our side, we claim not a very scrupulous one. Lately, they have had to call another gentleman to take his place, because he has been given the position of Librarian in the Ontario Government buildings. I know the position he holds, because a letter I am about to read is written on a sheet of paper, headed, Legislative Library, Ontario. The letter is as follows:—

Toronto, Feb. 13, 1895.

My dear ————,—It is strange that a letter came from you this morning on the very subject that I intended writing you about to-day, that is, South Renfrew in the Commons. I am writing in the strictest confidence, of course. How would Peter Ryan run in that riding? You know what kind of a speaker Peter is. He addressed a meeting there, I think, in the MacIntyre contest. He would create great enthusiasm, as he is a most enthusiastic fellow in every sense. Think this over, and drop me a line, or, if you find a feeling at all in favour of such a candidate, write him direct, but do not mention my name in connection with the suggestion. You know that if a prominent Irish Catholic is elected in Ontario at the approaching elections, if Laurier should carry the country, and the prospects are excellent, he would be in the new Cabinet. Drop me a line.

Yours in haste,
W. T. R. PRESTON.

That shows, at all events, the practical effect which can be claimed for such legislation as this so far as it affects Ontario. I am not going to enlarge upon this matter, because very little evidence speaks more convincingly than a great deal of talk. The hon. gentleman claims that the majority of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia had been increasing ever since he got into power. If he has conducted himself on the lines of the legislation that got him into power, no wonder need be felt if he has increased his power; but the hon. gentleman who addressed the House did not attempt to answer the argument of my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), that it was through this Act to which objection has been taken that the Attorney General secured power. My hon. friend's statement could not be contradicted; the hon. gentleman did not attempt to contradict it, for it is well known that, while the Attorney General had a majority of only 13 or 14 votes, the provincial government had disfranchised 30 or 40 Dominion employees in the district which elected him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was his majority at the last election?

Mr. TISDALE. What has that got to do with it?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Between 200 and 300.

Mr. TISDALE. That has no bearing on the issue, and is simply evading the point. In fact, it is difficult to keep hon. gentlemen opposite on the point under discussion. I propose to keep them to the point.

Mr. FRASER. Does that mean, then, that every Dominion official will vote Tory?

Mr. TISDALE. It does not always follow. The government of the province would not, however, disfranchise them unless they thought Dominion officials would vote Tory. That, of course, is human nature. However, I say that is no argument in reply to what the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has put forward. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) suggested—and I suppose it was true, because no doubt the hon. member knows what he is talking about—that the local Government was all the time appointing Conservatives to positions. Well, I do not know what kind of Conservatives they may be, but I admit there are weak-kneed Conservatives as well as weak-kneed Reformers, and one way of getting such people over is to appoint them to positions, and thus increase the strength of the Government. I am not saying that all Conservatives are like that, for I know to the contrary; but the hon. gentleman's statement, that all the time the local Government has been increasing their power, without giving an explanation of the fact, made it appear as if the politicians were somewhat different by the sea than they are in Ontario.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman's statements are correct, it must be so, because never in my experience in Ontario have I heard of the Liberal Government appointing any one to office except a member of its own party, and that is accepted as fair politics. So boasting as he did that the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia were appointing Conservatives all the time, it was difficult to understand how they could increase their majority, if, as it is alleged, the majority has been increased. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) also boasted that when Mr. Mackenzie came in power he did not change the law. If there had been nothing else but the fact that this extraordinary action had been taken within a year by his own Liberal friends, that would have been sufficient to prevent action on his part. I desire now to draw the attention of the House to some points which the hon. member forgot to state. He forgot to tell the House his own opinion of the law, or to give it any arguments justifying such a law. On the last occasion when my hon. friend from Annapolis brought up this resolution, I told him I was not prepared to support it, and when he happened to speak to me today on the subject I said I had not made up my mind about it, because I said that at all events he should give people a 'locus penitentiae' before passing a law on a principle hard to justify, that is, to pass a law compelling people by force, if you cannot do it by other means, to do what you believe to be right. I hold that only exceptional circumstances will justify such a course, but I must confess that after what I have heard to-day, which is the first occasion on which the whole circumstances have been laid before the House, when it was stated that hundreds and even thousands of people were disfranchised, people who were not officials in the ordinary sense of the term, but who happened to obtain employment from the Government in two great provinces controlled by the Liberals, I have entirely changed my mind. I think, under these circumstances, we would not be doing our duty to British freemen if we did not say that this Nova Scotia law should be repealed—I will not say so much about the Ontario law, because that legislation is not so sweeping in its character, although I object to it, as only Dominion officials are disfranchised. In the lower provinces, however, any one who is employed, and has to earn his bread and butter and support his family through the Dominion Government, is disfranchised, and thereby one of the rights and privileges of a freeman is taken from him. Hon. members talk about provincial rights; but what sort of provincial rights are they when citizens of a province are not allowed to exercise their constitutional liberties of voting on provincial matters because they have accepted employment under the federal Government? I appeal to every fair-minded Liberal to repeal this Act and come, if necessary, to their relief by passing even what I consider very objectionable legislation, and such as only extreme circumstances would lead me to favour. Let the provincial Act of Nova Scotia be toned down so as to go only to the limit of the Ontario Act, and I will not support the proposed Bill; but to say that whole townships or little villages of employees in the service of the Dominion Government shall be disfranchised, is doing an act of violence to the constitution. This course should be taken by whatever government is in power; although the Conservative Government is in power to-day, I admit the Liberals are acting the part of critics as well and as honestly as politics can be administered, and if hon. gentlemen opposite get into power, we promise them that we will take care that the Liberal Government shall carry out this policy, and if they fail, we will endeavour to make them do so. It is a reflection on our institutions to say that we cannot protect the rights of Dominion

voters, and that we cannot prevent them being coerced under our ballot system. Coercion cannot be applied under our ballot to any great extent. So I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to join with hon. members on this side of the House in seriously considering whether this blot should be allowed any longer to remain on the legislation in connection with two or three provinces of the Dominion, and whether this Parliament should not exercise all its constitutional powers to come to the relief of the people so affected. It was not fair for the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac)—and this was the only point made in his speech—to call this a measure of retaliation, because we have never shown any spirit of that sort in our federal legislation. The provinces commenced it. We in this Parliament have greater powers than the provinces, but the less the power of a self-governing body the more tenacious they should be of their rights. I am glad that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has taken considerable trouble to expose to the House this state of things, because I had no idea until to-day that the franchise was so restricted and warped in some of those provinces. I had not an idea that this —I hardly know what word to apply to it, but I will call it confiscation—I had no idea that this confiscation of the rights of men who ought to vote prevailed to such an extent. I ask the Liberal party in this House in all kindness and sincerity to use their influence with their friends to prevent this state of things and to save the federal Parliament the necessity of taking such action as I believe will be rendered necessary in time to come. I hope that we shall not be obliged to pass such legislation in this House, but at all events we should go the full length the constitution allows us, to compel this blot to be removed from the franchise legislation of the provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The name of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) has been frequently mentioned of late as an aspirant for a position which I think he may legitimately aspire to, namely, a seat in the Cabinet. I do not know what the hon. gentleman made this preliminary canter for, or whether he hoped it would justify his promotion in the eyes of the leader of the House, but certainly I am compelled to say that he has somewhat sunk in the esteem of many who had a very good opinion of him before. What is the highest idea of statesmanship announced by the hon. gentleman? What does he recommend this House to do? He asks us to copy certain legislation enacted by certain legislatures of the provinces, and which legislation in the very same sentence he declares to be vicious and immoral. Why, I was astonished at the hon. gentleman. He rose in his place first and he said: that although he had been privately canvassed by the hon. member (Mr. Mills) to vote for this resolution, yet such was his abhorrence of its anti-British character that he felt himself impelled to say that he could not bring himself down to a standard sufficiently low to vote for it. Then the hon. gentleman says: When I come to consider the matter over, I think I will adopt the lex talionis and vote for it; and he says further: Because they have done a wrong down there to some people of the same political stripe as I am I will be prepared to advise Parliament to do a greater wrong to a larger number of people of the opposite stripe. Sir, that is the hon. gentleman's view of statesmanship. I do not think that any honourable man in this House treats this resolution seriously. The hon. member who moved it intimated as much himself when he said that he hardly expected that it would be passed.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I did not say any such thing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman——

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I beg your pardon. I am strictly in earnest with reference to it, and I want that to be distinctly understood.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt, from what I know of the hon. gentleman, that if he could not only disfranchise every Liberal office holder, but every Liberal in the province, he is prepared to do it. Why, Sir, that hon. gentleman does not think that a Liberal has a right to vote——

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is a personal attack which I repudiate entirely.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I accept the hon. gentleman's repudiation. He would, I presume, like to let a few Liberals vote just for the name of the thing; but he would like to disfranchise sufficient of them to enable him to be returned always by Act of Parliament, and not by the vote of the people.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is not so. Some of my best friends are Liberals.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But they won't stay so now.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes, they will.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will not consider whether these provincial Acts are justifiable or not. One has to know the local circumstances under which they were passed in each province before one can pass an opinion on them. I do not think it is necessary for this Parliament to take into review the legislation of the several provincial parliaments upon subjects strictly within their proper purview, or to determine whether they were wise or not in passing them. I may remark, however, en passant, that one of the reasons advanced in Prince Edward Island for the passing of the Act, whether a good reason or a bad one, was that

they had not the Ballot Act in that province. There was open voting there, and with the Dominion Government possessing the control of a trunk line of railway 210 miles in length, and employing a great many hundreds of men, it was said that these men having to vote openly were not their own masters, and that they were marched up in platoons, and compelled to vote for the Conservative candidate whether they wished it or not. That was the argument advanced in Prince Edward Island, and a large number of the men themselves desired to be relieved of the invidious position into which they were forced on account of the fact that there was open voting and that they could not exercise the franchise freely. To my knowledge no expression of opinion by way of petition or otherwise—if I am wrong I should be glad to be corrected—has ever come from any portion of these men complaining of any wrong done to them.

Mr. CURRAN. Why did they not pass a Ballot Act, then ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish they would. When I had the honour of leading in that province I did pass a Ballot Act, but when the Conservative party came into power they repealed it. That is the answer I give to the Solicitor General.

Mr. CURRAN. That is retaliation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That may be the hon. gentleman's idea. I want to show him that the Liberal party in Prince Edward Island carried a Ballot Act, and for years that Act was in force and the people voted under it. They had the same liberty to vote and to maintain the secrecy of their vote as they have in the Dominion elections, but the Conservative party came in, and for reasons of its own made the voting open, and the consequence was that an inordinate proportion of the voters were compelled to vote openly at the risk of losing their places, and, rightly or wrongly, the Liberals passed this Act to remedy what they thought was a grievance. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) took quite a length of time reading to the House the proceedings of the Quebec conference, and certain comments made upon it by my friend Mr. Peters, of Prince Edward Island, and by, I think, Mr. Fielding. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) hardly, I think, exercised that wisdom and prudence which generally characterizes him when he undertook to administer a castigation to a gentleman who was an opponent of his, and between whom and he there is now a thousand of miles of distance. I have a suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that when the Attorney General of Nova Scotia is present my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) is not so free in the use of his expletives as he was to-day when he referred to Mr. Longley. The Attorney General of Nova Scotia is prepared to take care of himself and to justify his conduct in the legislature, and I think he does so in a way satisfactory to himself and to his constituents. The hon. member from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) read in the House language used by the Premier of Nova Scotia away back in 1871, and remarks made by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, twenty-four years ago; a gentleman who is long since dead and gone to his last resting place, and the hon. member (Mr. Mills) asked us to form some conclusion because these remarks were uttered antagonistic to the confederation of the provinces. Why, Sir, we all know that at that time there was a very bitter feeling existing in Nova Scotia with reference to the way it was legislated into the union, and I am not surprised at all at the language then used by the Attorney General of the day. But we have nothing to do with that here now. I thank the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) for one thing. He has a correct appreciation of the speech which was delivered by the leader of the Government in Prince Edward Island. Mr. Peters pointed out that which a great many believe, namely, that when the Liberals do come into power, if they ever do, Prince Edward Island will then be treated properly and get that which has long been denied it; which is justice. Mr. Peters has expressed that in eloquent and strong language, and so far as the extract which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) read from the speech of Mr. Peters is concerned, proving that when the Liberals get into power, not only Prince Edward Island, but all the provinces would get justice, I am in accord with him. It was the best part of the speech of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). I hope he will give it a very wide circulation, and that the sentiment which he has quoted will find a resting place in the bosoms of very many electors. If that should occur, we will get justice then and we will be prepared to administer the same lex talionis to them in return.

Mr. CURRAN. With regard to the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.), who has just addressed the House, and also the speech of the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) as was well observed by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale): both these gentlemen avoided expressing any opinion upon the spirit of the legislation passed by the provinces, or as to whether it was proper legislation or not. These hon. gentlemen have very carefully avoided stating their own views, and I think they were very wise in taking that course, because it is not difficult to find the opinions of the very best Liberals in this country upon that subject. These opinions are upon record in this Parliament, and no less a distinguished man than the late Sir A. A. Dorion, when a member of this House and Minister of Justice said, speaking in 1874:

With the ballot I do not see why public officials should not vote; with the ballot every one should vote.

And when this question was brought up in the local legislature of Quebec, when the Liberal government, under Mr. Mercier, or what was supposed to be the Liberal government, brought in a Bill for the purpose of disfranchising a large number of persons, the best Liberals in the House rose to oppose that legislation, amongst others, Mr. Lareau, the author of a history of constitutional law in Canada, a gentleman who is well known and highly respected by both Liberals and Conservatives in the older provinces: Mr. Lareau made a speech, in which he challenged the wisdom and the fairness of such legislation, and emphasized, as follows, the doctrines of the Liberal party:—

They were face to face with an electoral reform. They had to decide yes or no whether a large number of honourable men should be deprived of the right to vote. It was said it would be better for the employee, while others pretended it had been tried in other assemblies and created trouble. Again, had the promoters of this Bill been requested by these employees to deprive them of voting? He did not know, but did not think so. He concluded by quoting a number of authorities opposed to restricting the right of voting to any class of citizens.

I rose, Mr. Speaker, just to point out that the doctrine of the Liberal party preached by those held in the highest esteem by the Liberals of this country, has always been opposed to the spirit of the legislation which the hon. member for Antigonsh (Mr. McIsaac) has sought to defend to-day, without giving his own views on the subject.

Mr. CASEY. What are your views?

Mr. CURRAN. My views are that every man should vote under the ballot.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to see the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) so emphatically sat upon by the Solicitor General. If the hon. member for Annapolis has really meant his motion, or anything else, except a little "hifalutin" for the approaching elections, he must now feel himself entirely extinguished by the truly Liberal dictum, derived from the Liberal party, which has been laid down by his friend, the Solicitor General. The hon. member for Annapolis has already given his whole case away, for he not only argued against the principle of the Bill throughout, but he told us at the end of his speech, that he had made those remarks for the purpose of letting the House understand what the object of this motion was, and I think we clearly understood its object before he got through. The object of the motion was to attack the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia, and, in particular, the Attorney General, Mr. Langley. The hon. member compelled us to believe that he was seriously afraid that Mr. Longley might desert the local legislature, and take the field against himself in the county of Annapolis.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am willing to meet him at any time.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Annapolis says that some of his best friends there are Liberals. That may have been the case before this discussion took place; but, after the speech of the hon. member and after the rebuke administered to him by his own leader, I think they cannot be his friends any longer, consistently, with any sense of self-respect. The arguments, as I have said, have all been against the course which the supporters of the hon. member for Annapolis have urged us to take. But too many may run away with the impression that this Bill refers only to Nova Scotia. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that if this matter were seriously before us, it would apply to the province of Ontario as well as to Nova Scotia, although in Ontario for local purposes. The only officials disfranchised are judges, Customs officers, postmasters in cities and towns, and excisemen. That would be sufficient to bring Ontario within the list of provinces which would be affected by the hon. gentleman's proposition, if it became law. His proposition would have a further effect that has not yet been pointed out by any one whom I have heard; it would disfranchise not only civil servants of the different provinces, but all members of the provincial legislatures; for his proposal is to disfranchise any one in the receipt of emoluments or payments of any kind, other than for contracts let by tender or public auction. Would the hon. member like to see his friends in the local legislatures disfranchised? Perhaps he would; but I am sure his friends would not. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) gave us some startling information in regard to the state of things in Nova Scotia, which we had not before. He said there were whole townships and villages of Dominion employees in that province who were disfranchised by this local Act. I really did not think things had got to such a pass as that in Nova Scotia. We have heard something about Pictou Tories, and about the lavish use of patronage down there; but I never imagined before that there were whole townships of officials. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had been slightly misinformed. But, to close my reference to this serio-comic effusion of the hon. member for Annapolis, we will allow him what the hon. member for South Norfolk pled for in the case of Dominion employees, a locus penitentiae. Let him take time to reflect upon what he has done. The hon. Minister of Justice has given us an example of how this opportunity should be afforded to everybody, even to the erring employees of the

Dominion Government. He is willing that an erring employee of his department should have not only a locus penitentiae, but a place in the penitentiary in British Columbia. I do not propose that that sort of treatment should be administered to the hon. member for Annapolis; but I think we should leave him place for repentance, and we will hope that after he has had a good dinner, he will come to realize that he has got off a very good joke for the House, and a very good pamphlet of abuse of the local Ministers for his own possible advantage.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would not trespass on the indulgence of the House in respect to this matter were it not for one expression which has dropped from a couple of previous speakers, that is, that this particular motion is being supported by them as a retaliatory measure. As one who is prepared to vote for this motion, I distinctly repudiate that position; and I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments to present the matter as it occurs to my mind. I presume that we are here for the purpose of obtaining justice, as far as possible, for all the people of Canada, and I presume that the members of this House recognize here what seems to be too often forgotten outside of this House, that this Dominion is made up of various provinces, the whole being equal to the sum of its parts; and this fact is not to be set aside by drawing distinctions between Dominion and provincial jurisdictions. I think that when we come to look at the matter honestly and calmly as legislators, ready to do our duty to those who send us here, we shall find that there are very few matters that come before this House in which Dominion and provincial rights are not really intertwined. To my mind, the greatest reason why this House is justified in taking action with regard to this matter is a reason that has been forced upon us, year after year, by members of the party represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. Ever since 1885, when the Franchise Act was passed, we have had appeal after appeal in every Reform newspaper and from every Reform platform throughout the land, to wipe the abominable Dominion Franchise Act out of existence and adopt the local lists in its place. When we find that this is one of the planks of the Reform party, and when we find the provincial laws in this condition, we must all feel that the people of the Dominion and the provinces are directly interested in the legislation which is objected to so strongly by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) and which has not found one defender even among hon. gentlemen opposite. Had I any doubts whatever as to the injustice of this provincial legislation, they would have been dispelled by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) who, although he himself once occupied a seat in the local government, which was the subject of attack this afternoon, and although he was addressing this House on an occasion when naturally he would wish to create a favourable impression as regards the honesty and sincerity of his motives, yet seemed powerless, during the half hour of his address to say one word, despite his well-known ability and experience, which could enable us to form a conclusion as to the opinion he holds on this very questionable legislation. When I find also that other gentlemen of high standing in the councils of the Reform party, such as the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) decline to commit themselves to any opinion, it must be apparent that hon. gentlemen opposite are not proud of the position in which as members of the Reform party, they find themselves in view of the facts brought to our attention this afternoon. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to repudiate the idea that this House can have any interest in provincial politics, but it was not always thus. But a short time ago these gentlemen met here in conference in Ottawa to discuss matters touching the interests of the Reform party. At that conference, with no critical opponents present, where they could speak freely among themselves, their leaders, one after the other, referred to the fact that they had won back the outlying fortresses one by one. First Nova Scotia, then Manitoba, and then Prince Edward Island, until only British Columbia remained, and then each speaker went on to point out how they were prepared to advance in one solid phalanx to attack the Dominion. So that these hon. gentlemen will find it difficult, in the face of their own record, to persuade us that they themselves believe there is such a vast distinction and wide separation between Dominion and provincial legislation. In Ontario, it is true, the grievance is not so great as in some of the other provinces, but the principle is equally objectionable; and if the principle is wrong, it is the duty of this House to see that justice is done, if possible, to every Canadian, no matter what province he may belong and no matter how humble he may be. When it is remembered that in Ontario, where the Act is perhaps the least objectionable of any of the provincial Acts, postmasters in cities, officials connected with the collection of excise, custom-house officers and officials of that kind are prevented from exercising their franchise in provincial matters, every hon. member must feel that the greatest injustice is done these people. Not only is an injustice done to these men, but an injustice is done to every candidate in every constituency, because he finds himself confronted with an imperfect list, not only for provincial but also for Dominion elections, and further, an injustice is done the whole country, especially, when we find, as has happened in Nova Scotia, an Attorney General elected by a majority much less than the number of dis-

franchised people in the constituency. Therefore when the Reform party insist on the franchises of the provinces being adopted for Dominion purposes, and when we are compelled to take these imperfect provincial lists as a basis for our Dominion lists, we are justified, as a means of obtaining justice for our fellow countrymen and of securing proper provincial lists, in supporting this motion. If we had the power to amend the provincial laws, if we had the power to strike out the objectionable clauses in the provincial electoral laws, I am sure that every member of this House would be only too glad to support a measure to that effect. We certainly have not heard one word so far from hon. gentlemen opposite to lead us to think they would be opposed to any such reform. But as we have not that power, the question arises, in what way can we obtain justice for those who are deprived in the provinces of the right to vote? We may pass an Act on the lines of the present resolution, and in this way arouse the attention of the country to the injustice perpetrated by the various provinces. And I believe the good sense of the country would soon compel the provinces to do what was right, and restore the right to vote to those now unjustly deprived of it. We should be the less reluctant to make the authors of this injustice feel the effects of similar treatment, because of the fact that at any moment it is in their power to remove the disability from the effects of which they may suffer by removing the same disability to which they have subjected others. If the provincial legislation be right, it is perfectly certain that the legislation now proposed must be right; and if the provincial legislation be wrong, hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends will, if this resolution should go into effect, be furnished with an additional incentive to correct it. No one can be accused of improper motives, or of being based only by partisanship, because he supports this resolution. Hon. gentlemen opposite who, in this matter, find themselves between the devil and the deep sea, may be at a loss what stand to take or what argument to use. But it seems to me that it is the duty of every hon. member to find out, in the first place, whether there is any injustice existing in the province. If he decides that there is not, then he should support this resolution, because it is in exactly the same line as the provincial legislation. If he decides that there is, he should equally support it, because it will have the effect of rousing the people to a proper sense of the injustice done and thus be the means of causing it to disappear. We hear a great deal of provincial rights from hon. gentlemen opposite, and there is no one in this House who desires to deprive any province of its rights; but I would ask these hon. gentlemen to remember that the Dominion also has rights. So long, however, as the people have their attention solely diverted to petty parish politics, so long as a spirit of provincialism is fostered to the exclusion of the national spirit, this country can never attain the position it ought to occupy. If we endeavour to do our duty to the constituents who sent us here, from a Dominion standpoint, hon. gentlemen may rest assured that just to the extent to which we succeed in doing our duty from a Dominion standpoint, to precisely that extent shall we do our duty from a provincial standpoint. Sir, I will support the resolution moved by my hon. friend, although, as the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) said, a year ago I was not prepared to support this measure. It certainly is an unusual piece of legislation, caused, I think, to the credit of the British name, be it said, by an unusual state of facts, and by the fact that, though a year ago full notice was given to the various provinces that the attention of this House had been and would be called to the injustice that existed, a year has rolled by, nothing has been done to remove this injustice, and do away with these evils. Therefore, I think this House should remove them. While I will vote for the measure of the hon. member for Annapolis, I would reserve the right to object to the details of some of the clauses. This is a matter, I presume, that would come up in committee, after his Bill is presented in this House, and hon. members can fully and properly support the resolution, though they may differ from the hon. member as to some of the details of his proposal.

Mr. FRASER. It might be well for us to consider what business we have with the provincial franchise. I would ask serious attention to that point. This House has a right to make its own franchise, as the local House has the right to make its franchise. But what would be thought should the local legislature enact laws telling this Parliament how it should regulate its franchise? While I am not in favour of any man being deprived from voting, except upon good grounds, which grounds I will speak of later on, I have a strong opinion that until our Civil Service is put on the same footing as that of England, it is perfectly right that civil servants should not be allowed to vote. I make that statement broadly, and I call to my support the facts of English history. Until the passing of the Civil Service Act of 1866, whereby appointments to the Civil Service were restricted to those who succeeded in competitive examination, the civil servants were not allowed to vote. And the reason for that was that they were appointed by the Government, and were the friends of the Government. Now, while I do not say I would do it, I say there is a perfectly good argument there for this Parliament, as well as the local parliaments to say that civil servants shall not vote. Everybody knows how the appointments are made. But the

fact must not be forgotten that the local legislature, in passing this Act made it apply to their own civil servants as well as to those of the Dominion

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The proportion is about four to one thousand.

Mr. FRASER. Noboly is in a position to give the facts in this case. The hon. gentleman does not know the figures.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I do know. I have laid the facts before the House.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman cannot tell me how many are employed in the various departments, whose employees are disfranchised by this Act.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The proportion is about one thousand to four in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FRASER. All I have to say is, and the hon. gentleman may controvert the statement if he can, that not over 2,000 are employed in the various departments of the Dominion Government throughout the province, who would be affected by this Act. In many counties, not more than ten or twelve are affected by this Act of the local government; and I venture to say that there are not fifteen affected by it in the gentleman's own county, the county of Annapolis.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). You know nothing about it.

Mr. FRASER. I make that statement, and I think I could support it with very good authority. The hon. gentleman is not aware what would be the effect of the legislation he proposes. Under this resolution, if it were carried into law, every man loses his vote who, at any time within two years before the election, has been employed by the local government in any capacity whatever. Look at the local Act. It disfranchises those who have been employed in any of the departments named, "within fifteen days before the election." Keeping the same ratio that he has just given, or very near it, the hon. gentleman makes "fifteen days" read "two years." If a man receive even the smallest emolument from the local legislature, then, until two years after that he is deprived of the right to vote. And the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) feels that he must vote for that.

Mr. AMYOT. That is a matter of detail.

Mr. FRASER. I have to deal with the resolution as we have it here. Whether you call it a matter of detail or not, it is in the resolution, and the hon. mover asks us to vote for it. And the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) who is loud in his interruptions will vote for it. But, seeing the incongruous position in which he is placed, he seeks a way out of his difficulty by calling this a matter of detail. I am dealing with the resolution as it appears. This resolution was conceived, not in a spirit of one seeking to rectify a wrong, but of one seeking to gain an end in a spirit of hostility—not that I believe the hon. member for Hastings has that in view. Look at the contrast between the Act of the legislature, and this proposal. Every postmaster in Nova Scotia is allowed to vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman—but it is now nearly six o'clock. This is a private members' day, and it is for the House to determine whether we are to come back to-night. The atmosphere here is warm and close, and I am willing to move the adjournment, if that is the wish of the House.

Mr. FRASER. I am perfectly willing. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Ottawa and Aylmer Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Langenberg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. McDonald, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Red Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. Pelletier.)

Bill (No. 60) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Niagara, Hamilton and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Alliance Nationale.—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Lowell.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to amend the Railway Act, to provide greater security for passengers and employees, and in other respects. He said: This Bill, as its name signifies, is intended to provide greater security for passengers and employees in the first place. The principal provision for the security of passengers requires the use of an automatic attachment to the air-brakes commonly used on trains, which shall prevent tampering with those brakes by any ill-disposed persons, or their accidental disarrangement in such a manner that they cannot be applied by the engineer. We have in mind many occasions on which such arrangements have occurred, causing great loss of life and property. There was a case of the kind in St. Thomas some years ago, when such a disarrangement of air-brakes resulted in a very serious accident. I am informed that there is more than one kind of device intended to overcome this difficulty, and the Bill leaves to the companies the liberty to adopt any one which will be effective. For the security of the employees of the railway it is made obligatory to provide outside ladders at the ends of cars in the position prescribed by the Act, which is that most convenient for the purpose of getting on and off the roofs of the cars; also to have an automatic extension running-board connecting the running-boards on the roofs of the cars, and a rail along one side of each running-board to assist brakesmen running from car to car, especially at night and in bad weather. Everybody knows what an extremely risky job it is to do the duty of a brakesman at night and in foul weather, especially when the roofs of the cars are wet or icy. Another provision is that when cars provided with automatic couplers are made up in a train along with cars not so provided, the cars having automatic couplers shall be put together, and the cars with the old-style couplers put together. I am informed that the coupling between cars having automatic couplers and those having old-style couplers is more risky than the coupling of two old-style couplers themselves, and this is an attempt to provide for cases of mixed trains until such time as the Act of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) providing for automatic couplers on all cars comes into effect, which will be some years yet. The Act also provides that where cars provided with air-brakes are made up with other cars, those having air-brakes shall be put next to the locomotive, and the air-brakes used. The Bill also provides for compensation for overtime for different classes of employees when they are kept out on trips through accident, or from other causes not arising from their neglect of duty. It also provides for fixed compensation for the injury or death of an employee in the discharge of his duty, which fixed compensation shall be binding on the railway company notwithstanding any contract that may have been made between the company and the employee, and this compensation shall not be to the prejudice of any further compensation from the railway company which the employee may be declared entitled to receive by a court of law. There are various other minor enactments, but these are sufficient to indicate the scope of the Bill. I hope to have an opportunity of explaining more fully on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PENITENTIARY ACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) further to amend the Penitentiary Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to enable the Government to transfer insane convicts from the penitentiaries to provincial asylums, to make arrangements for that purpose with the provincial authorities, and to take back the patients should they be restored to sanity. The other provision of the Bill is that after the present accountant of penitentiaries shall have ceased to hold his office, the inspector of penitentiaries shall have the duties and powers of accountant in addition to those appertaining to his present office, and the office of accountant shall be abolished.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the Bill apply to penitentiaries in British Columbia?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To all the penitentiaries.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 67) further to amend the Fisheries Act.

Mr. LISTER. Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill is intended to be of a temporary character only. It is to extend the exemptions made under the

powers given by the Act to the Governor in Council. Last session the Act was amended so that the power of exempting by the Governor in Council was taken away, and the exemptions previously made were to cease on the first day of the present month. The present Bill would, besides extending the former exemptions, enable the Governor in Council to make further exemptions during the operation of the present amendment. The proposed Bill will also give time to endeavour to secure joint action by United States authorities regarding international rivers. The most important one is the River St. John, and I may state here that that river forms an international boundary for about eighty miles. Practically, so far as the operation of this Bill is concerned, the boundary leaves the River St. John at a point three miles above Grand Falls, yet eighty miles lower down that river the boundary line is only distant twelve miles. So that tributaries flowing through that section of Maine, and on all of which mills or factories are in operation, empty into the St. John, so that, practically, so far as the question of boundary is concerned, the River St. John and tributaries have to be considered as more than one hundred miles.

Mr. LISTER. In what way does the hon. gentleman use the word exemption? Is he going to abolish the exemptions fishermen are entitled to?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the Bill apply simply to saw-dust, or does it apply also to the time in which people are allowed to catch fish?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It applies only to saw-dust, and other objectionable material, injurious to fish.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to inquire of the hon. Minister of Finance if the Supplementary Estimates for this year are ready, or when we may expect them?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned, my work of collecting them from the different departments has been done some time, and they were sent down to the printers. I expected to have them yesterday, but have not been able to get them for Council to-day, so that it will be impossible to have them brought down to-day. I am sorry that the delay took place. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, I would like to ask the leader of the Opposition if he has come to the conclusion that it will be better to have this debate go on from day to day till it is through?

Mr. LAURIER. We have not made much progress with the Order paper. Perhaps after Friday you may be able to go on with the debate from day to day.

INDEMNITY TO CANADIAN SEALERS.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the Government has received any answer from the Imperial Government to the request forwarded on behalf of the British Columbia sealers, asking the Imperial authorities to advance them the sum of $425,000 as the American Government had not paid the amount? The hon. gentleman, I believe, in answer to a question put by me, said that that request had been forwarded about the 6th of March. This is a matter of great importance to the sealers, and I would like to know whether that communication reached the Imperial Government, and whether the Imperial Government have taken any notice of it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No answer has yet been received to the request forwarded by cable message on behalf of the British Columbia sealers, nor to their petition forwarded at a later date through the usual channel.

THE BUDGET.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to make a short explanation, and a further statement with reference to two or three matters in connection with the address which I delivered on Friday last. There was one question the hon. gentleman asked me, which I promised to answer a little later in the address, but which escaped my memory. That was with reference to the charges for loan management, which were mentioned in a portion of the address. The explanation is, that in 1892 we placed a loan upon the British market to a lesser amount than the issuing power in the prospectus, and, after that, as money was wanted, we sold the stock to our agents in London at the current market prices. The amount of stock sold last year was £1,256,000 odd, and the charges of management with regard to which the hon. gentleman asked me, are the usual charges—discount, brokerage, and stamp duty upon that amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did they amount to $332,000, on that £1,200,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, about that. I have in my hand the notes which I had when making my statement with reference to the obligations of Canada, and until the hon. gentleman, who replied on Friday evening, came to the various points, I supposed that I had included in my spoken statement all the obligations included in my notes. I find,

however, that three of them escaped being mentioned here, although I had them in my notes, and had calculated them as part of the statement. One was with reference to the Kingston and Smith's Falls Railway, to which there is a subsidy voted of $250,680. That is not under contract, and falls into the list of contingent liabilities for railway subsidies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that to be added to the $8,790,000, spoken of by the Minister of Railways ?

Mr. FOSTER. I divided those into three sections. I took first the liabilities which were already running ; then I took the capital liabilities, being those for railway subsidies, and the completion of the canals. The other category, into which this falls, was for railway or steamship subsidies which had not commenced to run—that is, on which no payments had been made. That one will be charged to railway subsidies, although it is a special act. Then the other was the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway. What I refer to now is the old subvention made some years ago, and with respect to which a contract was entered into four years ago under the subsidy of $80,000 per year for twenty years. That, in gross, would be $1,600,000. That I supposed I had mentioned, and what I thought the hon. gentleman criticised me for not mentioning was the added help to the Hudson Bay Railway, with regard to which there has been some talk, and with regard to which some papers have been brought down. Recollect, this includes simply the old subsidy, with respect to which a contract was entered into. That will fall, if it becomes due, under the head of Railway Subsidies. The other was the Fast Atlantic Service, well known to the House. I thought I had mentioned $750,000 a year for it. Some arrangements with reference to the floating of the scheme have been made, but the scheme has not yet, I am sorry to say, been successful. This is a liability which if it matures will fall upon the consolidated revenue fund, and must be provided for out of the yearly revenue. It will be partly or wholly met by economies. One large economy which will take place, if the line becomes established, is the $125,000 which we now pay to the Allan line, and which, of course, will then cease. These are all the points I omitted at the time I made my statement, and which I desire to supply to-day. The purpose I had in view was to give our obligations as they stood, either certain and running, or contingent upon legislation.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman spoke of the subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railway, and he added the words, "as to which a contract was entered into some time ago." What was the date of that contract ?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1891.

Mr. LAURIER. With whom ?

Mr. FOSTER. With the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. The present company ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Has any money been paid under it ?

Mr. HAGGART. A certain portion of the road—forty miles—was completed and on that, I suppose, they would earn a certain amount of subsidy and land grant. I think there was no cash payment.

Mr. DALY. And no land grant.

Mr. LAURIER. No money was paid, then ?

Mr. HAGGART. No. I think it was understood that they had not earned a subsidy, and so no money was paid, and I believe that no part of the land grant was given.

Mr. EDGAR. Does that still subsist ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. And the Order in Council, too ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the meaning of the new order, then ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While I understand the Finance Minister to speak with reference to the old contract, he has not as yet answered the other question—what the Government intend to do about the new Order in Council giving the company two and a half millions in cash.

Mr. FOSTER. That I will have to ask my hon. friend to remove a little into the future, not very far.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under other circumstances, I would probably feel it my duty to apologize for the length of time which I have already occupied, or may possibly have to occupy, in dealing with the hon. gentleman's speech on Friday last. As it happens the hon. gentleman on that occasion introduced a great deal of irrelevant matter—in point of fact the hon. gentleman seems to have mistaken the occasion of the Budget statement for an opportunity to make a campaign speech—and he has, therefore, only himself to thank if, on the present occasion, the debate goes over rather wider limits and occupies a long-

er time than might otherwise be requisite. Now, I do not at all dispute the fact that it was very natural for a Finance Minister situated as the hon. gentleman is situated, to attempt a diversion. It has been the unhappy fate of the hon. gentleman, in connection with his late attempt at revision of the tariff, and also in connection with his present large deficit, to have been obliged to consume an enormous amount of crow; and consequently it is not unnatural that the hon. gentleman should think that it might be as well to take every opportunity that presented itself to divert attention from those matters that ought more particularly to engage our attention to-day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman came before us on Friday—to do what? It was his duty, in the first place, to explain to us the cause of the biggest deficit that has ever existed in our financial history since confederation, with the solitary exception of the deficit caused by the North-west rebellion. It was likewise his duty to inform us fully and fairly of our present position and to make a full statement of all the liabilities of Canada, present and contingent, a thing which the House and the country has a right to expect at his hands at this time. That is what I conceive the hon. gentleman ought to have done. What the hon. gentleman in point of fact did was this—deducting the padding, of which I do not complain, because it is always customary for the Finance Minister to review a number of facts which are already before the House through the medium of the Public Accounts and the Trade and Navigation Returns—but, deducting the padding, three-quarters of the hon. gentleman's speech were devoted to a series of garbled and misleading assertions—I cannot call them statements—touching deficits which occurred nearly twenty years ago. Sir, the object was plain. As I said, under the circumstances it was quite an object for the hon. gentleman to divert attention from his own deficit and liabilities. I am obliged to pay a little more attention to those statements for the simple reason that I am aware that all over the country statements made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech are accepted by those among his followers who have not the opportunity of hearing the reply as a good deal more authentic than ordinary statements made by Ministers here or elsewhere. Rightly or wrongly, Sir, the Budget speech has come to be looked to as a sort of state paper, and, therefore, I regret that the hon. gentleman on this occasion should have imported into it a number of statements of, to say the least, a very dubious and doubtful character. Sir, I have noticed, and I think that many members of this House have noticed, that while the hon. gentleman has a good memory and is fairly accurate in his statements as regards those events that have occurred in his own recollection, his knowledge of the past financial history of this country, and the past commercial history of this country, is of the most perfunctory character. What is contained within the four corners of the hon. gentleman's brief he is quite competent to deal with; but he has shown on this, as on other occasions, that he possesses an extremely superficial knowledge of things that occurred prior to his appearance in this House, as was extremely well shown on the occasion of his last Budget speech, by my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden), who sits behind me. Now, as not unfrequently happens, the hon. gentleman on this occasion overreached himself. He has proved what I suspect he did not at all intend to prove; what I fancy his friends will not thank him particularly for proving. But, first I would like to ask a few questions of the hon. gentleman, and if he is disposed to answer them, I will give him every opportunity. I would like to know (after listening to his Budget speech of Friday last), whether he is prepared to allege that the Mackenzie Administration in general, or I myself in particular, was responsible for the distress existing in the United States from 1873 to 1878. I would like to know, Sir, whether the hon. gentleman thinks that the Mackenzie Administration, or I myself, was responsible for the distress which notoriously existed in the case of our other greatest customer, Great Britain, about the same time. I would like to know, in the light of his speech of Friday last, whether the hon. gentleman holds that we were responsible for the shrinkage in values and for the diminished imports from 1875 to 1879. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman, like some of his predecessors, holds that the Grit Administration were responsible for the three successive bad harvests of 1876, 1877 and 1878. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman thinks that we were responsible for the fact that Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues—or ought I say, his co-conspirators?—deliberately added $4,000,000 to our annual expenditure, without providing for a penny of it, and likewise handed over to us liabilities—also unprovided for—to the tune of $60,000,000, which would have required a further fixed charge added to our annual expenditure of $3,000,000 more. And, lastly, I would like to ask whether the hon. gentleman or any of his friends behind him will to-day rise in the House and say that a policy of low taxation is likely to be responsible for diminished imports, or that it was probable, had we had a beneficent tariff like his own, ranging from 30 to 100 per cent, from 1876 to 1878, that the imports would have been less diminished than under a 17½ per cent tariff. If the hon. gentleman has no objection, I would like, if he desires to answer these questions, that he answer them now.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to break in on your speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why, Sir, the House will recollect that the hon. gentleman made a great point of the diminished imports which occurred from 1876 to 1878. Sir, until now I have always thought, and I think the House has thought, that it was the special glory and object of the National Policy to diminish the imports of manufactured goods, and thereby to afford a larger market to our own manufacturers; but, waiving that point, the hon. gentleman has proved—and there, for once, I think the hon. gentleman has done some service—the hon. gentleman has proved conclusively in more than one passage in his speech, to which I refer the House, that the crisis which occurred between 1875 and 1879 was vastly more severe than the present crisis; and by inference and by consequence, that the fiscal policy and the administrative policy which prevailed from 1875-76 to 1878-79, were vastly superior to the present policy. Let me ask the House, and let me again ask the Minister, where he would have been had he been called upon to face conditions such as existed from 1874-75 to 1878-79? Sir, let us judge the hon. gentleman, as I always like to judge hon. gentlemen, from his own mouth and his own statements. He attributes his present deficit to three causes. I quote from his own speech:

> First of all, I had to contend with a shrinkage of 7½ per cent, I had to contend with reduced imports of 10 per cent, I had to contend with a depression in the United States lasting well nigh eighteen months.

All true. Sir, fancy the position of the hon. gentleman if he had had to contend not only with a shrinkage of 25 per cent, which was about the figure that took place between 1875 and 1876, as ascertained by a careful report made by my late esteemed colleague, Mr. Isaac Burpee, who, at my instance, made a special investigation of that question—what would the position of the hon. gentleman have been had he had to contend with a reduced importation of 30 per cent, as occurred in those years; what would his position have been had he had to contend with a depression in the United States of far greater severity than the present, extending over a period of more than five years, and these things aggravated by having to provide for seven millions a year, added without provision by his predecessors, and with three bad harvests to boot? Where, I ask, would the hon. gentleman have emerged? Would it have been with deficits of 2 millions, and 1½ millions, and 1 million? Sir, the hon. gentleman, like his late chieftain, would have had deficits of 20, 30, and it may well be 60 per cent on his revenue, as actually occurred under the regime of Sir John A. Macdonald. It is a plain rule of three, reduced importations of 10 per cent, said the hon. gentleman, justify and excuse my deficit of four and a half millions, so that if there be a reduced importation of 30 per cent, his deficit would have been not 5, but 15 millions of dollars, in round figures—or put it at 4½ millions, and 13½ millions, if that would suit the hon. gentleman better. So, with the hon. gentleman's other excuses, I cannot call them arguments. Now, I would like to ask him, I would like to ask any business man in this House or in this country, are they going to escape the payment of one cent of interest on our present net debt of $250,000,000 because of the long—what shall I call it? exposition in which he indulges, to show that if we had not done this, that, and t'other thing, and incurred this liability and that liability, our total debt would only have been $139,000,000? Does it better our position one iota that at the present moment, according to the hon. gentleman, our total fixed charges are nearly $27,000,000 out of an estimated expenditure of $37,000,000? No, Sir, those fixed charges are largely due to the policy of himself and his predecessors: and while our fixed charges, ranging up to this enormous amount, may and do add greatly to the difficulties of the situation, may and do add greatly to the difficulty of dealing with it, and while they are an extremely strong argument against adding to these fixed charges, against incurring any other fixed obligation, they do not justify in the slightest degree the fact that at this moment our fixed charges, over which he has little control, are close on $27,000,000 out of $37,000,000, which is, in my judgment, a disgraceful and a dangerous state of things, and a grave impeachment of the policy which the hon. gentleman has been expounding to us of late. Sir, all this, to my mind, is little better than elaborate trifling. What the country wants to know is, not what the position of the country was 20 years ago, but what the position of the country is to-day. Now, the hon. gentleman did one thing for which I commend him—it was perhaps the one piece of good sense that relieved his discourse—the hon. gentleman did frankly acknowledge a huge deficit. But he was not equally candid as to our total liability, he was not candid as to other matters to which he alluded, and which I shall treat incidentally as I proceed. Sir, I do not at all ignore the gravity of the financial situation; I ignore it the less because I cannot but feel that in the estimates which he has submitted, the Minister of Finance has given us mere guesses and not careful calculations. The Minister guesses that if he and his colleagues can keep down the expenditure to its estimated figure, he may save a million; and he guesses that if times get better, he will get a million and a quarter more. He takes no account of possible liabilities for the Atlantic fast service and other matters of

this kind, he puts his trust in the chapter of accidents. Well, Sir, if things go well, his calculations may come out well. But let there be any such shrinkage, any such protracted depression as I had to contend with; or let there be, unhappily, a succession of bad harvests, and again I call the attention of the House to the position in which the hon. gentleman may find himself. But, Sir, he ignored two very important factors; he ignored—and to this I call the attention of my hon. friends, especially—he ignored completely the enormous increased taxation under which we laboured in 1894-95, as against the taxation which existed in 1878. Sir, by an extremely shallow artifice, the hon. gentleman, whose policy and the policy of whose predecessors, has added $40,000,000 a year to the taxes of the people, if you count not only the sum paid into the treasury, but the sum actually taken out of their pockets, takes great credit to himself because, out of $40,000,000, he was compelled to restore $4,000,000, not of his own accord, but in deference to the action of the United States Government, the most of which he has taken back since. He takes excellent care to say nothing of all the taxation that he and his colleagues have added, but he parades from one end of Canada to the other the paltry fraction they took off. Sir, he did one thing more, he acknowledged, and thereby again he was obliged by force of circumstances to state the truth, that the taxes he had raised were taken out of the pockets of the people, because he claimed great credit for having enriched them by taking the same taxes off. Nor did the hon. Minister of Finance say anything on another important point, and that is the vastly increased collective indebtedness of the people of Canada. Canada to-day owes several hundreds of millions more collectively than Canada did in 1878; by that I mean our large municipal debt, our largely increased private debt, our increased railway debt, our increased federal debt, and our increased provincial debt. I am not going to waste further time over that matter. If the hon. gentleman disputes the figures, I can produce them. I have them in detail, and I shall be happy to give them to him or to his friends. There is one point to which I want to call the attention of the House; not only has our taxation been enormously increased and our total indebtedness increased, but the collective income of large sections of the people has been greatly diminished. Sir, I do not believe for my part that Canada collectively, making allowance for shrinkage in values in certain quarters, allowing for the diminished value of property and allowing also for the increased indebtedness—I do not believe that Canada, at all events the five old provinces, are as rich, collectively, to-day as they were sixteen years ago. I know that very large classes of the community are much poorer, although it is true that certain favoured localities, and certain favoured individuals have amassed considerable wealth, while a multitude of the people have become greatly poorer. There has been a huge displacement of wealth. There has been, at all events, no increase of wealth. Wealth is far less evenly distributed to-day than it was sixteen years ago, even if, on a close calculation being made, the result showed that there had been an increase. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's financial policy is, comparatively speaking, a trifle. It is not his financial policy, it is his fiscal policy, it is the whole fiscal policy of the Government which is on its trial to-day. On its trial to-day? It has been sentenced and found guilty and is now standing waiting to receive its doom. By its fruits we shall know it. Now, let us see what the Government did undertake to do seventeen years ago. The hon. Minister of Finance was not here then, nor were a great many of his colleagues, and perhaps they do not know, and they do not remember, what the Canadian Government as constituted in 1878 undertook to do, and now is the time to remind the House and the country what those men promised, and to show them what those men performed. Sir, they promised mainly these two things. They promised they would enrich old Canada by the expedients of heaping double and treble taxation on her. They promised, in the second place, they would create a second Canada for us in the North-west, to share our burdens and lighten our responsibilities, and for that purpose they induced us to incur a huge debt. How have those gentlemen succeeded? Let their own census returns speak for them, from the first page of every volume they have yet published to the last; let their own Public Accounts speak for them; let their tariff speak for them; let their deficits speak for them; let the rise of the Third Party speak for them, a party which is a practical revolt of the large part of the agricultural population against intolerable misgovernment. I sum up the position briefly for these hon. gentlemen. In these sixteen years they have spent, as I shall presently show, about one thousand millions of dollars in taxes alone, wrung out of the people. They have lost to us, including therein the immigrants that they themselves have stated came into Canada, at least two millions of people in these sixteen or seventeen years. They have in the North-west thrown away lands and diverted from the control of Government and the country an area equal in acreage to half a dozen respectable European kingdoms, and out of the disposition of those lands they have not received enough hard cash to pay the expenses of surveys. Sir, it is a fact that to-day, after parting with the control of a territory one

thousand miles in length by two hundred miles in breadth, our Public Accounts show that we have not taken in as receipts from them sufficient to pay the cost of surveying that territory. Well, Sir, as to their other promises. They have been quoted before, and I shall only briefly enumerate them. We were to pay the whole expense of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway out of those same land sales. How often have we heard that declaration announced from the Treasury benches. We were to become the granary of the world, and to export 640 million bushels of wheat —no less than that. We were to force the Yankees into begging reciprocity at our hands—it has been a tedious process. The Government were to enrich the whole community, to stop the exodus, and above and beyond all, to inaugurate an era of economy. Sir, the present Finance Minister had two great opportunities given to him. Last year he had an opportunity of revising the tariff. The present year he had an opportunity of readjusting the system of taxation. I propose to examine in some detail how the hon. gentleman has used those opportuities. It is true of the hon. gentleman, as of some other parties, that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. Drink deep or taste not—but it may be that the hon. gentleman has conscientious objections to drinking deep in any shape ; some of his predecessors in that place did not share them. I want to call the particular attention of the House to the net result of the hon. gentleman's tariff experiments. They are interesting, they are highly interesting. And here again I find myself compelled to apologize to the hon. gentleman. I did make a misstatement some months ago, as to the exact extent of his reductions. I am going to rectify it now, and I think for the last time. In the six months of 1894 we imported, of dutiable goods, $32,845,000 worth ; we paid of duty, $10,198,000. In the six months of 1895 we imported of dutiable goods, $28,046,000 worth, on which we paid duty to the amount of $8,701,000. The percentage of duties in the six months terminating on the 1st of January, 1894, amounted to 31 per cent and five hundreths. In the six months terminating on the 1st of January, 1895, it amounted to 31 per cent and 2¼ hundredths, being a reduction of exactly one-fortieth part of 1 per cent, from which it follows, they by pursuing this prudent and highly conservative course for forty years the hon. gentleman may hope to reduce the tariff 1 per cent, and if he follows the advice of the gentleman behind him (Mr. Montague) in the 400 years, which I think that gentleman said he wanted, he would get back to the average tariff of 1878. Four hundred years, therefore, Mr. Speaker, exactly represents the difference between the two parties. Now, I have had my doubts and my difficulties in times past as to where we ought to place these economical Rip Van Winkles. I did not know exactly where to locate them. They do not know enough to be placed with the economists of Sir Robert Walpole's time, nor of Cromwell's time. It was impossible to find them in that period of great souls which distinguished Queen Elizabeth's era, but at long last the Secretary of State has come to the rescue. He has given us a pointer, and now I know where to place them ; and it is in the early part of the reign of Edward IV., A.D. 1463. Sir, this is very interesting. I have always myself had a profound respect for the wisdom of our ancestors, though I have not got credit for it always. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this for it is most curious and most interesting. In the volume in my hand, Mr. Speaker, I possess the Statutes At Large from the first year of Edward IV. to the forty-third year of Queen Elizabeth. Our forefathers had one excellent plan ; they meant what they said and they were in the habit of giving their reasons before they introduced an Act of Parliament, and their reasons so far as I can see were mostly true, or, at any rate, expressed their real intention. Sir, were that excellent course pursued down to this day what revelations the preambles of the various Acts of Parliament, particularly about the Hudson Bay Railway, might bring forth. Now, allowing for the dialect, you will find presently that the very words used by our respected ancestors in 1463 are almost the same as those I have often heard used from the Treasury benches in the period from 1878 to 1894. The ideas are identical. The only difference is this : Our ancestors were more straightforward than we were : they knew what they meant and they said so. There was no dodging about the issue with them. What they wanted to prohibit they did prohibit, and they had not recourse to any juggling with specific and ad valorem duties but they did it at once. Here is a little work for the hon. the Secretary of State. I am told his department is not as fully employed as it might be, and so instead of issuing proclamations to the Indians of the Cayuga reserve, the hon. gentleman might apply himself to reviving the Statutes of King Edward IV. Sir, there is a splendid list of such statutes. It might be drawn out by the Secretary of State for the Manufacturers Association and sent to be registered by their man of all work, the Minister of Finance. First of all, to go a little further afield, there is a Grand Statutory Chapter 21, Anno 19, King Henry VII., which prohibits the importation of silk goods, and if any feminine free traders are caught wearing silk goods of foreign manufacture describes how they are to be dealt with. Then there is Chapter 9, of the first year of Richard III., which ought to be specially dear to the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). This declares under what circumstances Italian merchants may sell goods,

and it also mentions the restraints that ought to be imposed on aliens. Why, Sir, just read "Yankees" for "Italians," and the Act of King Richard III. would fit the hon. gentleman from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) at once. But, it is when we come to King Edward IV., it is when we come to the year of grace, A.D. 1463, that we find where the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and his colleagues really drew their inspiration. Here I have got to apologize. I have been talking to these hon. gentlemen opposite, and I have been treating them as if they were mere plagiarists of Yankee notions. Not at all, Sir. They went back to the pure source of English law undefiled which I will read to you. Everything King Edward IV. did seems to have been directed, and directed admirably, to the carrying out of true protection doctrine. Why, Sir, here is a Statute of Edward IV., a restraint for bringing corn into the realm to the damage of farmers; here is a declaration that farmers shall not sell wool out of the realm to the prejudice of the manufacturers, and here is a declaration that no one can bring wrought silk into the realm to be sold, or he shall answer for it to his peril. But the jewel of the whole, the gem of the whole, the real Magna Charta of English protection, is Chapter 4, Anno Tertio, Edward IV. I shall not apologize for reading it, because I know the hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), will delight to see that he is only treading in the footsteps of his ancestors. It is entitled:

Certain merchandise not lawful to be brought ready-wrought into this realm.

And it reads:

Item, whereas in the said Parliament, by the artifices of manual occupation, men and women inhabiting and resident in the city of London and other cities, towns, boroughs and villages within the same realm of England and Wales, it hath been piteously showed and complained, how that all they in general, and every of them, be greatly impoverished, and much hindered and prejudiced of their worldly increase, and daily living, by the great multitude of divers commodities and wares pertaining to their mysteries and occupations, being fully wrought, and ready made to sale, as well by the hands of strangers, being the King's enemies, as other in this realm and Wales fetched and brought from beyond the sea, as well by merchants strangers, as denizens and other persons, whereof the greatest part in substance is deceitful, and nothing worth in regard of any man's occupation or profit.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that these worthy men understood the dangers of shoddy goods at that early date. You will observe likewise that they were clearly awake to the necessity of preventing England from being made a slaughter market:

If due remedy be not in this behalf provided: our redoubted Sovereign Lord, the King, considering the promises and willing in this case to provide remedy, by the advice, assent, and authority aforesaid, hath ordained, enacted and established, that no merchant, born a subject of our said Lord the King, denizen or stranger, nor other person, after the feast of St. Michael the Arch Angel next coming, shall bring, send, nor convey nor cause to be brought, sent, nor convey into this realm of England and seigniory of Wales, any of the chassers, wares or things underwritten, that is to say.

I am not quite sure whether the law-makers of this early day plagiarized in some mysterious way the tariff of the Minister of Finance, or whether the hon. gentleman plagiarized King Edward IV. However, these goods were then prohibited in England:

Any woollen caps, woollen cloths, laces, corses, ribbands, fringes of silk and of thread, laces of thread, silk twine, silk in any white embroider, laces of gold, tires of silk or gold, saddles, stirrups or any harnesses pertaining to saddles, spurs, bosses of bridles, andirons, gridirons, any manner of locks, hammers, pinsons, firetongs, dripping pans, dice, tennis balls, points, purses, gloves, girdles, harness for girdles of iron, latten steel, tin, or of alkemine, anything wrought of any tawed leather, any tawed furs, buscans, shoes, galoshes, or corks, knives, daggers, wood knives, bodkins, sheers for tailors, scissors, razors, sheathes, playing cards, pins, pattens, pack needles, any painted ware, forcers, caskets, rings of copper, or of latten gilt, chaffing dishes, hanging candlesticks, chaffing bells, facing bells, rings for curtains, ladles, scummers, counterfeit basons, ewers, hats, brushes, cards for wool, blanch iron thread, commonly called and named white wire, or any of those wares or chaffers to be uttered and sold within the same realm of England or Wales by way of merchandise, upon pain to forfeit the same merchandises at every time, and as often as they may be found in the hands of any person or persons to be sold; the one part of the same forfeiture to be paid to the use of our Lord the King, and the other half to him that will first seize the same for the King; the same half by him so seized for our Lord the King to be delivered by the said seizor thereof to the Escheator of the county or place where the said seizing shall be by indenture between them made duly to answer thereof in his account.

And then, Sir, there is a qualifying postscript, which goes to show not only how zealous they were to provide a home market, but how desirous they were to see that vested interests should not suffer. The protectionists were to have their own way on land, but it was provided further:

Provided always, that if any of the said wares or chaffers made out of this land be taken upon the sea without fraud or collusion, or come in this realm, by way of wreck, that those be in no wise taken within this Act or statute, but that they may be sold within this realm, this ordinance notwithstanding.

An honest protectionist on land was to be protected in his rights, but an honest pirate at sea was not to be overlooked either.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are there any more acts like that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, there are lots more; but that, I think, is

the true Magna Charta. Now, there have been several curious coincidences noted, but it is a very curious coincidence, indeed, that, four hundred years ago King Edward IV. had a certain councillor of the name of Montague. He was a privy councillor, and, according to court gossip, a mighty loose fish, too. Who knows, Sir, but there may be a connection? although I am bound to say, so far as my recollection recalls the portraits that have come down to us from that time, that there is not a great deal of physical resemblance between the hon. member for Haldimand and the stately proportions of the kingmaker and his brother. Now, having analysed the tariff reductions, it becomes our duty to look at the tariff exactions; and I would, with all my heart, that the exactions were as moderate as the reductions have been. In this connection I am going to make one or two statements which, to some of my hon. friends may appear rather startling. But I make these statements after examination, and with knowledge, and I think I may venture to say that hon. gentlemen will find that I am amply able to maintain what I do say, though I will not engage to maintain all that our opponents are pleased to allege that I do say. With respect to that tariff, I make these three statements. First of all, I say that the amount of the total taxation from excise and customs exacted from the people of Canada since 1879, fully averages $60,000,000 a year; that is to say, that in that time it amounts to a total of about $1,000,000,000. Looking at the whole situation, I will not dispute the statement of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who, I believe, estimated the taxation at a much higher figure. It is quite possible I know that he may make good his case, knowing as I do the enormous inconvenience and injury which result from interference with trade. But I am prepared, for my part, to show that $60,000,000 a year is a minimum, and highly conservative estimate of the total taxation inflicted on the people of Canada by the present tariff. Then, Sir, I have to make this second statement, that the total amount of taxes exacted from the people of Canada during that time, would not merely have defrayed all our expenses, but, could the people have been induced to bear it, the balance would have enabled us, if invested at 4 per cent. to defray all our expenses at the present rate for evermore. And, as regards the incidence of this taxation on the people, I make this statement, that, apart from the excise and customs duties on liquors and tobacco, which are classed by hon. gentlemen opposite as voluntary taxes, and which, in a certain sense are so, an ordinary Canadian artisan or wage-earner receiving ordinary wages, is compelled, under this tariff, to pay at least twenty-fold as much as his English brother artisan, earning like wages.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen will do well, when I make a statement, to wait until I conclude my remarks, and then, if they can, they are abundantly welcome to answer them, though they will not find it so easy to do so. These are strong statements, but I am prepared to justify them, and to stand by them. I make them here with full knowledge of the weight of this taxation. And now, as proof of my statement that $60,000,000 are at present exacted from the people of Canada, everybody knows that we tax ourselves at present to the extent of about $30,000,000 a year which is paid into the treasury, and, therefore, the total amount of taxation so paid in those sixteen years amounted to about $450,000,000. It is an incident of all indirect taxation, that whenever you undertake to raise a large sum of money from the people by indirect taxation, even when it is imposed in the most honest possible manner for revenue purposes only, there will be a large loss. The extent of that loss depends on the number of middlemen through whose hands it passes before it reaches its final destination; but it is always large. Probably it is not at all an unfair average to say that in the great majority of cases it fully equals one-half of the original tax. That is a point which hon. gentlemen will find very fully discussed elsewhere, and I will not waste time upon it now. But, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows, too, that all financiers, good, bad and indifferent, find it convenient to raise money by indirect taxation, knowing, notwithstanding its expensiveness, that otherwise there would be great difficulty in getting the people to pay. No doubt that accounts for the large figure which indirect taxation has played in all financial schemes. But, in the present instance, we are not dealing with a tariff imposed for revenue only. We are dealing with a tariff which is openly avowed to be a protective tariff, a tariff which, in many instances, is prohibitive, a tariff which ranges from 30 to 100 per cent. So far as a tariff is protective, the measure of the taxation is the total consumption of imported goods, plus the goods manufactured under that tariff in the country. Where those goods are double the amount imported, the tax will take at least $3 out of the pockets of the people for every $1 which it puts into the treasury. Where the goods manufactured in the country under the tariff are four, or five times the amount of the goods imported, then you many fairly conclude that it will take four or five times more out of the pockets of the people than it puts into the treasury. Now, we will take a case which my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) worked out very well last session—the case of cottons. Our total import of cottons of all kinds is about $4,000,000.

Our total manufacture of all kinds amounts to about $10,000,000. Our total consumption of cottons is, therefore, about $14,000,000. By the time they reach the consumer, these goods are subject to a tax of about 40 per cent—about 30 per cent directly under the tariff, and about 10 per cent or probably more, indirect, in consequence of their passing through the hands of certain middlemen. The practical result is that, in the case of cottons alone, the people pay a tax of about $5,600,000, of which the revenue receives $1,140,000. And as with cottons, so with all other manner of articles, with this single qualification, that this tariff is largely prohibitive, and where it is prohibitive, a huge tax is inflicted on the people, of which nothing goes into the treasury. We had an admirable illustration of that very lately in the case of sugar. Until the other day, our consumption of 300,000,000 pounds of sugar was taxed two-thirds of one cent. The people were taxed $2,000,000 a year, and not one cent went into the treasury. That is going to be modified now. The people will be taxed to the tune of $3,000,000, and $1,200,000 is to go into the treasury. Then there is absolutely no detailed evidence of the indirect mischief and loss which arises under these tariffs from the well-known fact that when you tax one class of manufacturers, you hurt another. When you protect one man, you injure another. That is constantly the case, and in nothing more is it the case than in the matter to which I shall allude further on—the enormous mischief which these men have done by their tax on iron, for instance. I have only computed the loss at a little over double the amount of the taxes. That is to say, we take a little more than two dollars out of the pockets of the people for one dollar we put into the treasury. That, I may add, is a vastly smaller figure than those American economists, who have had occasion to look closely into the matter, have estimated the tax at. I repeat that, on a minute examination, it will be found that mine is really a conservative estimate. There is an extremely strong probability that the real cost to the people is greater than the $60,000,000 a year at which I have put it. Of this amount $30,000,000 goes to the treasury, and the remaining $30,000,000 is the lowest estimate of the loss that is caused. Another cause that has enormously aggravated the burden of this huge sum of one thousand millions, is the frightful injustice with which it is levied. In most countries, statesmen try to make the taxes as low as they can on the poorer, and as high as they can on the wealthier portion of the community. But what did hon. gentlemen opposite do? Mind, I am now speaking of the taxation that existed up to 1894. The principle remains, but our exertions on this side resulted in some of the grosser abuses being modified last year. I have here a statement in pretty full detail showing the operation of these duties. I call the attention of the House to a few of the more glaring cases of gross injustice. I find that what is called heavy beaver overcoating of the coarser sort, which costs in England 29 cents, was taxed by us to the tune of 72 per cent under the old tariff. It is a coarse beaver overcoating which is brought into this country and sold for the benefit of some of the poorer portion of the community. The more expensive beaver, which costs 7s. 9d., was admitted, under our tariff, at 28 per cent. I am, of course, giving now the extreme range, although there are overcoatings which cost even more. Serge cloth which cost in England 41 cents paid 58 per cent, and that which cost $1.26 paid 33 per cent. What is called nap overcoating, which cost in England 28 cents, paid, under our old tariff, 75 per cent, and that which cost $1.34 only paid 33 per cent. I give those simply as illustrations of the gross injustice with which, in the past, that tariff was levied. As I have said, the remonstrances of myself and my friends here did compel the Government to somewhat modify those outrageous duties, and although the principle remains and the injustice is not obliterated, it has been to some extent reduced. I now want to call attention to the other fact to which I have alluded, and that is the way in which taxes are distributed in Canada and in England, and I propose to give exact and literal proof of the statement I have made, that the taxation to which the artizan, for instance, is compelled to submit in Canada is twenty-fold worse than what he is compelled to submit to in England. Let me here take occasion to characterize, as they deserve, certain impudent assertions which are being made in various parts of the country, to the effect that if the Liberal party get in they propose to levy heavy and obnoxious taxes on the whole community. I have seen statements that if the Liberal party came into office they would tax every gun and every dog, and impose a poll tax on every man, woman and child. If there be any simple souls who believe those statements, let me assure them, on behalf of myself and friends, that neither dog nor gun will be taxed under our regime, and much less will any poll tax be imposed. The English taxes are levied in this way. One-third is extracted from the people by means of taxes which do not touch the poor man at all, such as stamp dues, income tax and death duties. Those do not touch the poorer classes at all. Another third is extracted by heavy duties on liquor and tobacco, which undoubtedly touch the poor and heavily, too, but which hon. gentlemen opposite have all along contended are purely voluntary taxes, and therefore, do not count. Then there remain the customs taxes. What are they? Remember they are the only

tax which the English wage-earner is compelled to pay, according to this argument. They aggregate about £20,000,000 sterling. Of those, fully £15,000,000 are taxes on wines, spirits and tobacco, which come under the same category as excise. There is no tax levied on the poor man in England, except some utterly trifling and insignificant taxes on certain kinds of fruit bringing in a very small revenue, and the tax on tea. And that tax on tea, subdivided among the people in England, would show that the total tax which the English artizan is compelled to pay would barely equal one-twentieth part of that which the Canadian artizan or wage-earner must pay on every single article he requires to use for the benefit of his family, with the solitary exceptions of anthracite coal and tea. Everything else is taxed. His shoes, his books, his tools, the clothes he wears, the nails and iron he uses in his daily avocations—all are heavily taxed under this tariff. I have computed the average taxation of every family in the Dominion at about $60. Deducting $10 for the excise, there remains $50 per family, and on that I base my statement that the taxation amounts to nearly $10 per head. On that, also, I base my statement that the absolute taxation which the Canadian wage-earner has to pay is twenty-fold greater than the taxation which his brother artizan in England is compelled to pay under the English system of taxation and customs duty. Now, my third statement is self-evident. It is clear as daylight that if I am correct in saying that $1,000,000,000 have been exacted from the people of Canada within the last sixteen or seventeen years, $400,000,000 or thereabouts would have been ample for all the requirements of government; and I merely mention this to show the huge sacrifices which have been inflicted on our people in the attempt to carry out this experiment of the National Policy. Could our people have been induced to submit, under a revenue tariff, to a like taxation, they might have paid off every atom of the federal and provincial debt, and municipal debt, and a huge cantle of their private debt besides. Or the money might have been invested for them, and the interest at 4 per cent would have amply discharged all that ought to be spent for the government of this country. I now come to a graver subject yet, and that is the question of the loss of population, for which the National Policy is so largely responsible. Now, Sir, I desire to call your attention to the extent to which that loss has gone—because I am aware that a number of hon. gentlemen, either by deliberately shutting their eyes, or by refusing to examine into the question, or listen to the discussion of it, are gravely in error as to the extent of that loss. Sir, I find, in the first place, that in the older provinces of Canada, in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec, according to the census returns, the total growth in the last ten years amounted to barely 325,000 souls—a growth, Sir, of about 7½ per cent. I find that of that growth, poor and meagre at it was, one hundred thousand or more were due to immigration, as shown clearly in certain of the census returns which deal with that question. Now, the result of all that is this: That during the last ten years the absolute growth of the native population in these five provinces amounted to barely 225,000 souls, on a population, in 1881, of 4,150,000. That is to say, Mr. Speaker, in these old provinces, amply capable of supporting a population treble that they now contain, the total growth in ten years had sunk to 5½ per cent, exclusive of immigration. Now, Sir, if the House wants to know, further, what that means, I will tell them. At a very moderate computation, our annual increase of population always before amounted to—and still would if our younger people had stayed here—to about 2 1-5 per cent per annum. The truth of the matter is this, that our annual growth was just one-fourth part of what it ought to have been. How grave a matter this is may be learned from two facts. As everybody knows, during these ten years, there was considerable immigration into Canada, though infinitely less than the Government stated; and, as everybody knows, or everybody ought to know, there was, during these years, a large emigration from the parent country. I have looked up the growth of population of England and Wales for these ten years, and I find that while the five old provinces of Canada, apart from immigrants, increased 5½ per cent in ten years, the increase of population of England and Wales, after supplying a large number of emigrants to other countries, was 11·65 per cent. So we have come to this in Canada—our natural growth, apart from the immigration, in our older provinces, is less than one-half that of England and Wales, after supplying emigrants to half the known world. And if a further indication is wanted, I will call the attention of the House to this further fact—that in the United States, during a period when their population corresponded with ours, from 1790 to 1800, and from 1800 to 1810, and downwards, their average natural growth of population appears to have been rather more than 3¼ per cent. Their growth was 3¼ per cent per annum from 1791 to 1820, without any assistance from immigration. Our growth appears to be about one-half of one per cent, or thereabouts. Now, Sir, if there is any sane man in this House who thinks that these facts can be ignored, I should like to hear from him. If there is any sane man in Canada who will tell the people that all this indicates prosperity, I

should like him to state the reason why. Sir, I regard the true wealth of a nation as mainly concentrated in the number of healthy, vigorous, intelligent men and women that nation possesses. These I regard as an item of wealth infinitely more valuable than savings bank deposits, infinitely more valuable than anything indicated by circulation or mileage returns. Sir, the true test of prosperity, in my judgment, is that the people that come to Canada should be glad to come, and glad to stay, and that the people who are in Canada should be glad to remain, and not look for opportunities to go away. Now, Sir, I have accepted, up to this point, these same census returns as being truthful. But we have the strongest grounds for accepting as correct the statements made by my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden), that, in certain of the maritime provinces, at any rate, very gross frauds have been committed for the purpose of swelling the apparent population. And, if I have misstated the case, if I have imputed wrong to the department which did not exist, the conduct of the department itself is the answer. When the charge was made on the floor of this House, and the proof was given by my hon. friend in a manner which no man could gainsay, and no man could contradict, what did we find the department doing? Putting every obstacle in my hon. friend's way, and in the way of other hon. members who wished to investigate the matter—deliberately refusing to give the names of people who had been returned in certain districts, refusing on the flimsiest and most ridiculous of pretexts. The indications are that, if the proportions shown by my hon. friend in the figures he gave, hold for other districts, instead of an increase of 225,000 for these provinces, I fear we should have a bare 200,000. It is to be hoped that my hon. friend, and other hon. gentlemen will prosecute the inquiry into this matter, and ascertain, if possible, to what extent these frauds have gone. Now, Sir, with reference to the returns of population, the conduct of the department, and the conduct of those charged with making the census returns is open to the gravest suspicion. In other respects, it is open to no suspicion at all. Sir, I have here a volume called "Census of Canada for the years 1890-91, vol. 3," to which I wish to attract the attention of this House. I do not object to men defending their cause by any honest arguments, but I do object, and I think the country will object, and I hope the whole House will sustain me in objecting, to seeing our census returns made the means of disgraceful fraud. As to the returns of population, I have indicated what I think. But now we come to the proofs which these census returns offer us of the huge increase in industrial establishments, and of people employed therein under the National Policy. These census returns declare that 25,000—only think, 25,000—new industrial establishments blossomed into existence between 1881 and 1889 and that 112,000 people were employed in these establishments, who, presumably, would not have been employed at all but for them. I have taken the trouble to analyse these statements. I am not going to deal with the matter fully, my friends must help me to bring before the country the results to be learned from the analysis of the returns with regard to these figures, 25,000 new industries. First, I come to what appears to be a wholly new industry, because I find no reference to it in the similar volume of the census of 1881, which, also, I have in my hand. This is the industry of knitting factories. You will find them narrated on page 195. The House will be delighted to hear that there are now, or were, in 1891, 223 industrial establishments in the shape of knitting factories in Canada. Where is the Minister of Militia? Is he here just now? or is there no Nova Scotia Minister representing that province?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I am very sorry, because I was about to congratulate him. Nova Scotia is specially privileged. Of the 223 knitting factories, 99 were developed in Nova Scotia. And more than that, of the 99 developed in Nova Scotia, 93 were developed in the county of Shelburne. I find on further examination that the 93 industrial establishments in the shape of knitting factories in the county of Shelburne, employed collectively 126 hands. I find further on the same page of the census, that they earned in that year, $1,823, being at the rate of $14.55 per year for each hand, or 28 cents a week, and 4½ cents a day. I find that in Quebec, in the county of L'Assomption, there were 12 industrial establishments known as knitting factories, employing collectively 12 hands, earning an average of $63 a year, being at the rate of $1.20 per week, wherewith, I suppose, to discharge the wages of superintendents, the cost of finding power, and dividends to the company. Portneuf is equally favoured, it has 12 establishments, which average $90 per year in wages, or $1.60 per week. Now, I find here that the value of machinery and tools employed in each factory are given; and it may interest the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) to know that the 93 knitting factories in Shelburne actually employed for machinery and tools to the value of $623, being at the rate of $7 per factory for machinery. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact. We are told there were 25,000 new establishments; I have shown you what some of those consist of. I have analysed these further, and I find that out of the 223 knitting factories, there may possibly be 30 that deserve the name by a stretch of courtesy. Those 30 pay

$288,000 in wages out of a total of $322,000. The remaining 193 pay an average of $200 a year for all purposes. But, Sir, great as the knitting factory is, fine as the work which the National Policy has got in there, finer still is the work which the Census Commissioners got in there, it pales before the industry of carpet-making. The House will be glad to know, I was glad to know, that there are now 537 industrial establishments for making carpets in the Dominion of Canada. I find by a reference to the census returns of 1881, that there were only 11 then in existence; we have therefore an increase of 546, which is something like—how many thousands per cent? Is it 5,000, or 50,000 per cent? Some of those hon. gentlemen who are good at it, may occupy their leisure time in making the calculation. Well, Sir, of these 557, 51 are in New Brunswick under the fostering care of the Minister; and they employ 51 hands, mostly old women. Their collective wages are $1,792; so that each of them earns $36 per year, or 70 cents per week. Nova Scotia possesses 106 factories for carpet making, employing 117 hands, who earn $62 a year, or $1.10 per week, according to the census. Prince Edward Island, I am happy to inform my hon. friend, averages $100 per year. Assiniboia has one factory for carpet making, paying $15 per year in wages. Now, I may remark that of the 213 knitting factories in all the provinces except Ontario, not one appears to average $100 a year in wages, or to employ 2 men. The total wages paid in these 213 factories amount to $14,827, which is not quite $70 per year each. Of hosiery factories, I find there are 58. Of these, 18 paid $124,000 in wages; and 40 paid $7,000, being an average of $170 a year apiece. Now, Sir, what I want to point out is the absolute worthlessness of the industrial statistics which have cost Canada $550,000, according to our public accounts, and which are being paraded in every newspaper these gentlemen control, which are paraded in our Year-Book, which are quoted by gentlemen who desire to discourse on statistical matters, as evidence that after all the National Policy did a great deal, that it established 25,000 new industrial establishments, which employ 112,000 hands—but how many of them at wages of 4½ cents per day? Sir, I take the case of the boot and shoe industry, a valuable industry, an industry which has many large manufactories. Let me take the case of Quebec, which is reported to have had 1,905 industrial establishments for making boots and shoes. Now, 320 of these paid $2,400,000 in wages out of $2,900,000. They employ nearly all women and children, and 5,200 men out of a total of 7,445. The remaining 1,600 industrial establishments employ 2,245 men among them, being an average of one man and one-third of an apprentice to each industrial establishment. Sir, take the case of blacksmiths. They supply 9,432 industrial establishments, which employ 11,761 men. Well, the result is that 7,000 of these establishments are operated by one industrious artisan, and 2,400 employ one man and one boy. I will take another case. I will take the case of one or two of our cities, and although I have given this before, it will bear repeating. We will take the case of the good town of Port Hope. During the last ten years unhappily Port Hope lost 539 in population, besides the natural increase; but while the people decreased, the industrial establishments multiplied. There are now 147 industrial establishments in Port Hope; 63 of these employ one man, or one woman, one boy, or one girl; 20 of them employ two men, or two women, two boys, or two girls; 33 of them employ three men, women, boys or girls; 116 establishments employ 219 people, or equal to one man or woman to each industrial establishment, and three-quarters of a boy or girl. Sir, does the House want to know anything more about the value of these census returns? Here is the volume, it is a mine, and I present it to my hon. friends. For every case I have given 50 more can be presented, whenever the hon. Minister of Finance desires them. And here I may make a remark or two on the new taxes that have been imposed. As the hon. gentleman knows, I had no opportunity of inspecting these proposed changes on Friday night, but since then, of course, they have been placed in my hands. As regards the taxes on spirits, none of us will raise any objection to the increase, the Finance Minister is welcome to get all he can out of spirits and liquors. The only question is whether he has raised the taxes to a point which may possibly provoke further smuggling or illicit distillation. A good deal of smuggling has taken place in the past, and I am inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman has got perilously near the point at which that smuggling will be largely increased. As regards sugar and the collateral industries affected, I do not know that I am going to say more at the present time than this: They afford a most admirable object lesson of the general truth I stated, that for every dollar the hon. gentleman pays into the public chest he is safe to exact at least two dollars from the people. We are going to pay one dollar and fourteen hundreths on all sugar from this time out, as nearly as the refiners can get to it; we shall get about $1,200,000, and the people will be taxed to the tune of about $2,000,000, provided our consumption equals the amount expected by the Finance Minister, namely, 250,000,000 pounds. As to how the other industries may be affected or interfered with, it is impossible to say. I observe the hon. gentleman has raised the tax in some cases on other articles to something like 50 per cent

on the original value, as in the case of jams and jellies, and I find he gives enormous protection in the case of certain syrups and molasses. I do not know exactly how many pounds go to make a gallon of ordinary cane syrup; but if I followed the hon. gentleman rightly, the tax now imposed is likely to give 70 or 80 per cent protection to any party who embarks in the manufacture of cane syrup, a protection hugely out of proportion to any benefit that will accrue to the treasury. Although it may be that some parties have to suffer from this excessive protection, it is an ill wind that blows nobody good, and the House will be glad to know there are worthy parties, some not altogether unknown to us, who are supposed to benefit largely by the imposition of this tax. A very strange statement has been made and publicly circulated, which I mention, not that I am going to pledge myself to its literal truth, but which I deem to be a matter that will bear some investigation and inquiry. In a despatch from Halifax it is stated that the levying of a duty of one-half cent a pound on raw sugar will prove a bonanza to the Acadia Sugar Refining Company: that they have a stock in hand of raw sugar admitted free which in view of the imposition of the new duty will represent a profit of $335,000, not to speak of the general increase in the price of sugar. If that be the case, those worthy gentlemen must have accumulated about 34,000 tons of sugar within a very recent period.

Mr. HAGGART. Sixty thousand tons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, 34,000 tons. 67,000,000 pounds of sugar, I beg to inform the hon. gentleman, will yield at one-half cent per pound an amount of duty equal to $335,000, and 67,000,000 pounds represents 34,000 tons. The hon. gentleman can revise this calculation at his leisure. I should like to know, and I dare say many other people would like to know, who are the proprietors of the Acadia Sugar Refining Company. Why should the proprietors of the Acadia Sugar Refining Company, if these statements be correct, receive a gift of $335,000 at the public expense, which is practically what is being done? I remember long ago an occasion when the case was reversed. When the duty was taken off tea, if my memory serves me, Sir Francis Hincks compensated the holders of tea. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways, and the Acadia Sugar Refining Company might hand $335,000 over to Canada, and they might do this not unjustly. The hon. Finance Minister may not assent to this, but the cases are practically identical. These corporations have been very highly favoured in the past, and a very fair ground for argument might be made out for assuming the position that while no injury should be done to them, one of such corporations should not be allowed to pocket $335,000 at the present moment for their own personal benefit. I do not know, but I rather suspect that other refiners may not have been all equally provident. If they have been, there is going to be a very heavy discount on our new taxes. However, I have put certain questions on the Order paper, to which I hope to receive full and fair replies, which will enable us to ascertain in some detail how and in what fashion those benefits have accrued to those lucky individuals, the proprietors of the Acadia Sugar Refining Company. Sir, in this connection I may refer to certain specific cases of injustice committed by the tariff. I have often pointed out that while this tariff discriminated very heavily, in our judgment, against the whole producing classes, it was almost equally unjust to certain classes of manufactures, and that is in the nature of a protective tariff. What is one man's finished product is another man's raw material, and the consequence is that when you impose taxation in that fashion, you are very apt to hurt one manufacturer proportionately as you assist another. Now, Sir, that has been very notably the case of late years with respect to certain very important classes of manufacturers; all those who work in iron. I do not hesitate to say that they have been very unjustly treated, indeed, under this present tariff. I can see no just reason whatever why the iron worker should be compelled to pay 30 or 40 or 50 or 60 per cent perhaps, on his raw material, while the cotton manufacturer or the woollen manufacturer gets his raw material free. Let us have some fair-play, let us have some justice, let us have some reason in these matters, and if you are going to allow your cotton manufacturers and your woollen manufacturers and other manufacturers free materials, why in heaven's name discriminate against the iron manufacturers. They employ full-grown men with families dependent upon them, and it is well known that in the textile industries a large number of employees are only women and children. Sir, the manufacturers of Canada will do well to understand that, while the Reform party do not profess to favour them specially, neither do they wish, nor if they can will they permit, injustice to be done to one class of manufacturers for the benefit of another. As to our agriculturists, everybody knows that they are at present exposed to intense competition from the whole world. Every one knows that the prices of their products are not fixed by Government, but are fixed by the prices for which the productions of India, Argentina, Australia and other countries can be sold in the home market. The Government are hopeless and helpless to aid, but they are very potent to injure, and we find that things which are in the strictest sense

the raw materials and the tools of the agriculturists, are constantly and repeatedly subject to very unjust taxation for no earthly reason except the benefit and advantage of a very small number of protected manufacturers. I notice one thing more. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) descanted largely on his free list, and I have a word or two to say as to that free list. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that a very great number of articles have been put on the free list. They range in our tariff from No. 482 to No. 778. There are 296 items on the free list, and of the 296, by actual count, I make it that there are three items which may fairly be considered as likely to benefit the public at large. The remaining 293 items are almost all for the benefit of certain special classes, either manufacturers or parties entitled to some privilege. On that free list of which we have heard so much there are, as I have said, three articles of general benefit, namely, anthracite coal, tea, and certain fruits. Almost all the rest of the articles are subject to duty and the articles that are admitted free are admitted, as I have said, simply and solely for the benefit of special individuals or special classes. But, Sir, it may interest our farmers particularly to know what they are allowed to import free. Should a farmer desire to adorn the walls of his mansion with pictures of the old masters, at a value of, perhaps, $20,000 each, he can import them free; but if he wants wall paper he has to pay from 40 to 100 per cent duty. If it pleases the farmer he can import ice free, but if he wants coal oil, he must pay 6 cents a gallon. By a wonderful dispensation, leeches are allowed to be imported free. I suppose the Finance Minister regards the leech as a totem of the National Policy, and entitled to special consideration. All Indian tribes respect their totem, and I do not see why protectionists should not respect theirs. But, if the farmer gets his leeches free, they take it out of him in tools, which are taxed 35 per cent. If the farmer greatly desires it, he is allowed to import ambergris free; but if he wants Indian corn for his cattle, he has to pay a duty of 7½ cents per bushel. If he likes a cabinet of antiquities, the farmer can get them as free as he pleases; but if he wants binding-twine, he has to pay 12½ per cent ad valorem. He can get sand free, but saddlery is 30 per cent and barbed wire $15 per ton; and that I think about comprises the list of articles which the farmer of Canada might import free. I do not want at the present moment, I have hardly time in fact, to dwell at length on the immense corruption which is always consequent upon a tariff of this kind. Wherever you make it the interest of a number of people having a command of money to dictate to the Ministry of the day what shall be taxed or what shall not be taxed, you have provision for ever made while your tariff lasts, for a permanent corruption fund. But I want to call attention to the extent to which our manufacturing friends, according to their own report, do dictate and did influence, not later than last year, the operations of the Finance Minister. I shall quote from the report of the secretary of the Manufacturers' Association. Quoth that gentleman:

> It is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes made in the tariff along the lines of their recommendations, and in many instances the language used in both is substantially identical.

No doubt it is.

> This is particularly noticeable as regards the iron industry, the duties on textiles, the duties on drugs, chemicals, alcoholic preparations, &c., as well as upon a large and extended list of miscellaneous articles, and most important additions to the list of non-dutiable articles. In many instances, where we suggested no changes, no changes were made.

Sir, I don't doubt it. I do not doubt that the Minister of Finance, then as heretofore, has proved himself in all respects the faithful servant and mouthpiece of the Manufacturers' Association. Now, what is the excuse that these men make; what is the excuse the Ministers make for their heavy taxes? They are willing to tax us to death to keep out pauper-made goods, and then they are willing to take millions of these taxes to pay paupers to come here and deprive our people of their livelihood. I have spoken of the enormous waste of capital that went on under the National Policy, and I emphasize it again for this reason: That in that waste of capital lies the chief apology for the creation of those numerous combines which now conspire together to raise the price of many articles of common trade and commerce, and which have been very ineffectually dealt with by certain measures, promoted by the Government or by some members of it. Now, Sir, as to one silly taunt which I notice the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) lately threw out with respect to the Opposition. The hon. gentleman was good enough to taunt the Opposition that we opposed the outlay for the construction of railways and other purposes intended to promote trade. Sir, the Opposition opposed no outlay for the good of Canada; but of what purpose is it to spend huge sums of money for facilitating trade, while your whole policy neutralizes the introduction of trade? Why should you cheapen transport and tax the things transported until they cannot be brought in? Why should you turn the people of Canada away and pay immigrants to take their place? Sir, I have given again and again the reasons why protection as a rule must fail; but in Canada these reasons have special weight. I doubt if there ever was a country so wholly and utterly unsuited to protection as a country like Canada, lying as it

does within the same parallels of latitude, having all through very nearly the same productions, having very little indeed to exchange with each other, where the several provinces are on the whole competitors rather than customers one of the other. Now, Sir, we have had very curious testimony lately given us as to the opinion the late chieftain of the Conservative party entertained with respect to that matter. We have the evidence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), than whom no man is better qualified to speak, as to the way in which the protective campaign of 1878 was inaugurated. We have the evidence of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) as to the difficulty with which the said chieftain was kicked on in the line of protection by himself and others, and how hard it was to keep him straight. We have the testimony of a gentleman of very high standing in Canada, Mr. Goldwin Smith, whose words I give as I read them the other day :

> Till the election of 1878 was over, Sir John Macdonald disclaimed protection, and described his commercial policy as readjustment of the tariff. I had a personal interview with him a few days before the election, and I learned from his own lips that he foresaw the evil consequences of an application of protection to a country like Canada, as nearly as I think myself.

I dare say that my hon. friends in the maritime provinces will likewise recollect a certain telegram addressed to a certain Senator Boyd, in which the late chieftain of the Conservative party, a few days before the election, utterly repudiated the protectionist theory, and declared that all he wanted was a readjustment. And now, Sir, one word or two as to another argument of the hon. gentleman. He pointed to the enormous expansion of our trade and commerce in the last sixteen years. It had risen, he said, from $172,000,000 in 1878 to $240,000,000 in 1894, and, I suppose, to about $230,000,000 in 1895. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the total advance in those seventeen years scarcely equals 2 per cent per annum. But I want to call the attention of the Finance Minister to a still more curious fact. The advance in the ten years from 1868 to 1878, under a purely revenue tariff, and taking almost the worst of our years, was greater in proportion than it was in the seventeen years the hon. gentleman quotes. Making all allowance for the admission of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, our increase amounted to about $34,000,000 in those ten years on an importation of $130,000,000. That means that our importation from 1868 to 1878 increased considerably more in proportion than it did from 1878 to 1894, and a very great deal more than it did from 1878 to 1895—and I may ask how much of the importation of the latter period was due to borrowing? Now, I have not time to go over certain of the silly fallacies or frauds which hon. gentlemen opposite have been insisting upon; but I will just enumerate some of them. I think we are getting about to the end of the home market fraud, the desire for economy fraud, the sham loyalty fraud, whether it takes the shape of proclamations to the Indians of Haldimand or others, the desire for reciprocity fraud, the general prosperity fraud, and the reduction of prices by reason of high taxes fraud; and if any hon. gentlemen on the other side are still unconverted, I advise them to look at the "Farmers' Sun," where they will find a number of very excellent articles, which they can read with considerable profit. Very likely, hon. gentlemen opposite do not like my way of putting these things. Very likely, they think I have been too rough in these matters. It has been my misfortune, Sir, to know too much about them and their predecessors. It has been my misfortune to know what have been the objects of some of the manufacturers who have urged an increase of taxation. It has been my misfortune to have learned, what has been confirmed of late, what would be the result of protection in Canada, as it has been in the United States and other countries. I knew that protection might help a few while it would hurt the mass of the people; I knew that it meant intolerable corruption; and I stand to every word of my speech as Finance Minister in 1876 and my speech in 1879, criticising the proposals which my successor brought down. I admit one thing: I admit that I did not allow enough for the power of clap-trap or the inordinate greed of certain parties; nor did I, perhaps, allow enough for the great effect which the example of the United States has always had upon our people, or for the rather natural desire which many of them had to retaliate upon the United States in return for the extent to which that country had interfered with our trade and commerce. As you probably pretty well know, Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been accused of being a most pessimistic individual; but, Sir, the wheel has turned wonderfully. Why, Sir, I recollect when I was accused of the exact reverse in 1876, 1877 and 1878. Let hon. gentlemen read "Hansard" for those years; let hon. gentlemen look at their own campaign literature for those years: they will find that I was then charged with being reckless, overconfident, extravagant and utterly indifferent to the position of the country. Now, Sir, that was just exactly what I have not been, either then or now. I had very good reason in 1878 for the confidence I then expressed that we were about to weather the storm and weather it successfully. I knew in 1878 that the great interests of the country were all sound. I knew that there was only one, the great lumber interest, which was suffering under a temporary depression by reason of the depression existing at the time in the United States. It was perfectly true that

the importers and tradesmen did suffer considerably in 1878, as it is impossible that they will not suffer at any time when there is a great and sudden shrinkage in the value of the goods they purchase. Men buying in a sinking market are very apt to suffer. But it was proved then, and subsequent events proved, that in 1878 and the years preceding, the manufacturers of Canada, as a whole, had done exceedingly well. Now, Sir, I knew that the revival was close at hand. I knew that the taxation we had, as subsequent events showed, was abundantly adequate in any ordinary year, when we had not a bad harvest, to produce all the revenue we required. And I knew another thing of great importance to this country: I knew that from 1872 to 1878 the farm population of Canada, notably that of the province of Ontario, was growing in a very respectable ratio—many times greater than the rate at which it has grown since It is true, Sir, that in that period our cities, towns and villages all grew moderately; but the country grew in due proportion. During these late years we have seen, and seen with regret—I think all men have seen it with regret—that the population of the country districts all over old Canada has been absolutely stationary, while a few towns and cities have increased out of all due proportion. To-day the conditions have changed. Then we saw clearly what would have resulted had our policy been permitted to prevail; to-day we see clearly what has resulted from the reversal of our policy. My statements made in 1878 and in 1879 have been amply justified. I could heartily wish that they were not. I could heartily wish that I had been an untrue prophet; but I will give, this afternoon, just one instance of the way things have gone with a great many of our towns and villages formerly prosperous and thriving throughout Ontario, and I think the same rule applies to the hon. gentleman's own province. Some time ago, for the question is one of more than passing interest, I had occasion to investigate the condition of a town of about 4,000 people. I found that in 1878 this country town traded with about 5,000 families. To-day it trades over the same area, but the population has diminished absolutely, as well as relatively, and there are scarcely more than 4,000 families now in that same area. But I find this very important fact, that, whereas, in 1878, and the years immediately adjacent, on an average, every farmer spent in purchases for his farm and family, close on $600 a year in that town, to-day it is doubtful if those same farmers spend more than $200 or $300 a year. The result is that a trade of close on $3,000,000 in that town had shrunk to a trade of about $1,000,000 per annum. All the natural increase had gone, and there was a large reduction of the population both in town and country. That is a simple statement of the facts, and although I will not say that it will be reproduced in all its details in every town and village in Ontario, or the other provinces, I say that, substantially, it represents the condition of a very large number of formerly prosperous and thriving towns and villages throughout the country. Sir, this decrease in trade seems to be spreading upward to the cities. Even the hon. members for Toronto, I think, if they will own the truth, must be aware that the growth of that great city has not, of late years, by any means kept pace with their expectations and desires. They have found that the cities of a country cannot prosper unless the people at large prosper; and in the condition of Toronto, and other cities, we may see the certain result of an evil policy, when it has had time enough to work its natural results. The truth is that the farmers of Canada, as a rule, were very well off, indeed, in 1878, in spite of the bad harvests. Many of them had then a considerable deal of spare capital. And since that time they have been living on that and their borrowings. Their mortgages are infinitely greater to-day than in 1878, even though the rate of interest—no thanks to the hon. gentlemen opposite—has largely decreased all the world over. Now we have come to a period of standstill and enforced economy. Sir, if the Minister of Finance be really desirous to ascertain the condition of the farmers, particularly of Ontario, I would advise him to invest in a copy of a journal which does not always talk too kindly of himself or me, and that is the "Farmers' Sun," and he will find some nonsense and some unfairness, but a lot of useful information about the condition of the farmers. Here I will say one word as to the possible remedies for this state of things. I do not hesitate to say here that as regards any advantage or immediate relief to the farmers of Canada, I know of but one remedy, and that is the obtaining of access on fair and reasonable terms to the markets of the United States. That is the one thing which might bring immediate relief. But we may have lost our chance. The golden opportunity may have gone through the dishonesty and treachery and hypocrisy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not believe myself that it has entirely gone, but I admit that all that men could do to render it impossible has been done by hon. gentlemen opposite. The next remedy that I would prescribe, if I could, is simply to strike off our trade restrictions. Let us have tariff for revenue only. Let what the people pay go into the people's treasury, and be expended for the people's benefit. Let us have an end of all these wild-cat projects. Let us cease to offer up perpetual sacrifices to the great god, Jingo. Let us put our house in order, and make the most of what we do possess, and there is great need that we should. Before con-

cluding, I will apply one rough test. Mind, I do not mean to say that it is a perfectly accurate test, but, at the same time, it is one that is worth applying. Everybody knows that our chief industry is agriculture, that we have very heavy debts to pay, taking into acconut all the debts which the people of Canada collectively owe. Nominally, we pay these debts in money, but really we have to pay them in wheat, barley, cheese, lumber, fish, minerals, and natural products of every description. Practically, our manufactures are nowhere. Now, let us measure the cost of our debt and the cost of our Government, not in ounces of gold, but in bushels of wheat, and see where we stand. In 1878 the interest on the total indebtedness of Canada, even allowing for the larger rate of interest, would not have exceeded fifteen millions of dollars. To discharge the interest on our collective debt at that time would have cost us, at the prices then prevailing, about fifteen million bushels of wheat, which might be the produce of one million acres of land. In 1895, I believe, if a true account were struck, the interest on our collective indebtedness was not less than $30,000,000. It would cost us 60,000,000 bushels of wheat to pay that interest at the present prices, and it would take 4,000,000 acres of our best land to produce that wheat. The total taxation, in 1878, amounted to $20,000,000, allowing for the deficit, and that would have cost 20,000,000 bushels of wheat. In 1894 our real taxes amounted to $60,000,000—$30,000,000 for the treasury, and $30,000,000 to private parties; and to pay that taxation, it would take 120,000,000 bushels of wheat at present prices, instead of 20,000,000. Were I to measure it by barley, the case would be worse, and by meats, not very much better. But I am happy to say that there is good reason to believe that our farmers and producers are at last awakening. In 1878 they drove away the sheep dog and gave the management of their flocks to the wolf, and now they appreciate the result. A good deal has been said at various times about the remarkable uprising known as the Patrons of Industry. I will give the hon. gentlemen opposite some figures from a source they cannot dispute, which may tend to show that their appreciation of the position is altogether astray. I find that the Conservative leader of the Ontario Opposition, Mr. Marter, the other day, speaking at London on the subject, gave the following interesting calculation to show that Mr. Mowat was in a minority. There were in Ontario, he said, at the last election, 107,000 votes cast by Conservatives, 98,000 by Patrons, and 153,000 by Liberals; thus showing Sir Oliver Mowat to be in a decisive minority. Therefore, on the computation of the Conservative leader in Ontario, the genuine Conservative vote has been reduced to about 30 per cent of the total voting population. Our farmers have learned that taxation never reduces prices. New inventions will reduce prices, cheaper transport will reduce prices, the development of new countries will reduce prices, but all that reduction is in spite of taxation, and not because of it. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite will insist, I will make them an offer. They claim the right, and the sole right to arrogate to themselves, in virtue of the National Policy, all the reduction that has taken place in the price of manufactured goods. Let them shoulder, also, the responsibility for all the reductions that have taken place in the price of farm products since 1878. There are other one-sided arguments in which the hon. gentleman indulged. Like many others, he is willing to take, at any time, a few scattered facts which go to favour the National Policy, and to ignore all the rest. What man is there in charge of a large business who could not make himself out possessed of a huge surplus if he were to put on the one side all his credit, and to omit, on the other, all his debts? I do not refuse to admit that per se the increases in bank deposits, circulation and mileage are good, if they be accompanied by an increase in population. I admit, though that is more doubtful, that increase in insurance is good. These things are good as far as they go. But they cannot and do not neutralize the other and far more important facts of loss of population, depreciation of property, and huge taxation, to which I have called attention from time to time. Sir, I cannot pause now to discuss the injustice of this system of taxation further than to say that it is one of those systems of taxation under which it happens that the very poorest in the community, in proportion to their means are often the most heavily taxed, while the rich very often escape with an infinitely smaller proportion than the poorest are obliged to pay. Now, when the taxation is light, that may be overlooked; but when the taxation reaches the present enormous proportions it becomes a question which we must all, and the Government in particular, take carefully into consideration. Nor, Sir—for I have taken longer than I intended—can I find time to allude to no more than the barest and briefest way to the intolerable folly and wastefulness with which the money of the people has been dissipated. I can only name our Tay Canal, our Curran Bridge, our railway subsidies, our North-west expenditures, our immigration expenditures, our seventeen paid Ministers, our duplicate Speakers, our St. Charles extensions, our Caraquet railways, our Fredericton bridges, our Behring Sea arbitrations and our Prohibition Commissions;—our Franchise Act, our Civil Government costs us a million and a half; another million and a half we pay for Militia, and get no Militia after all. Sir, these and all the other favourite ways of

wasting the money of the people have been pretty fully laid before this House in times past. Take our Intercolonial Railway;—fifty millions of the people's money invested, and not one copper of revenue from it. We call ourselves lucky—most fortunate—if we can make both ends meet, and, notwithstanding our sinking fifty millions, we are not obliged to add more than a few hundred thousand of capital account from year to year. And what shall I say of the new projects in the North-west? Sir, I have here a document made up on very high authority which shows that there are to-day in the country extending from Sudbury to the western limit of the province of Alberta, a population of 261,161 souls. This, of course, includes the greater part of Algoma. In the same territory they have of constructed railway, 4,348 miles, being at the rate of one mile of constructed railway for every 60 souls or every 12 families in these territories. And we are asked for aid for projected lines which would run the total up, according to my calculation, to something close upon one mile of completed road for every ten people now in the territories—including the subsidy likely to be brought down for the Hudson Bay railway. I repeat that I do not, for my part, despair of the position of the country. But, I realize the facts. I realize that very great chances have been thrown away. I realize the long succession of blunders which have characterized the conduct of Government during the past twenty-five years. I can remember that Canada entered into confederation in this position—our debt was one-third per head that of the United States, our taxation was one-third per head of the United States. How stands the account to-day? Our debt per head, or I am greatly mistaken, is at least treble that of the United States. The debt of the United States per head of the people is $14. Our debt, according to the computation of the hon. gentleman, not taking into account the liabilities which he excludes, would amount to close upon $300,000,000, which would be about $60 per head. How has our population increased? Since confederation we have barely added a million and a quarter of people in nearly thirty years. Look at the increase in the United States, in their early days, without heavy expenditures upon immigration to help them. In 1790 their population was 4,000,000; in 1800 it was 5,300,000; in 1810 it was 7,315,000; and there was an estimated population of 9,000,000 in 1818. When I look back to what might have been done, when I realize that with reasonably wise government it would have been no great feat for Canada to have gained a population of 8,000,000 souls—perhaps 10,000,000—I cannot but feel that the greatest opportunities have been most ruthlessly thrown away. Well, Sir, as I said before, what, under these circumstances, can we advise? Our advice is simple and brief:—Make adequate provision for your deficit; do your duty to the country and let the people know and fully understand what the public liabilities are—liabilities which, according to the figures I have submitted, are not much short of $300,000,000. Sir, I advise that we learn prudence and economy; that we be content, as the Scriptures have it, with such things as we have; do not stretch our hands for further territory which we cannot properly administer or provide for without doing injustice to our own people. I would advise the hon. gentleman to dispense, for the time being, with his Pacific cables and Fast Atlantic services, I advise him to make friends, if it can be honourably done, with the people of the United States. And above all and before all, I advise him to strike off, as far as possible, existing trade restrictions. These things done, Sir, I will grant there is a reasonable chance that the country may right itself, that out of all this evil, there may spring some good. Sir, I do not pretend to say, and I do not believe that this country is going to escape entirely scathless from the results of sixteen years of folly, fraud and falsehood. We must suffer for what we have done; we must retrace our steps and must be prepared to submit to some sacrifice in doing it. What these gentlemen have done is to put back the progress of Canada for a whole generation. We cannot, and we do not pretend that we can give back to Canada her lost children, her "lost legions." Nor is it in our power, except in so far as our example can redeem the past, to blot out the marks of shame upon the shield of Canada which these men's conduct have caused. Sir, the hon. gentleman's proposals may stop the deficit. That is well. That ought to be done; that must be done. But we must do more than that. We must lighten the burdens of the people as well as stop the deficit. I do not pretend to say that that will be an easy task. I say that it is a task utterly and hopelessly impossible under the present system. Nevertheless that is the goal that the Reform party must keep in view, that is the goal for which they must strive; that is the goal which I hope and trust they will soon attain. As to the manufacturers, I desire to say most emphatically that we have no ill-will on our side of the House to the manufacturers as a class. We know that manufacturers prospered more up to 1878, and in a far more substantial and permanent way, than they have since, if the truth were known. Sir, we recognize fully the value of manufacturers to a country situated as Canada is. But our motto is: Justice to all classes. We neither propose to do injustice to farmers to please manufacturers, nor to do injustice to manufacturers for the purpose of pleasing farmers. Sir, I admit, I am not going for one moment to conceal from the House the fact, that a considerable customs tariff must be enacted for some time to come, but it must be a just tariff, it must be no tangled mass of

dishonest absurdities like the one under my hand ; it must be something which is fairly and honestly framed for the purpose of bringing revenue into the treasury, and not at the dictation of protected manufacturers' associations for the purpose of enabling them to divide with the Government the plunder unjustly obtained from the people. Therefore, Sir, I propose this amendment to the motion that you leave the Chair :

That all the words after "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof :— "the Estimates for the fiscal year 1894-95 amount to the sum of $38,517,152 independently of any further Supplementary Estimates which may be brought down.

That the said sum of $38,517,152 is in excess of the amount expended in 1893-94 by the sum of $922,127.

That the deficit for the year 1893-94 amounted to $1,210,322.

That the deficit for the present year is estimated by the Minister of Finance at $4,500,000.

That from statements made by Ministers of the Crown, in this House, it appears that our existing obligations for railway subsidies and for public works now in progress will involve a further outlay of $20,000,000, computed as follows :—

For railway subsidies now voted..	$8,729,000
For the St. Lawrence Canals.....	6,000,000
For the Trent Valley Canal.....	5,000,000
For the Intercolonial Railway and minor works	1,000,000
	$20,729,000

The interest on which sum, together with the subsidy provided by Statute to be paid on account of a fast Atlantic service, will entail an addition to our already very heavy annual fixed charges of $1,400,000.

That, inasmuch as enormous sums of money are now exacted from the people of Canada which are not paid into the treasury, and inasmuch as the burthens of the people are thereby greatly and unnecessarily increased, and it is of the utmost importance to the well-being of the community that not only should the present extravagant expenditure be diminished, but that the said burthens should be reduced as largely and speedily as possible,—it is expedient that in making provision to restore 'the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure,' as recommended in the Speech from the Throne, the existing tariff be so modified that it may be made a tariff for revenue only."

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

After Recess.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, before criticising the policy of the gallant knight from Oxford as laid down in the amendment which he moved, and before dealing with the statement of policy indicated by that hon. gentleman, I wish to correct a few of the criticisms in which he indulged in his reply to the magnificent statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I think the gallant knight was not very good-natured in the criticism he offered. He said that without desiring to be discourteous the Finance Minister had performed a perfunctory operation, following a brief prepared by his department. Any hon. member who heard the candid and clear statement of the Minister of Finance must consider the remark of the gallant knight entirely uncalled for. The Minister of Finance has not had the educational opportunities enjoyed by the gallant knight from Oxford—he has not had the advantage of a legal education. I now refer to a biography published in a book called "Both Sides of the Question," in which it is stated that the gallant knight from Oxford received in early life his education as a lawyer. Afterwards he turned his face to a calling more natural to him, and became a financier. This work further stated that he became an adept in finance. The gallant knight undertook the management years ago of the Commercial Bank, and no doubt there are many widows in different parts of the country who will remember that institution with regret. Subsequently the hon. gentleman devoted his entire attention to the financial condition of the country, and became, as that work stated, an adept in finance. Hon. members will also find in that work a description of the qualities and capabilities of the hon. gentleman. There may be some hon. members who are titular leaders of the Opposition, but the real leader, according to the hon. gentleman's own opinion, is the gallant knight from Oxford. We have at last a policy propounded. The hon. gentleman criticised the Finance Minister on the score that there was in his speech an absence of reference to the National Policy. I will state for the information of the House that the policy of the Government is the policy which was enunciated in 1878, and which has been followed down to the present time ; that the Government is at present a Government in favour of protection, and it intends to follow that policy and to appeal to the people on that line. The gallant knight twitted the Finance Minister with having made no reference whatever to that policy. Did hon. members hear the gallant knight make any reference to dear departed ones, to commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade ? Now, however, we have a new policy, a tariff for revenue purposes only. We have at length obtained from hon. gentlemen opposite a statement of policy, and this policy of a tariff for revenue purposes only was explained by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who said in a speech delivered in the lower provinces that there were three kinds of tariff, a free trade tariff, a tariff for revenue purposes, and a revenue tariff. That hon. gentleman did not trouble to mention anything about a free trade tariff, because no country in the world has such a tariff. He spoke of what a revenue tariff was, compared it with a protective tariff, and he instanced as a revenue tariff

a tariff such as that in force in England, and it is such a tariff and such a policy that we are dealing with to-night. I venture to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that when the country comes to understand what a revenue tariff is, as explained by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and as it will be explained to the country from one end of it to the other before the general elections arrive, a tariff for revenue only will occupy the graveyard with the dear departed ones, unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. But before dealing with that question, as I intend to deal with it fully in the latter part of my speech, and instituting a comparison between the policy of the Government and the policy of the Opposition, let me deal with some of the statements of the gallant knight in his criticism of the Finance Minister's speech. One of the statements was that he looked with alarm on the state of depression that existed from one end of the country to the other, that the country was in a more depressed condition than it was in 1878. The gallant knight does not seem to have listened to any of the opinions expressed outside; he does not seem to be aware that people all over the world, and especially on the other side of the line, have declared that Canada has weathered the storm of depression which has swept over the world better than any other country that can be mentioned. I will give the gallant knight some of the statements made to show him how this country has improved, and although it may, perhaps, be a little tiresome to deal with figures on this point, it is necessary I should do so in order to present to the country a comparison of the condition of the Dominion now as compared with 1878. I shall also show the hon. gentleman evidences of the prosperity of the country. It will be remembered that the gallant knight stated that deposits in savings banks did not afford evidence of prosperity. Let me quote from the hon. gentleman's speeches on that point. Perhaps he has obtained better light now than some years ago, when he declared that one of the tests of prosperity was the amount of deposits in savings banks. Let the hon. gentleman refer to any political economist, and he will find that strongest evidence of prosperity is to be found in the increased savings of the people as evidenced by savings bank deposits. If the hon. gentleman has no faith in himself or in political economists, let him read the speech delivered by Sir William Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer, delivered the other night in the English House of Commons, when, in referring to the depression which has spread over England, and mentioning the decrease which had occurred in exports, he declared that the country was sound, and that one of the best evidences was the increased deposits in the different savings banks. Undoubtedly that is one of the evidences of prosperity in a country, and in the Government savings banks of the Dominion we have striking evidence afforded by the savings of the people now amounting in deposits to the enormous sum of $297,000,000. Another test of wealth and prosperity is the amount of raw material imported into a country for the purpose of being manufactured. Let me make a comparison between 1881 and 1891 as regards the amount of raw material coming into Canada. Of wool alone in 1881, the import was 6,930,000 pounds; in 1891 it was 10,503,000 pounds; of cottons, 8,011,759 pounds; in 1891, 40,263,333 pounds; of raw sugar in 1881, 19,876,872 pounds; in 1891, 252,644,000 pounds. The same remark applies to hides, rubber, jute, veneers, hemp, raw silk, broom corn, there being an enormous increase in each of these articles. Now let me answer some of the criticisms in regard to the census which the hon. gentleman has so profusely indulged in this afternoon. The number of industrial establishments in the country in 1881 was 49,923, and in 1891 they had increased to 75,768. The capital invested in 1881 was $165,302,625, and that has increased in 1891 to an invested capital of $353,836,817. The number of employees in 1881 was 254,935, whereas the number of employees in 1891 was 367,865. The wages paid in 1881 amounted to $59,429,002, and the wages paid in 1891 amounted to $99,762,441. The cost of raw material—this is a true test, Sir, of the growth of the manufactures of this country, it is as true a test as possibly can be applied to the increase in a country's wealth—the cost of raw materials increased from $179,918,593 in 1881 to $255,983,219 in 1891. The value of products in 1881 was $309,607,068, and that had increased in 1891 to $475,455,705. Here is a table which give correctly all these figures:

	1881.		1891.	
	No.	$	No.	$
Number of establishments	49,923	.....	75,768	.....
Capital invest'd	.....	165,302,623	.....	353,836,817
Number of employees	254,935	.....	367,865	.....
Wages paid	.....	59,429,002	.....	99,762,441
Cost of raw material	.....	179,918,593	.....	255,983,219
Value of products	.....	309,676,068	.....	475,455,705

That ought be a sufficient answer to the argument of the hon. gentleman. But the hon. gentleman went further and he criticised the mode in which the census was taken. Well, the census of Canada is taken precisely in the same manner as it is taken in most Anglo-Saxon countries in the world. If you go to the United States census you will find included there hundreds and hund-

reds of industries which have only one person employed in each, and I may say, that is the case in a great majority of them. The hon. gentleman could easily have found the increase of manufactures—even in his interpretation of the word "manufacturers" from our census, if he had taken the trouble to do so. Let us also judge by the total trade of the country how it has increased from 1878 to 1894. Notwithstanding the decreases in value of the present time, compared with the year 1878, our total trade has grown from $153,000,000 in the latter year to $230,500,000 in the year which has closed. Look at the interprovincial trade of Canada. Look at the immense trade which has sprung up in the different provinces of the country, a trade which has increased, as estimated, from $2,000,000 in 1867, to $125,000,000 in 1894. What an enormous increase is that. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not content with criticising the census, and although he did not refer as much as usual to it in his speech yet he adopted his old tactics of depreciating and decrying the country in which he lives. Worse still, he was not correct in his statements. He said that the farming property in the province of Ontario had decreased in value to the extent of $200,000,000; but, Mr. Speaker, what do you say to a statement of that kind when I tell you that there has been no decline whatever in that respect. On the contrary, Sir, there has been a gain of $95,000,000 in ten years. Land has decreased but there has been an increase in buildings, implements, and live stock. Let me refer the hon. gentleman to an authority which he will not deny; the authority of Mr. Blue, an officer of the Ontario Government and Sir Oliver Mowat's statistician.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is much like your own statistician.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, then, we are to take the statement of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with regard to everything that is going on in this country. According to him our statistician is at fault and so is the statistician of the Government of Ontario who has taken every means to find out the real facts and who has a staff at his command for the purpose of inquiring into them. Should we not better depend on such statistics than on those furnished by the hon. gentleman? Where are we to go for our statistics if not to duly accredited officials? What means has the hon. gentleman at his command for finding out what the real statistical condition of the country is? Are we to take his "ipse dixit" as to what the condition of the country is, and are we to reject the statement of the statistician? I am taking evidence such as is furnished in this country, evidence that cannot be controverted and it shows that instead of a decline in the farming operations and agricultural wealth of the country, it has increased from $882,000,000 in 1882 to $979,000,000 in 1892. If any other evidence is wanted of the progress of the country, of the commercial development of the country, and of the increased wealth of the country, the railway statistics show it. Let me make a comparison between the years 1878 and 1894 in this respect. There were 6,143 miles of railway in operation in the country in 1878, and there are 15,627 miles at the present day. The train mileage run in 1878 was 19,669,447, and in 1894 it amounted to 43,670,029. The number of passengers carried in 1878 was 6,443,924, and in 1894 the number carried amounted to 14,462,498. The tons of freight carried in 1878 was 7,883,472, and in 1894 they amounted to 20,721,116. The earnings of the roads in 1878 amounted to $20,520,078, and the earnings of the roads in 1894 were $49,552,528. The working expenses in 1878 were $16,100,102, and in 1894 they were $35,218,433. The following table shows the facts:

Years.	Miles in operation.	Train mileage.	No. of passengers.	Tons of freight.	Earnings.	Working expenses.	Proportion of expenses to receipts.
1875.....	4,826½	17,680,168	5,190,416	5,670,836	$19,470,539	$15,775,532	81·
1878.....	6,143½	19,669,447	6,443,924	7,883,472	20,520,078	16,100,102	78·
1894.....	15,627	43,670,029	14,462,498	20,721,116	49,552,528	35,218,433	71·

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) paid a well deserved compliment to the Finance Minister as to the credit of the country, but he could not help that. The credit of Canada stands first and foremost of all countries in the world, except perhaps the mother land. Financial men who are the best judges of our resources and of the financial condition of the country, put our securities as high and higher than most of the other countries in the world. We are higher than all the sister colonies and we stand higher than those friends of the hon. gentleman in the republic to the south of us. Only to the mother country herself does Canada rank second. Our 3 per cent securities are selling, if I am informed rightly, at between 99 and 100 in the London

market. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) criticised the borrowing of the Finance Minister in the old country, and he told the Finance Minister that when he did commence borrowing he should have borrowed sufficient when he was at it. It was a mistake, said the hon. member for South Oxford, that the Finance Minister only borrowed $10,700,000. Well, I remember a time in this House when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not take that course or make that criticism. I remember when he blamed the Government for borrowing too much money, and, when not having means to apply it, of keeping it in hands. But now the hon. gentleman finds fault with the Finance Minister for a different thing altogether and he blames him for not borrowing enough. The hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) must know that the borrowing powers of the Finance Minister are limited. If he had looked at the Supply Bill, 57-58 Vic., he would find that the borrowing powers for general purposes amounted to $13,588,280.74. Now the loan made by the Finance Minister was for £2,250,000 or $10,950,000, leaving a balance of $2,638,280.74, which the Finance Minister retained for the purpose of guarding against possible contingencies, and which he retained in order to provide for what the hon. gentleman warned him that he did not provide for, namely, for the redemption of some of the loans which we have had from the savings banks throughout the country. It is one of the favourite maxims of the hon. gentleman for South Oxford, to revile and run down the credit of the country. He stated that there was no provision for redeeming any portion of the $40,000,000 which we have borrowed from the people of this country That sum is for the purpose of providing for the payment of debt. Besides that, there is the sum of $4,938,352 in specie and guaranteed sterling debentures, over and above what the law requires for the redemption of our currency. This amount is retained by the Government for the purpose of providing for a possible run on our savings banks, besides $2,000,000 odd, which has been unissued. So that there is ample provision for the redemption of any amount that is likely to fall due ; and the unexampled credit of the country would enable us, even if we had not this provision, to borrow at any time a sufficient sum for the purpose of redeeming any amount that we would likely be called on to pay. The hon. gentleman also criticised the statement of my hon. friend in reference to the liabilities of the country. He alleged that the statement I made in the House the other day, with reference to our liabilities on account of railway subsidies, did not correspond with the statement of the Finance Minister. My statement was that those liabilities amounted to nearly $9,000,000, while the statement of my hon. friend was that we were liable for railway subsidies under contract to the extent of $2,257,000, and that the probability was that there would be contracts involving a further sum of $2,587,000, and he added that if these two sums were added together and deducted from the $9,000,000 nearly, the remainder would probably not be called for by any of the railways entitled to subsidies. That was a statement prepared by my department. I told the officers to go carefully into the matter, and the statement of my hon. friend was strictly correct. The hon. member for South Oxford also stated that there was one liability which my hon. friend the Finance Minister made no mention of ; that is, probable expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. He stated that he had it on authority which it was not safe to disregard, that a large amount of capital might be required before many years to place the Intercolonial Railway in as good a position as it was in a few years ago. I can assure the hon. gentleman that my instructions to the general manager are that he shall at all hazards maintain the road and its equipment in the highest possible state of efficiency. That was the first duty imposed upon him. I told him that his first duty after that was to make the expenditure and the receipts as nearly as possible balance. He was not to enter into any unnecessary improvements ; he was to look after the proper conduct of the officials ; he was to see that the utmost economy was practised in every branch of the railway ; and I have the authority of the general manager for stating that the road and its equipment are to-day in at least as good a condition as they have ever been. I do not claim a great deal of credit for this state of things, beyond the credit of insisting on the officials of the road carrying out their instructions to the very letter. I have also his authority for stating that the road has as excellent equipment as any road on the continent of America ; and I can state for the information of the hon. member for South Oxford that he need have no fear that any degradation of the road and its equipment will necessitate any expenditure on capital account for a number of years to come. I have been enabled during the past year to save the sum of $65,000, principally in oil, fuel and repairs to cars, by the strictest economy ; and I can gratify the hon. gentleman by stating, notwithstanding the severity of the year and the consequent extra expenditure required for running the road, that this year, like last year, the Intercolonial will come out with a slight surplus. Do not misunderstand me when I say that ; I do not expect to need anything on capital account. There are some expenditures which will be absolutely necessary. Some expenditures may be required to enable us to meet the increased business of the road ; but these will be principally terminal expenditures. I regret

to say that during last summer we suffered great losses from fires on the Intercolonial. At Halifax the elevator and a great part of the station were burned, and at Rivière du Loup the station was burned. These two items alone involve losses amounting to nearly $325,000. So the hon. gentleman, in his criticism of my hon. friend's Budget speech, might have omitted altogether his reference to the probability of large sums being required to restore the Intercolonial to the state of efficiency that existed under his regime. The hon. gentleman stated that my hon. friend had not mentioned the claim of the Chignecto Railway as a liability of the Dominion. The statutory time for the payment of the subsidy to that railway has expired ; the contract has not been performed. If any arrangement should be made by the Government in the future for the purpose of continuing the work, the House of Commons and the people of Canada will be fully informed of it ; and the hon. gentleman, instead of classing it as a probable liability, should wait till the time arrives when he can properly so consider it. I may say the same with reference to the Hudson Bay Railway. That question will be dealt with on its merits, and the members of this House will have a full opportunity of considering any expenditure which the Government think advisable to make for the purpose of building that road. I would like to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition state what his policy is in reference to that road. He was at Winnipeg, and in various other parts of the Northwest country, and I have no doubt he was asked what he intended to do in reference to that matter. If I remember correctly one of his speeches there on the subject, he did not exactly promise the construction of the road, but he said that he considered it of the gravest importance to the people of that portion of the country, and that if he obtained power he would order a commission to inquire into the necessity of the undertaking.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are you going to do ? Appoint a commission ?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman, in speaking of the extraordinary expenditures which his Government were obliged to assume from 1873 to 1878 as liabilities imposed upon them by the Government of Sir John Macdonald, asserted that they had to provide for $60,000,000 of liabilities, involving, at 5 per cent, an expenditure of $3,000,000 a year. The policy of the Government of Sir John Macdonald might have been reversed ; but the hon. gentleman approved of that policy. It is true contracts were let on some of the works, but the moment the hon. gentleman and his friends came into power they cancelled every contract. Afterwards, they changed their policy and re-let the contracts, and I would like to have the pleasure of showing to the hon. gentleman in what manner they re-let them. Did they let them to the lowest tenderer ? No ; they picked out their particular friends, and to them they awarded the contracts. The hon. gentleman disdains paying any attention to the statistical authorities in the country. Of Mulhall he thinks nothing : Johnson, he ridicules ; the statistician of the Ontario Government he treats with contempt ; and, on his own authority alone, he ventures to make a most extraordinary statement with reference to what our people owe to foreign investors. That a gentleman who left his legal practice to devote himself for the rest of his days to the investigation of financial affairs should make the statement that we are paying interest to the extent of $30,000,00 per year to foreign investors, is something one finds it difficult to realize. I have not the statistics to prove the contrary, but I need only mention the amount that its absurdity may be patent to any one at all conversant with the subject. Let the hon. gentleman go to the bankers and the loan societies, and the other capitalists whose business it is to keep themselves cognizant of all these matters, and repeat to them this extraordinary statement, and he will find that whatever reputation he may be credited with as one having some knowledge of the financial condition of the country will vanish in their estimation. The hon. gentleman states that the depreciation in securities in this country exceed £16,000,000 sterling, and he referred with approval to the opinion of the London "Economist." But every hon. member knows that the London "Economist" is gifted with a peculiarly biased correspondent from this section, and we all remember the graphic production which appeared in that paper a couple of years ago from the pen of the right hon. gentleman, in which he described, in the most gloomy periods, the system of taxation in this country, and how oppressively it bore on our agriculturists. After further reference to the "Economist," the hon. gentleman called our attention to the organ of the Patrons, the "Farmers' Sun." Well, that organ has been particularly severe in its criticisms on the right hon. gentleman himself. I, myself, am of opinion that these criticisms were untrue, and I should advise the right hon. gentleman to look upon that newspaper's opinion as to the state of the country with the same suspicion as we are both disposed to give its comments on the hon. gentleman himself. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has adopted the principles of the Patrons, or whether the Patrons have adopted the policy of the hon. gentleman, or whether the Protestant Protective Association have taken up both or either of them, or they have adopted the Protestant Protective Association's. But whether they

have agreed to disagree, or the reverse, the hon. gentleman was sufficiently enamoured of their society to become a condidate for membership of the Patrons of Industry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman give his authority ?

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman deny it ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. I will be prepared later to give my authority.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has made the statement. Let him now produce his authority, or withdraw it.

Mr. HAGGART. I will accept the hon. gentleman's denial at present that he never was an applicant, but he was proposed in a Patron lodge, and refused admission. Fancy the right hon. gentleman from South Oxford sitting in a Patron lodge and striving to reconcile their policy with his, or square his policy with theirs. He then went on to speak of the depreciation in values in this country. But let us compare the losses in this country with the losses on the other side. It is true that there has been a depreciation of securities of all kinds in this country, but it is slight in comparison with the depreciation in the neighbouring country, and other countries of the world. It may be true, as the "Economist" says, that the depreciation in this country in railway investments amounts to £16,000,000, but let me direct attention to the railway losses in the United States. Seventy-six railways, or one-third of the total railway mileage of the United States were placed in the hands of the receiver last year. These aggregated a capital of $1,758,000,000. Twenty-three railways were sold under foreclosure, representing a capital of $79,924,000. I could refer the hon. gentleman to the sister colonies, to England, itself, to Belgium, to France, to Spain, Italy, and a host of other countries to show that the depreciation in Canada has been much less severely felt ; and that I maintain is due to the fiscal policy of this Government. The hon. gentleman is very fond of making comparisons. He said that the expenditure in 1878, under the Mackenzie Government amounted to $24,455,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No ; I did not. I said it was $23,516,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The total expenditure in 1878-79 was $24,455,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Public Accounts he will see that the total expenditure in 1878 was $23,500,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I am speaking of 1878-79.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what I am speaking of. Look at the Public Accounts, you ought to have them under your hand.

Mr. HAGGART. The expenditure of the hon. gentleman in 1878 was in the neighbourhood of $24,000,000. The estimated expenditure for 1895-96 is $36,834,000, or a difference of a little more than $12,000,000. That is the difference in the expenditure between 1878 and 1895. I wish to find out from the hon. gentleman, after I have explained each item of this expenditure, how he is going to economize. The debt charges, interest and sinking fund, amount to $4,660,000, every dollar of which the Opposition are just as much responsible for as the Government. The items which constitute public debt are the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, $44,000,000 or $45,000,000, the amount of indebtedness of the different provinces assumed, the expenditure upon the canals, and the expenditure upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. Did not the hon. gentleman build most of the canals himself ? Did not his party, when in power, consent to the building of the Intercolonial? As to the indebtedness of the different provinces, was it not a compact with them, and was not that agreed to, universally, in this House ? The total amount of that debt hon. gentlemen are responsible for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not ; I voted against it.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman, or any of his friends, rise and criticise the figures of my hon. friend, the Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather think they will.

Mr. HAGGART. Will they criticise the expenditure of $45,000,000 on the Intercolonial ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not the hon. gentleman, and was not his party bound to that expenditure ? Were not the Hon. George Brown and the other leaders, parties to the compact with the provinces under which that road was to be built ? Was not the assumption of the debt of the provinces one of the terms of confederation ? Was not the expenditure upon the canals—a large portion of it made between 1875 and 1878—agreed to by hon. gentlemen opposite ? And does the hon. gentleman object to the expenditure we made for the purpose of obtaining the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very decidedly, I do.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the hon. gentleman, I will venture to say, is the only man of that way of thinking on either side of this House. His party are as proud of that work as we are on this side of the House; and they know that it could not have been made for a less expenditure of money, or of land. The friends of the hon. gentleman tried to get contractors to build it for even more, and could find nobody to accept their terms. Therefore, I say that the debt of the country, which is represented by these four items, these gentlemen are as much responsible for as any member of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in the slightest degree.

Mr. HAGGART. The additions to the debt since 1878-79 increased the expenditure on account of interest and sinking fund by $4,600,000. If the hon. gentleman and his party come into power, must they not pay that amount? Then there are increases in the subsidies to provinces—$800,000, and $30,000 added the other day increased subsidy to Manitoba. These two items, on account of debt and provincial subsidies, hon. gentlemen opposite will certainly have to pay if they get into power. Then there are the increases in the earning departments of Government—Railways, Canals and Post Office. These increases amount to about $4,000,000. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a matter of book-keeping. Take, for instance, the Intercolonial. The total earnings are turned into the treasury of the country, and the total expenditures are covered by the Estimates passed by this House. With this item of $4,000,000, added to the others, we have a total of $9,400,000. The expenditure in 1878 was $24,455,000. Add the increases I have given, and you have the smallest sum which gentlemen opposite, if they were in power, could expend in the administration of public affairs. Let me give the details of these increases in the earnings department. The Post Office expenditure in 1878 was $1,720,000; the receipts were $1,200,000; leaving a deficit of $520,000. The Post Office expenditure in 1894 was $3,517,000; and the receipts, $2,800,000; leaving a deficit of $690,000—not nearly as much, in proportion to the receipts, as in 1878. The expenditure on the Intercolonial in 1878 was $1,816,000; and the receipts were $1,300,000; a deficit of $516,000. In 1894, the expenditure was $2,981,000; earnings, $2,987,000; a surplus of $6,000. Take the details of the further additional expenditure, steamship subsidies, increased from 1878 to 1894 by $147,000; quarantine, increased $18,000; agriculture, increased $165,000. Do hon. gentlemen opposite, if they get into power, intend to do away with our experimental farms? There was nothing of that kind in 1878. Is that one of the items in which they intend to decrease the expenditure? The administration of justice has increased $205,000. Does not the hon. gentleman know that most of the expenditure for judges is fixed by the different provincial governments? They appoint the courts, and they state the number of judges they require; and does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that they can make any reduction in the administration of justice? Then there is an expediture of $258,000 for the government of the North-west Territories, for which the Mackenzie Administration had not to provide in 1878. The adulteration of food is $19,000; steamboat inspection, $12,000; fishery bounty and protection, $280,000. Perhaps the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), when he takes the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries in a new Government, if he does not take the position of Minister of Justice, will be able to wipe out that expenditure altogether. He may do away with the cruiser protection service, he may wipe out the bounties to fishermen in different parts of the maritime provinces and thereby save an expenditure of $280,000. All these items amount altogether to $10,504,000, leaving $1,896,000 to be provided for according to our Estimates of the present year. Now how is this made up? On Indians there is an expenditure of $450,000 more than there was in 1878. Do you intend to reduce the expenditure upon Indians? Do you intend to shut up their schools? Do you intend to make any reduction in the expenditure in that section of the country? I venture to say that the hon. gentlemen, if they ever get into power, will be unable to make any reduction in the expenditure now made for the purpose of civilizing the Indians, making more moral the aboriginal inhabitants of the country whose land and territory we possess. It is a duty we owe to them, and every portion of the Dominion are willing to make a fair expenditure for this purpose. On penitentiaries we estimate $138,000. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen will be able to strike that off. I am speaking on the supposition that they attain to power, but the probability of their doing so is very small. I remember the hon. member for South Oxford addressing a meeting up west when he assured his audience that if the Liberal party got into power he would be the Minister of Finance. I remember the contemptuous manner in which he spoke of his associates, stating that he would be a necessity in a Liberal Government for the purpose of conducting financial affairs, as he was now a necessity in Parliament for the purpose of criticising the lies which the Tory party were hurling from this side of the House. He talked as if he were the only gentleman capable of doing it, and that if he were not elected to the House, there would be no other member of the party capable of criticising the Budget. We have

heard the letter read by the hon. member for Middlesex yesterday, in which we are promised another. We are going to open South Renfrew, they say, and we are going to have Mr. Peter Ryan to run in that constituency. We have the assurance of the organizer of the party, or at least of some of the electors in South Renfrew, that Peter Ryan is to be in the next Government. It appears that Ontario is only going to have three representatives in the Cabinet, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Peter Ryan, and, perhaps, the third one will be the hon. gentleman who looks particularly after superannuations. There is $156,000 in that item, Militia and Defence, $480,000 ; Mounted Police, $166,000, which is the increase above the amount expended in 1878. That is one of the items, I believe, they intend to strike off altogether, do away with the mounted police up in the North-west, and then they will be able to reduce the expenditure by $100,000. Then we have a total of $1,390,000 : add that to the amount above mentioned, and it still leaves a balance of $586,000. That amount is the increase from 1878 to 1894, and the Geological Survey, Immigration, Dominion lands, Dominion Police and Legislation, will take that up. Now, the hon. gentleman says that if they get into power they will make a great reduction in the burdens of the people. The hon. member for South Oxford, I know, does not think so ; I know he does not think that he can reduce the expenditure of this country beyond a small amount. The leader of the Opposition says it can be done, but I do not think he will be able to carry out his promises, if he ever gets a chance. Let me consider for a moment some of the promises of the hon. gentlemen, and the way they are going to reduce the expenditure. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite who may address the House after myself, to give a statement of the particular items in which they intend to decrease the expenditure of this country, and show how they are going to levy the amount of money that will be needed. We remember that there was an interprovincial conference at Quebec some time ago, and I will just analyse some of the demands of that conference. The leader of the Opposition is bound in a sense by that conference, because one of my hon. friends the other day read a letter from Mr. Mercier, then the leader of the Quebec Government, in which he stated, if I am not mistaken—at least the statement has never been denied in this House—that if the leader of the Opposition got into power he would carry out the pledge made by Mr. Mercier during the election, and give increased subsidies to the provinces. The result of fulfilling that promise will be to increase the subsidies to the different provinces to the extent of $1,721,476. If these hon. gentlemen get into power that will be an additional annual charge upon the expenditure of this country. Carrying out that pledge, how is it possible for them to reduce the expenditure ? If they do not intend to carry it out, let them stand up and say so. The people of the country demand that the Opposition should say whether they intend to carry out the resolutions passed by the Quebec conference, and approved by the leader of the Opposition, in case they get into power. Let us see what is stated by Mr. Peters, the friend of the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies). He states openly in a speech down there that the hon. member for Queen's is Mr. Laurier's right-hand man, and if the Liberal party get into power, the hon. member for Queen's will have an influence with the Government such as no other man will have. He says there will be no direct taxation required from the people of the island, if Mr. Laurier gets into power ; in other words, he expects that the demands made by the Quebec conference will be acceded to if the Opposition get into power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's colleague in the Senate proved last year that there was a matter of $2,000,000 due from the Dominion to the island, and the hon. gentleman took him into the Government after he advanced that argument and satisfied him it was right.

Mr. HAGGART. How appropriate it is to the argument to state that a colleague of mine in the other House had proved that $2,000,000 were due by the Dominion to Prince Edward Island. What has that to do with the statement I made that his friend and supporter in the island, Mr. Peters, relies upon the success of his party to get better terms for Prince Edward Island, on the plea that the island has been neglected, that they are entitled to more, and that if the hon. member for Queen's gets into power they will have more public works, the resolutions of the Quebec conference will receive an endorsation from the Government, and Prince Edward Island will receive $70,000 more than it does at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) About one-fourth of what you lost on the Montreal bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman will not say that if he and his friends get into power he would not give $70,000 annually to Prince Edward Island. I will tell the hon. gentlman this, that his friends in Ontario could not support a policy of that kind ; they dare not support any Government in power which would milk the Dominion to the extent of $1,770,000 more, and if the Liberals had a majority of two-thirds of the Ontario members, the Government dare not support such a policy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then you do not intend to give us that ?

Mr. HAGGART. So, for the purpose of my argument, there is this amount to be added to the expenditure of 1878, and also different sums to carry out the promises made by the leader of the Opposition in regard to public works. Hon. gentlemen opposite criticise the Government for our lavish expenditure, not lavish expenditure, in their opinion, but corrupt and criminal expenditure. But hon. gentlemen opposite have stated publicly that in regard to the North-west, Manitoba and British Columbia, the present expenditure is not sufficient, and it would be increased if they got into power. At Medicine Hat, Mr. Laurier said :

I am not a puritan or a saint, but simply a man, and I do not hesitate to say to you that in the west you need public works.

Mr. Gibson at Medicine Hat, said :

In the North-west the requirements are many. Your constituency has not got all it should have. You need a bridge.

Mr. GIBSON. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. What I said on that particular occasion was that money enough had been spent on the Tay Canal, and money enough had been stolen in connection with the Curran Bridge to give them the rails required.

Mr. HAGGART. I am quoting from the hon. gentleman's speech at Medicine Hat. That was his statement at Revelstoke.

Mr. GIBSON. I never made a speech at Medicine Hat.

Mr. HAGGART. At Vancouver, on September, 13th, 1894, that hon. gentleman said :

He would say that the Liberal party was just as much in favour of legitimate public works as the Conservatives were. Any one sailing from Vancouver to Victoria could see where public money might be spent in improving the approach to the Terminal City's magnificent harbour.

Perhaps he did not say that.

Mr. GIBSON. My reason for saying so was that on the passage from Vancouver to Victoria we found that through the negligence of the Dominion Government in not erecting proper lighthouses on the route, a large steamer of 1,200 tons was lying on the rocks.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Laurier, in his speech at Vancouver, said :

I agree with my friend Mr. Gibson, that perhaps there is something to do for this city yet. Perhaps it would be well to encourage and assist the energy of the people, and that the harbour of Vancouver might be improved with some public money. I can only reiterate what has been said by Mr. Gibson : That when we have a Liberal Administration at Ottawa, it will be the duty, it will be the pleasure of that Adminstration to favour any public work that is for the credit and benefit of the Canadian people, and it would certainly be for the benefit of Vancouver, and for the whole of Canada, that the harbour of this fair city should be made as accessible as it is possible to make it.

Mr. Laurier at New Westminster said :

Great works are required up on the Fraser River.

Mr. Laurier, at Winnipeg, on September 6th, 1894, ("Globe" report) said :

Mr. Laurier, in reply to a question from Mr. James, a prominent Patron of Industry, stated that because of the insufficiency of information in his possession, he had formed no opinion as to the feasibility of the Hudson Bay route, but he would favour the voting of considerable money in favour of a thorough investigation.

Hon. gentlemen oppoiste, as appears from their public utterances in the North-west, Manitoba and British Columbia, have promised considerable additions to the expenditure for public works, and also an expenditure for Prince Edward Island of $1,771,000 ; and yet, notwithstanding the statement I have made, and the comparison I have instituted, showing the uncontrollable expenditure, hon. members opposite declare they would reduce the expenditure to the extent of $5,000,000 per annum, the hon. member for Oxford puts the amount at $2,000,000, and other members at $1,000,000. I should like to hear an explanation from some hon. gentleman opposite, and I suppose it will be made by the hon. gentleman who will follow me, how, when to the expenditure of 1878 there is added $1,771,000, even omitting altogether the promises of additional public works made by the leader of the Opposition in different sections of the country, to show how hon. gentlemen opposite could submit a less expenditure than that asked by the Minister of Finance. I defy such a reduction to be made, and I do not believe a statement could be submitted to show it, one that would stand the test of investigation by financial men, as it would be criticised from one end of the country to the other. The expenditure of the country, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated, is but slightly controllable—it is almost beyond the control of the Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is quite beyond his control, I think.

Mr. HAGGART. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, in addressing the people continually state that the present enormous expenditure is due to the Conservative Government. I affirm that as regards the public debt, every man is responsible for it, and if hon. gentlemen opposite were in power to-morrow, they could not bring down an estimate of a less amount than the one submitted a few days ago. Let me now discuss for a few moments the policy of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as enunciated in his amendment. It is proposed to establish a system of taxation on the principle of a tariff for revenue only. I accept the definition given by the hon. member for

Queen's (Mr. Davies), who declared that there were three systems of taxation, one is free trade, another tariff for revenue only, and another a protective system. I am quoting from memory from the statement that the hon. member made, and if I am not right I shall be glad to be corrected. Free trade, he stated, was unattainable at present. There was, he said, no country in the world which had a system of pure free trade. The system which they had in England, he added, was a tariff for revenue purposes. But the goal of the hon. gentleman was to adopt a system similar to what they have now in England and to impose the incidents of taxation upon the people of this country. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they dare not state from one section of the country to the other that they intended to raise taxes in Canada the same as they do in England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know that the hon. gentleman tends to impute to me that I said: I intended to raise the taxes as they do in England.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made no such statement.

Mr. HAGGART. I am taking the natural sequence of the amendment of the hon. gentleman in which he states that they intend to raise the taxes for revenue only, and the logical sequence of the statement of the hon. gentleman is, that that would be done by a system of taxation similar to that of England. I am not imputing any statement to the hon. gentleman, but I am drawing the deductions myself. Now let us see what is meant by "taxation the same as they have in England. Mr Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the system of taxation they have in England. The customs taxation in England is raised on nine articles only, namely, tobacco, £9,948,809; tea, £3,418,162; rum, £2,335,147; brandy, £1,423,826; spirits, £668,921; wine, £1,921,052; currants, £113,994; coffee, £177,206; and raisins, £175,957; the whole customs taxes of England is levied on these articles. Do hon. gentlemen opposite propose that the customs taxation in this country will be raised on similar articles? No, Sir; the people of this country would not submit to anything of that kind. It is but to be mentioned and understood in Canada that such is the policy, and the people will have none of it. In England the incidents of taxation do not fall on the rich as ought be the case and bear lightly upon the poor. Does not the poor man in this country use as much tobacco as the rich man? Does not the poor man in this country use as much tea as the rich man, although it may be of an inferior quality? Does not he use as much rum as the rich man? Perhaps he does not use as much brandy, perhaps more spirits, less wine, perhaps as much coffee and probably less raisins. The incidents of taxation upon the people of the country as it is known to be in England is a specific tax, or a tax per capita upon the people. In England the poor man pays the same as the rich man does under their system of levying the customs taxes. Do hon. gentlemen opposite intend to levy the custom taxes in Canada in a manner similar to what they are levied in England? I tell them that they dare not do any such thing. It may be asked why they levy the taxes in this manner in England, it must be remembered but then they correct it in another way. They correct it by the following taxes which are levied entirely upon the rich; the Probate Duty, the Legacy Duty, the Estate Duty, the Succession tax, the Deeds, the Receipts, the Bills of Exchange, the Patent Medicines (which perhaps do not fall so much on the rich) the licenses, the Companies Capital Duty, the Marine Insurance, other stamps. And then as other taxation, the Land tax, the House tax, the Income tax, which the poor man does not pay at all, and the Post Office tax which he, perhaps, pays less of than the rich man. They correct the levying of the taxation in England by a special impost upon the rich men of the country, but the customs tax is largely paid by the poor. In England there is a specific tax, or a per capita tax, and the people of Canada have only to understand the system and no Government in this country dare put on a tax such as that, nor dare they supplement it by a direct tax, such as the hon. gentlemen opposite propose to-day. Therefore, I state that if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite means a system of taxation such as they have in this country, the people of Canada will not submit to it. The policy of the Canadian people has been declared again and again in favour of incidental protection to the manufactures of the country. It is the policy of the American continent. Last session, or the session before, when the Democratic party got into power in the United States hon. gentlemen opposite were constantly vaunting "Oh, protection is gone for ever, we are going to have continental free trade for ever, and if we get into power in Canada we shall have a system of free trade, levy the taxes directly, and have reciprocal arrangements with the different countries of America. A more absurd statement was never made to an intelligent audience. If we were to have free trade in Canada, and allow the products of other countries of the world to enter free, what compensation would the people of the United States, or of any other country have for allowing our products to go into their country free. Such a proposition has only to be stated and understood to be laughed at by every intelligent people. Every one knows the great success of the Republican party of the Uni-

ted States at the last election, when the Democrats were swept out of office by a cyclone such as never struck any political party in the world. The people of the United States have declared in favour of a protective system, and a protective system must be the policy of this country for a number of years to come.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Four hundred years.

Mr. HAGGART. For a number of years to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not now a word of grief over their departed ones, unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union and continental free trade. The dear one which they have now taken to their bosom is a system similar to what it is in England, but I venture to say that the Liberal party themselves will see how ridiculous is their position in this respect, and that when they go before the country they will be hedging on the meaning of the word in the resolution. They will, no doubt, be telling to the manufacturers of this country that a tariff for revenue purposes means, perhaps, incidental protection to manufacturers, but they will not tell the true meaning of the word, and before long they will leave their policy of free trade, or the policy such as they have in England, in the cemetery with unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. The hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) chaffed the Minister of Finance that he had not said a word about the National Policy. Well, the policy of this party has been defined by the resolutions of 1878, and is still stuck to, and approved of by the people of this country. That policy is to protect many manufactures which may be peculiar to the country, which may be produced in this country by a system of protection as cheaply as they can be imported from any other country, although in the meantime in order to obtain that, the impost upon the people may be in excess of what they could get it for from other countries. There is the promise to the people of this country that we will protect our manufactures, and the promise of the manufactures is: we will give, after a time, the protected manufactures to the people at as cheap a price as they can be imported from any other country. Now, how have they carried out their promise? The four or five principal articles manufactured in Canada are woollen goods, cotton goods, leather goods, manufactures of agricultural implements, and the different industries of which iron is the component part.

Mr. LISTER. Seventeen of them were ruined under your policy.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) will have an opportunity of replying afterwards. What I state is, and I state it boldly, that for the same quality of woollen goods, the people of Canada receive for their money as fair value as they do in any other part of the world. Am I correct in that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Do they not get it cheaper than the people of the United States?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I have heard the same statement made with reference to woollen and cotton goods. The test of the cheapness of cotton goods in the country is the ability to export them and put them into successful competition in a foreign market with similar goods from free trade countries. Is not that the test that they are being manufactured in the country as cheaply as they could be imported into the country?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you want of the tax, then?

Mr. HAGGART. I will explain afterwards what we want of the tax. Let me get through with my argument, and I will tell you. I will admit openly that perhaps you may have to pay a little more for cotton goods. In regard to leather goods, I have the authority of the hon. gentleman himself, in a speech which he delivered in Quebec, for stating that Canadian manufacturers make boots and shoes as cheaply as they are made in any other country in the world. Are we not exporting those goods and selling them in free trade England? Are we not manufacturing the leather in this country and selling it in the old country? Do we not send agricultural implements to Australia, New Zealand, and all other countries in the world, and sell them more cheaply than any other country? Do we not buy sugar in this country as cheaply as it can be bought in any other country? and it is all manufactured in the country There is one industry, the product of which I will admit at present costs more here than in other countries, that is, the iron industry. At present there is a bounty on iron, and we also impose a duty on iron coming into the country; but we say to the people of Canada: You are at present paying a little more for your iron goods; but the time will come, and come shortly, when we shall be able to furnish you with iron goods manufactured in this country as cheaply as they are imported into the country. Let me, by way of example, show how the protective duty on iron has operated in the United States. In that country there is a customs duty of from $5 to $20 per ton on different kinds of iron and steel goods imported into the country. The hon. gentleman's argument is that that duty is added to the price at which the consumer could obtain the goods from outside countries, because the manufacturers in the country just keep the price up to the point at which the goods could be brought in

plus the duty. But what has been the case in the United States? Notwithstanding the high duty imposed upon pig iron coming into the country, the people of the United States have pig iron furnished to them from Alabama and Georgia cheaper than it can be bought in any other country in the world. It is sold in Alabama and Georgia for a little more than $6 a ton, while the customs duty is about $5 a ton. Some of the manufacturers in the city of Toronto are able, notwithstanding our duty, to purchase pig iron in the Southern States and pay the duty and bring it to Toronto, in competition with English iron and iron from other countries. Not only that, but the Americans are sending pig iron from Alabama and Georgia to enter into competition with the product of the cheapest iron manufactories in the world. They are sending it to Antwerp and London, where it is being sold in competition with German, Belgian and English pig iron. What does the "Iron Age," a paper published in London, state in reference to this matter? Owing to the competition of Germany and Belgium in the manufacture of pig iron, the iron manufacturers of free trade England have formed a combine, under which a certain percentage of the price obtained for every rail that is sold in England or in any other part of the world is paid to the German and Belgian manufacturers; and now the "Iron Age" states that they will be obliged to take another nation into the combine, because the people of the United States are sending their pig iron over to England to enter into competition with the English product. What the advocates of the National Policy in this country say to the people of Canada is this: Protect our industries for a short time; it is true you will perhaps pay a little more for the article manufactured in the country; but the result will be that after a while you will get your iron here as cheap as you can any where else, because we have the coal or the natural gas with which to manufacture iron in the country; we have abundance of iron ore, and we have the authority of two of the most illustrious of our friends in the Liberal party in favour of protecting the iron industry of Canada; we have the leader of the Liberals in the province of Ontario bonusing an institution for the manufacture of iron in the city of Hamilton; we promise, as in the case of woollen, leather and cotton goods, agricultural implements, and other great industries of the country, that a judicious system of protection will, in a few years, result in the establishment of iron manufactories, by which the skilled labour and the capital will be retained in the country, and the product will be sold to the consumer at as a low a price as he can import it at from any other country. What is the reason, then, the hon. gentleman asks, why you put imposts upon cotton and woollen goods brought into the country? The reason is this. In a small country like this the duty does not prevent foreign goods coming in. A diversity of industries of innumerable kinds is required to enable manufacturers to manufacture goods as cheaply as they could be imported from the country which has the largest market and the largest manufactories, and it is not necessary that foreign goods should be entirely prevented from coming in. The policy of this Government is that the protection granted should be placed at such a point as not to prevent all articles of the kind protected from coming into the country—why? For this simple reason, that the protection is a stimulus to cheap production. It improves the design; it increases the skill of the worker; it results in better machinery being used; and there is a certain amount of competition with foreign goods. Moreover, we are enabled by the import duties to levy a certain amount of money for the purpose of carrying on the Government of the country. What would be the result, then, if the hon. gentlemen got into power? If, as they say, they will never rest content until they sweep away every vestige of protection in this country, such a catastrophe will happen to this country as might never happen to any country in the world. The whole manufacturing class would be swept away at one blow. We would be left a purely agricultural country, and the history shows beyond cavil that a country without diversified industries is necessarily a poor one. They dare not do it, even should they get into power. If they should do it, their own following would receive such a correction from the electorate, from one end of the country to the other, that they would not remain in office a week. Is it possible that they would be so insane, if they should get into power, as to attempt to carry out the pledge they have made by a solemn resolution? We have heard the promises they have made with reference to commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, and we know how quickly they changed front on these and other questions, so that we are justified in concluding that they will again be equal to the occasion. But God help this country if such a catastrophe should ever happen us as the sweeping away of every vestige of protection. With the same blow all the capital invested in manufacturing would be swept out of existence. Perhaps I have dwelt too long upon this question and wearied the House. The question is after all one which will be decided at the polls. There the fiscal question will be the main issue. There may be endeavours in one section of the country and another to raise the religious cry, but the people are too intelligent to be thus deceived. The only live issue before them is the fiscal question, and I venture to say when that is put fairly before the pople, they will support the pol-

icy which has been enunciated by the Finance Minister of this Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I shall not attempt to follow the example of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and delay the House with a personal history of that gentleman. He was kind enough to give us part of the life history of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as a lawyer and a banker, and a Finance Minister, and financial critic, but I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in that line, and for one very good reason. I do not know his early history, nor do I suppose that it is of very great consequence to us in this debate. I, therefore, cannot dwell upon personal matters, but shall pass on to notice just a few of the points on which the hon. gentleman touched. I was glad to hear him affirm again that the policy of the Government was the same old policy that it adopted some sixteen years ago—that they are standing by it yet. I do not think that the hon. Minister of Finance went to that length. His faith in the policy was somewhat shaken last year and the year before, and he sought to deviate from it; but not being able to find any resting place, he has settled back on the old platform. Our policy, as embodied in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, has been described as a new policy—the policy of tariff for revenue. Now, I may tell the hon. gentleman who has thus described it, that his memory is surely a very short and unreliable one. Sixteen years should not have entirely obliterated from his mind the policy that was in vogue in this country prior to that when ye had a tariff for revenue. That policy was in vogue when confederation was formed, it was continued for six years under a Conservative Government, and for another five years under a Reform Administration. Surely, the hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that, and surely he must remember that that is the policy which he and his friends are so fond of contrasting in its effects with their own policy. Sir, it was held by the Reform party at that time, as it is to-day, that to depart from the principles which then guided us in fiscal matters, and to adopt a protective policy, would be a mistake. That opinion the Liberal party has never changed; and from that time down to the present, the issue has been clear and distinct between the party in power advocating a protective tariff and the Reform party advocating a tariff for revenue only. I think the people understand this. The hon. member for South Oxford has indicated clearly that the policy of the Liberal party is to enact a tariff, not on protective principles, but for the purpose of securing the revenue necessary; and to do this it is not necessary, as he has said, to levy the same duties upon the same articles and in the same way as is done in England. Then the hon. gentleman gave us an illustration of the development of the country under the National Policy, especially with reference to manufactures, and he took his figures from the census returns. Sir, it was bold of him—and I can only account for his doing it by the fact that he had the statement prepared and did not like to waste material—to venture any statement in that direction as proof of the satisfactory working of this policy, after the exhibition that was made of those figures by the hon. member for South Oxford this afternoon. However, he ventured to do so, and claimed that we should accept his statements as reliable. I need not enlarge upon this. We may safely leave the analysis that was made of these figures by the hon. member for South Oxford this afternoon, go to the country in connection with the utterances of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and allow the people to decide between them. The hon. gentleman is very anxious that we should point out what economy we would be disposed to effect if we should come into power. I do not know that we are called upon to do that at present. Let that hon. gentleman possess his soul in patience. Notwithstanding the cowardice of the Ministry, as shown in their determination to go to the country, and then wavering in their resolution—and then determining and then wavering again—it will be out of their power to delay an appeal to the electorate longer than another year, and then, when the Liberal party are elected to office, he will have practical evidence of the economies which they will be able to put in practice. Meanwhile, if it will do the hon. gentleman any good, I shall mention one or two possible ways in which economy would not be out of place. For instance, there could, as we have often pointed out, be effected a saving of several thousand dollars a year by wiping out the Franchise Act, which is worse than useless. Then, it might not be impossible to maintain an equilibrium between the revenue and expenditure on the Tay Canal. And while it is not possible to build bridges for nothing, still it might be possible, in the construction of a $200,000 bridge, not to spend $400,000. And so with reference to the Fredericton bridge and other outlays in all parts of the country, it might be possible, consistent with efficiently carrying on the public works of the country to save a considerable sum. He reverted several times to a personal attack upon my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and alluded to a statement which he said that hon. gentleman had made, that when we came back to power he would be necessary as the financial critic, as he would understand that department best, and then he would be necessary as Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And I did not say so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I think the hon. gentleman did not make these statements.

If he was speculating as to the future at all, I think he would speculate, not upon coming back in the position of financial critic, but, judging by the signs of the times, he might fairly indulge in the expectation he would ere long be administering the affairs of the country and administering them in such a way that a strong financial critic would be required to find fault. Then, the hon. gentleman thought he had made a point in mentioning that when my leader, accompanied by some of his supporters in the House, were on a trip in the North-west Territories and British Columbia, speaking in different constituencies where they had found public improvements needed, they stated that where these improvements were necessary in the public interest, they were ready, at all times, to support the expenditure for the improvements. Why, Sir, no one takes exception to that. No different policy would be pursued by the Liberal party if they were in power. Does any one suppose that needed public works would be neglected by them? It is not against public works, necessary in the public interest, that the criticisms of the Opposition have been directed; their criticisms have been that the public moneys have been squandered upon experiments, and upon objects not demanded in the public interest. But, Sir, I need not dwell longer upon the points made by the hon. gentleman save as I may allude to them as I enter for a few moments upon a criticism of the Finance Minister's speech, delivered to this House in what he termed "the exposition of the Budget." Sir, I am free to say that the statement of the Finance Minister was, in some respects, very ingeniously prepared. The hon. gentleman quoted many figures. But, instead of giving to the country a correct estimate of the position in which we stand, the effect of those figures would be, if they were accepted, to mislead the country as to the progress we have made, and as to the position we are now in. Before dealing with that, I would say that I am sorry that the Finance Minister himself was not able on the day he made that statement to tell us what the full amount of the liabilities of this country would be, but that to-day he had to rise in his place and give a supplementary list of those liabilities. And here I would say, as a member of a popular branch of the legislature, as a member of the people's House, I feel that under the arrangement of the present Government, and as that arrangement has worked out, the people's House is not treated with the respect, and is not allowed the position of dignity that the members of this House have a right to demand. Sir, I am not taking exception to the Prime Minister being in the Upper House. I recognize that within that House are many gentlemen of note and many gentlemen of great power. But, Sir, I say that it is not right, because the Prime Minister has found his seat in that House, that, important as that House may be, information that is asked for by the people's representatives on the floor of the people's House must be gathered from reading extracts from the speech of the Prime Minister delivered in another chamber—information refused to the people's representatives from the mouth of the gentleman, who is supposed to lead this House. Let the other Chamber enjoy the dignity conferred upon it by the presence of the First Minister. But, in this House we have a leader appointed by the First Minister. Let that leader be sufficiently taken into the confidence of the Prime Minister as to be able to give us information of primary importance on those subjects upon which we have a right to be informed. One or two things has been made apparent by the answers given in this House. Either the leader here has not been taken into the confidence of the Prime Minister, or the gentleman entrusted with leadership in this House has not been frank and straightforward in the statements he has made to this House. Neither of these do I wish to attribute to the Government of the day. But we are forced to one conclusion or the other by more than one scene we have witnessed in this House. Take the case of the Hudson Bay Railway. The leader of the Opposition in this House asked for information with reference to that. The leader of the House did not know the terms of the Order in Council—so I think he informed us—but promised us the information would be laid upon the Table before he made his financial statement. The papers relating to the matter were laid upon the Table just as the hon. gentleman rose to make his Budget speech. But we learn upon reading the utterances of the First Minister that the members of the other Chamber have the privilege of being told by the Prime Minister what has been done in reference to this matter. Sir, if the importance of that House was recognized, as it should be, if that House was given the dignity it ought to have, then, certainly, the vacancies that exist, as evidenced by the answers given by the hon. Minister the other day, should have been filled long ere this. The House in which the First Minister sits, in which the information was given, that is withheld by the leader in this House from the peoples' representative, ten vacancies allowed to exist there, one of them for four and a half years, another for four years, another for three years, and so on. Sir, what will the people understand of the nature of the duties of the members of that House? Will they not argue, if that House can for years go on with ten of its seats vacant, may it not go on for the years that are to come in the same way? Then, Sir, what do we find? The Minister making his statement in that Chamber, the Minister here hesitating to say anything, the Minister who has

just taken his seat saying that we would in time find out something about the Hudson Bay Railway. That is the information given. And what is the promoter of that railway doing at the present time? Why, Sir, when interviewed by newspaper correspondents, he speaks of the Order in Council as giving him the authority of the Government for building that road, in aid of which he is to have $2,500,000. He seems to take it for granted that the Order in Council will be ratified by what he seems to consider a servile majority in this House, treats it as a matter beyond doubt that the Ministerial majority in this House must ratify that Order in Council, judging them, I suppose, by the course in the past. Sir, that matter will yet have to be considered by them, and the country will wait to see what may be the action, and whether his opinion of them thus expressed, is a correct one or not. Meanwhile, I would say to the leader in this House in reference to this matter, not posted, afraid to make a statement, withholding it, from what cause I know not—I would suggest to him, that as the matter stands, it would be well for him to have a clerk make a statement in writing in reference to the matter and read that to the House, and if it did not turn out right, then he could say it was prepared for him by the clerk. Now, Sir, I come to consider the position that was taken by the Minister of Finance with reference to the present condition of the country as illustrated by a series of comparisons he instituted. He was pleased to take a table of 1874-79, and compare it with a table of 1889-94, in order to show what vast increase there had been in the volume of trade between these periods as an outcome of the beneficial results flowing in the adoption of the National Policy. Sir, he chose that period from 1874 to 1879, when, as he admits himself, there was a period of unusual distress prevailing all over the world, a period, as he himself declares, such as no other period since has approached; and he compares that period with the last five years. Sir, it struck me, so often were his comparisons made with the years 1889 to 1894, that it was possible the Minister of Finance was seeking to glorify himself during the period in which he himself had the honour of holding the portfolio, glorifying himself by the reduction of taxation. I have only to point out to him that whatever glory is due to him on that score, he effectually dispelled when, this year, in the presence of deficits such as were never known under a former administration, he was forced to restore the taxation, and again impose the burdens upon the people. But in dealing with the volume of trade as between these periods, let me take it on another basis. Let us look at the volume of trade in 1894, and again in 1874, and let us see what progress we have made during that time, five years of which were under a Reform Administration, and fifteen under the National Policy as operated by hon. gentlemen opposite. It seems to me that much as we rejoice in any development, much as we rejoice in any progress, the development and the progress in that direction are not such as we can congratulate ourselves very heartily upon. I would that it were greater, and I hail with joy any manifestation of increased prosperity. But when we compare it with what it ought to be, we will find that instead of the prosperity that we might fairly expect, instead of trade blooming under their National Policy, it has been instead blighted. Why, Sir, take the total imports and exports. In his two statements he spoke about the imports falling from 1874 to 1879, the exports rising in 1889-94, and the imports rising in the same period. Let us take them together. In 1894 the total volume of trade was $240,999,889. In 1874, 20 years before that, it was $217,565,510. In 20 years, 15 under the National Policy, the total volume of our trade has only increased $23,434,379; it has increased only 11 per cent, whilst our population in the same time has increased 31 per cent. Our foreign trade per head in 1874 was $56.88, while under their National Policy in 1894 it had fallen to $48 per head. There is $8.88 per head less trade in the Dominion of Canada in 1894, than there was 20 years ago in 1874. What does that mean? It means a decrease in our trade in proportion to the population of $44,590,706; or in other words, our trade should have increased, if it had kept pace with the increase in our population, as it should have done, by $68,025,085, while the actual increase was only $23,434,270. But, Sir, the Minister may reply to me: You have taken the year 1894, and this was a year in which there was a restriction in trade, in which there was a depression. Well, we will take the year 1893, the year of the largest volume of trade that this country has had under the National Policy, when it was seven millions more than it was in 1894; and we have only an increase of thirty millions in our trade in 1893, over what it was in 1874; while we should have had, in proportion to the population as given to us in the Year-Book, an increase of $68,000,000. But I go further and I ask the Minister of Finance: Who is responsible that there is not a larger population in this country, if it be not the Government of the day? Sir, they promised they would keep the population in this country by their National Policy; they said by their statistics that they had brought in, in addition to the natural increase of the country, 800,000 immigrants in 10 years to swell our numbers. Now, who is responsible that we have not a greater population, a relatively greater number, if it be not the Government that sit opposite administering our affairs? If we take just the natural increase and make no account of the immigrants that have been brought into this country, according to their showing we should have had in Canada today 5,355,427 souls; and, Sir, if we had

them then we should have had a larger trade in 1894 than we actually had, by over sixty-three million dollars, or if you take the year 1893, their largest year, we should have had a larger trade by fifty-six millions. Sir, I think that the boast of the Finance Minister regarding the increased volume of our trade is not one that can very forcibly strike us, but is one which we as Canadians, while rejoicing that there has been any development at all, must admit is a development which has been very much restricted, hampered and lessened under the policy which has been pursued. But the hon. gentleman was pleased to compliment himself in more directions than one. He came down to specific points, and he declared that as regards our export trade we had reason to be proud of the result. He instanced that our exports to Great Britain had increased, and to France an increase of 100 per cent. The hon. gentleman continued:

> There is an increase in trade with Germany from three-quarters of a million to two millions; there was also an increase of trade with Spain, Italy, Belgium, Newfoundland, the West Indies, South America, China and Japan, Australasia and other countries; and the only decrease in our exports last year was to the United States, a large decrease, and to Portugal, and a very slight decrease with our trade with Holland. I say that hon. members may look over the history of our trade returns and they cannot find in any previous year a state of things showing such a universal and widely extended increase in our exports to the different countries with which we trade as is found in the statement I made of our trade last year.

That was a comparison made one year with another, comparing 1894 with 1893. Let us go back in the history of this country 20 years, and compare the state of trade then. Our trade increased, the hon. gentleman said, $4,500,000 in our exports to Great Britain between 1894 and 1893, and that is true. To France the increase was 100 per cent; but the hon. gentleman did not tell the leader of the Opposition, when asked the question, what the volume of the trade was, but he said it was not much. But taking our imports and exports our trade with France was less during last year than it was 20 years ago. I may mention another fact, that in 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, when everything, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, was in a ruinous condition, we exported to France 50 per cent more than in 1893. Our exports to Spain, another country mentioned, were 11 per cent more in 1877 than in 1894; to Italy, another country to which the hon. gentleman referred, the exports were 40 per cent more in 1878 than in 1894; to Newfoundland we exported in 1873 within $18,000 of the amount exported in 1894, while our trade was nearly $1,000,000 more in that year than in 1894; to the West Indies, which was also mentioned, we exported in 1877 10 per cent more than in 1894; to Australasia, which hon. gentlemen opposite have been cultivating and of which they have been boasting so much, we exported in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, that year which is pictured by hon. gentlemen as a year of desolation and ruin, 15 per cent more in 1878 than in 1894; while to the United States our exports show a decrease to the amount of $8,000,000. So the hon. gentleman's boast of the extent of our export trade and his comparison of the years of the Mackenzie Administration with years of Administration by the present Government shows that our trade with those very countries in which he had gloried and regarding of the trade he had boasted was actually less than at the previous periods to which I have referred. Then the hon. gentleman spoke of our debt. Who is responsible for it? That question has been discussed, it has been threshed out, it has been dealt with so ably by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I shall not occupy the time of the House at this hour of the evening in dwelling on it. The hon. gentleman recognized the fact that it is $100,000,000 more now than it was when the Reform Administration left office. He knows whether the promises made with respect to the redemption or reduction of the debt through means they were to employ has been brought about or not. The debt is there, and interest has to be paid on it. But the hon. gentleman has attempted to minimize the burden by pointing to the fact that the rate of interest on which he was able to secure a loan on the English market was lower than on certain previous occasions. I rejoice with him, and I wish not to withhold an iota of the meed of praise due to him for what he has been able to accomplish in that direction, for no one can say anything regarding the credit of Canada standing high without pleasing me, and all credit due him I will give him in this matter; but when the hon. gentleman speaks about the burdens of the people being lessened, notwithstanding the increase of the debt, because the rate of interest has decreased under the loan effected, it requires a little examination to ascertain just where we stand and to find whether the burdens of the people have actually been lowered as a matter of fact or not. What did the hon. gentleman tell us himself? He said that in 1878 the rate of interest was $1.58, in 1894, $1.79. That is the amount of net interest per head of the population. We find, then, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, that 21 cents more of net interest is paid now than was paid previously; that increase of 21 cents per head, taking the Minister's own figures means an increase of one million dollars per annum to the burdens of the people. What more? While the rate of interest has increased under this Government 13 per cent, the interest on loans and mortgages effected by private individuals has fallen 25 per cent.

And why? It was because money seeking investment was plentiful and the rate of interest was reduced here as well as in England. While money was down the hon. gentleman was able to affect a loan on favourable terms, and he now ignores the fact—while I do not wish to minimize the amount of credit due to him—that it was not wholly the high standing of Canada in the money market that had to do with the reduced rate of interest, but also the fact that money was at that time cheaper in the markets of the world. But what about the burdens which have been imposed upon the people? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out the way in which that question would have to be determined. He said that it was not settled with bullion. He pointed out how this interest money is paid and in what it is paid. And taking the question in that way, what do we find? This burden has to be paid out of the wheat and other products, while wheat is one-half the price that prevailed in 1878. It takes two bushels now to pay that which one bushel would have paid before. The Minister of Finance has overlooked the fact that it would have taken three times as many bushels of wheat in 1894 to pay off the net debt as would have been required to pay off the net debt in 1878, and the debt of the country and the burdens on the people have to be measured by that standard, and not by the standard the Minister of Finance set up. Then, Sir, again we find the hon. gentleman taking credit to himself for reducing the rate of taxation on the people, and he congratulated himself on the fact that if he had not reduced taxation somewhat he would not have had a deficit, and he went on to make certain calculations, and dwelt largely in "ifs." I might suggest to the hon. gentleman that when he was dealing in "ifs" he might have said that if he had imposed twice the duty on sugar he could have taken off half of it, and he would then have had no deficit. But, Sir, we have to deal with facts as they are. Let us see what has been done in the direction of reducing the debt and the rate of taxation on the people. I will take, as a comparison, the period from 1874 to 1878 and 1890 to 1894, five years of the present Administration, and five years of Reform Administration. Well, Sir, if any one will take the trouble to look at the total of the per capita customs duty paid as found in the Trade Returns, he will see that during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration the average duty paid per head, from 1874 to 1878, was $3.44, and if he looks at the other period, from 1890 to 1894, under the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, he will find that it was $4.44 per capita. That is, that there was an increase of duty from 1889-90 over 1874-75 of $1 per head. And if you estimate the population at 4,000,000 only, that was $4,000,000 more per year that he took during the years that his taxation was reduced than was taken under the Reform Administration. When he speaks of that, I should like to point him to the fact that if $5 per head had been taken by Sir Richard Cartwright when he was Finance Minister—as the hon. gentleman himself says was the rate of taxation by his party in 1888 and 1889—then Sir Richard Cartwright, instead of having a deficit, would have had a surplus of millions upon millions of dollars. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) claims that under the reduction of taxation that they made, if they had maintained the same rate of taxation, they would have had during these years $125,000,000 of revenue, while as it was they had $107,900,000, the result being that they left in the pockets of the people $17,100,000. But if the rate of $5 per head had been levied during the five years of the Reform Administration, estimating the population at only 4,000,000, there would have been $31,000,000 more revenue, or $14,000,000 would have been left in the pockets of the people than the present Finance Minister claims to have left them by his reduction of taxation. But, Sir, while that is true in that degree only with reference to his reduction during the year it was off, what was the effect of the taxation that was upon the people of Canada during the other years of the National Policy from 1879 to 1889. The average per capita during that period was $4.40, or 96 cents per head per annum more than was taken by the Reform Administration, which, estimating the population of not more than 4,000,000, means that during these 11 years $3,840,000 extra in excess of taxation was taken from the people of the country; or if you estimate the population at 4½ millions, then $4,320,000 per year excessive taxation was taken from them during these eleven years, or a total of $47,520,000. So that when the hon. gentleman (Mr Foster) boasts of the reduction of taxation, and talks about throwing off his $4,000,000 on sugar duties and relieving the people of the country, what has that to do with the determination of the burden of taxation that is upon the people? Sir, taking his whole tariff together, with the reductions that he is claiming, and giving him all the benefit for that, we find that the taxation that he has wrung from the people of the country, even under his reduced taxation, was millions more than it was under the Reform Administration; and we find that during the eleven years that no reduction in sugar was made at all, he took nearly $50,000,000 of extra taxation from the people over and above what was requisite to carry on his affairs in such a manner as to conduct them in the best interests of the country. But now with a deficit of about one and a quarter millions for last year, and a deficit of four and a

half millions admitted by himself for this year, he has had, in order to guard against another deficit, to add to the already too heavy burdens of the people one and a half millions dollars more taxation. Sir, I am willing that the hon. gentleman should take to himself all the glory of the years that he has presided over the Finance Department which he is fairly entitled to; but to a gentleman who criticised so severely and so often the condition of things under the regime of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who during a time of financial distress such as he said Canada had not seen up to that time nor since—to a gentleman, I asy who criticises us so severely and jubilated over the position he occupied in comparison with us, there must be almost a feeling of pity and commiseration for him. Sir Richard Cartwright during his term as Finance Minister carried the ship of state through five years of such depression as admittedly has been unheard of in this country before, with only a deficit of 4½ millions, and now the present Finance Minister, in the face of that, is to be pitied when he has to stand up in his place and acknowledge a deficit of one and a quarter millions for last year, and of four and a half millions for this year, and another deficit staring him in the face for next year, which he can avert only by adding to the already heavily burdened people of the country one and a half millon dollars of more taxation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) professes again to preserve our industries, oblivious of the fact that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out that the great bulk of them suffer under his system, and are not as well off as they would be under a revenue tariff. I ask the attention of the Finance Minister and of hon. members to this fact. When the Finance Minister made these reductions of the tariff, which he claims to have made, every reduction he made on each separate item was an official declaration on his part that for the previous eleven or thirteen years each year that these duties were on there was an excessive taxation during all the years they were on. And, Sir, when he put 80 cents per 100 pounds on refined sugar, and some years afterwards reduced it to 64 cents per 100 pounds, thus reducing the burden of taxation upon the people 16 cents per 100 pounds, he declared by that act that for the years during which he maintained the rate at 80 cents per 100 pounds on that sugar, that he had taken out of the people excessive taxation according to what even protectionist principles required of him to give, or he could not have reduced it to the 64 cents as he did. I say that when the Minister of Finance reduced that duty from 80 cents per 100 pounds to 64 cents per 100 pounds, he in the same breath told us he was leaving protection enough to protect the industries of the country, and nobody doubted him in that respect, at least on this side of the House. But, Sir, if 64 cents was enough protection for the sugar refiner last year, and this year in proportion, then, Sir, it was enough for him during the years that it was 80 cents per 100, as levied by him, and if during these years he had left the duty at 72 cents instead of 80 cents, and put 8 cents per 100 pounds on the raw sugar, the people certainly would have got their sugar as cheap, the refiner would have had the same protection that the Finance Minister claimed was enough when he reduced the tariff, and there would have been put into the public treasury $240,000 per annum, instead of the paltry sum on that item of $10,000 which went there under the tariff as he arranged it at that time. So it is with reference to every item in which the Finance Minister made a decrease. When he made those decreases he declared it as his fixed principle that he would leave enough protection on. It was not a rate of revenue, but according to his principles of protection, which he declared was not to be gauged by a revenue at all, but according to the circumstances and needs of the industry and the state and condition of that trade at that time. That is a protective tariff And, Sir, when he made reductions he made them on that principle, and I say that every reduction he made on any single item was naturally a declaration on his part that for all the years before upon which an excess had been, that it was, even from a protectionist point of view, taxation wrung from the people, and which should have been left in the pockets of the people. I am sometimes amused at listening to hon. gentlemen opposite speak as if the Government were the country, and that any progress that is made in the country is all due to them. They speak as if it was a matter for the greatest congratulation on our part that in a country like Canada, with all the resources of Canada, a country that is seeking population, a country that can afford homes for millions and tens of millions of people whom we are asking to come here, with the riches of the sea belonging to us, the riches in the mines, agricultural lands unsurpassed with a race of men and women inhabiting it than whom there can be found no superiors in any country on the globe—that, because in the past two decades we have advanced somewhat, we have held our own, it is a matter upon which we are to congratulate ourselves, and for which we are to shout praises to the Government that they have not run us into the ditch altogether. Sir, it is not in their power, great as their power has been used tending in that direction, to wholly withhold progress from Canada. The test by which they are to be judged is this: Has Canada made the progress that Canada ought to have made under a proper fiscal system? That

is the test; and, apply that test as I have done to the small increase in the volume of our trade, and the small increase in our export trade, and to all the facts that the hon. gentlemen themselves enumerate as proofs of our advance, and I ask them if they are at all adequate. Sir, to prove the success of their policy they claim the credit for things with which their policy has nothing whatever to do. The Finance Minister points to our banking institutions, speaks of their solvency, commends their strength. I rejoice with him that our banks are on a stable footing; but what has the National Policy to do with our banks? What credit have the Government to take because our banking institutions are conducted on safe and sound principles? Sir, if our banking institutions were managed as the Government have managed the affairs of this country, I think their shareholders would think of their managers much as this side of the House, and as the thinking people of this country regard the Government of the day. Sir, I rejoice in the standing, the solvency, the stability of our banks; but I give the credit to the managers of those institutions, and not to the Government. If the managers of the banks were to make an investment of $70,000,000, and were to assure their shareholders that at the end of ten years that sum would be all repaid with interest, and if at the end of that term they were forced to confess that they had not received one dollar either in principal or interest, the shareholders might possibly think a change in the management desirable. Nor, if these managers were to put in a plea that they were not to blame, because one of their clerks told them so, do I think that even that would save them? We were told that an investment of that amount would be recouped to us out of the sales of our land in the North-west by 1890; but years after we find that the sales have not paid for the surveys and the cost of management; and the Finance Minister pleads as an excuse that the Government are not to blame, because one of their clerks not only said that it would be all right, but actually figured it out on paper, and what more could a reasonable man require? If the hon. gentleman wishes to compare the management of our banking institutions with the management of the Government, I am willing that the comparison should be made. If the cost of our banking institutions were to be increased largely on the assurance to their shareholders that they would add largely to the list of customers, and if, at the end of the term it should be found that only one-third of the promised list of customers had been added, I am inclined to think that the shareholders would think it was time to have a change of management. And when these hon. gentlemen told us that under their management we might safely incur increased expenditures, because they would bring people into the North-west, and when we found that, when the time came around not one-third of the promised number were there, we say it is time for the people of Canada to change the managers of their affairs. Sir, the Finance Minister made one statement on a public platform in the part of the country from which I come, with which I was rather pleased, because it indicated a desire, on his part, to extract what comfort he could out of the present condition of affairs; but when he contemplated the small increase to our population which had occurred in the last decade it must have been very disappointing to him that he could not show an increase under the National Policy of 12 per cent when there ought to have been a natural increase of 20 per cent, in addition to the 800,000 immigrants that the Government claimed were brought in. Yet the hon. gentleman took comfort in the thought that if we had increased in population only half a million that was 100,000 families; and estimating five to each family and a consumption of $200 worth of farm products by each family, it would mean an additional market for the farmers of the county to the extent of $20,000,000. That is true: but if the addition to our population by natural increase and by the immigration which the Government claim to have brought in as the result of the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars had been realized, there would have been an increase of over 1,500,000 to our population, or 300,000 families of five each, and if they consumed $200 worth of farm products per family, there would have been an increased home market for the farmers to the extent of $60,000,000. We are glad that he was able to claim an increase of 100,000 families; but under this case we should have had a home market for three times that number. Hon. gentlemen may say that I am extravagant; but they will not charge me with extravagance when I say that after their promises, the country might reasonably have expected that there would be in the last decade an equal increase to that which occurred in the preceding decade under a revenue tariff. But there was not. Had there been, there would have been a home market for one-half more than the increased amounts which the hon. gentleman claims under the National Policy. It is by this question of population that the weakness of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is shown. The Minister may take the public records and produce this set and that set of figures; he may cull and choose them as he likes: but the fact of the matter is, that in this Canada of ours we are not progressing in population or developing the country to the extent which we are entitled to expect; and I say it is lamentable to find, by the very census figures which hon. gentlemen themselves rely upon, that in a revenue tariff

decade our population increased 19 per cent, while in their National Policy decade it did not increase 12 per cent. I say that fact is discouraging, and it wipes out anything that may be urged by hon. gentlemen opposite as an argument at all worthy of consideration in favour of their management of public affairs; for, whereas, in the decade from 1881 to 1891 they only added 11·74 per cent to our population; in the same period they increased the debt 36·93 per cent. Not only have they not brought people into the country or kept our own people in the country, but the people in the country are being burdened and weighted down by the taxation imposed upon them, while a large part of it is being squandered in works for which the value has not been received, and in entering into which the Ministers would seem to have for their prime object the strengthening of themselves in some part of Canada. Sir, I shall not delay the House by going minutely into the census returns. My hon. friend from South Oxford has so thoroughly showed the fallacy of this boasted increase in the number of industrial establishments, taken from the census, that I shall not dwell further on that point. I cannot remember the exact figures my hon. friend gave, but he certainly showed such contradiction between promise and performance—such a discord between the magnificent promises held out to the workingmen, if they would only submit to the imposition of this immense taxation, how their wages would increase, and they would have constant employment, and the results as shown by the figures of the census—that one marvels at the hardihood of the hon. gentleman in attempting to controvert his statement. Let me give one instance of which I have personal knowledge. In a riding with which I am acquainted, there is set down in the census, under the head of pulp and windmill factories, two new industrial establishments to swell the increase. What is the number of hands employed? One hand employed in the two mills, and his yearly wages are a hundred dollars. One hundred dollars for one man to run two pulp factories for the whole year, or 33⅓ cents per day for each working day. The hon. Minister laughs, but it is no laughing matter. Let me ask him, in view of the promises made with reference to the National Policy, does he honestly think that the National Policy made that man rich? Does he honestly believe that those operatives, of whom my hon. friend from South Oxford gave the list, who are working, some of them, at as low as 4½ cents a day, have been made rich by the National Policy? If not, I ask the hon. gentleman to explain the reason why. He claims that it has made some people rich. I ask him by what sense of justice he dares to place on the statute-book a law to make some men rich and to give to others from 5 to 33 cents a day? That is a question for him to answer. Sir, these people who are earning this small pittance are Canadian subjects and entitled to the same consideration at the hands of the Government as other Canadian subjects; and if it be true that the Government have made certain people rich by their policy and reduced others to the position in which the census figures show them to be, the iniquity of their policy is manifest on its face, and, instead of lauding that policy, hon. gentlemen ought to make some amends for the injustice they have perpetrated by wiping it from the statute-book. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask us how we would have them economize, and they read extracts from speeches of my leader, which I heartily endorse, to the effect that in a proper expenditure on all public works necessary for the public interest the Government would receive his support. But do hon. gentlemen opposite build public works on that principle? Have they not, on the contrary, used grants to public works as means to endeavour to corrupt the constituencies, and have we not to acknowledge to our shame that they have succeeded in a measure in debauching, demoralizing and lowering the standard of some of the people? When you find a convention of one of the great political parties carrying a resolution, as was done by the Conservative convention at Prince Edward Island, in which they say:

> We deplore the repeated mistakes made by the electorate of our province in placing Prince Edward Island in hostility to the other provinces, and we trust that after the next election the island will be represented by men who will act in harmony with the Government in urging the just rights of the province to public works and winter communication——

when you find a convention deliberately adopting a resolution such as that, worded in the crafty manner in which it is, it is easily seen that an impression has been made by the Government on the people which should never have been made on free men enjoying the rights of free men. The money of the country does not belong to the Government. A constituency that has not been lowered in its moral tone will not bend its knee to ask from the Government as a favour that which belongs to it by right. A constituency that would do this has lost the spirit of manhood which ought to characterize Canadians, and which would characterize them under a proper administration of public affairs.

> We trust that the island will be represented by men who will act in harmony with the Government.

If the Government are willing to give to the provinces their just rights, what representative in this House would seek to prevent the Government doing this, or refuse to work in harmony with the Government in

such a matter. If the Government were actuated by a desire to do justice, the representatives of the pepole would act in harmony with them. Then the resolution goes on to advise the election of representatives who will act in harmony with the Government. So that according to that Conservative convention, then only will it be possible to obtain justice, then only will it be possible to obtain a fair share of the public money for the needed public works. And the press of this country—not all the press, for there is a noble portion that stands out for what is right, and fair, and pure—some of the press have been found to publish articles when elections are going on, declaring in plain terms that if the people desire the expenditure of any money on public works, the only way to secure this is to send men to this House which will bow down before the gentlemen on the treasury benches. Read the speech of the Minister of Public Works, who is supposed, more than any one else, to control the expenditure of this money. He said :

> We cannot do everything at once, but, as regards the principles upon which these appropriations are made, I will answer that the Government follow the same rule that determines the action of individuals. If any of you had a legacy left to divide among the people, you would most naturally begin with your friends.

What are the constituencies to deduce from that ? And to this Canada has been reduced. Sir, I hold that the financial policy of the Government is bad, and attempts such as those I have just alluded to are doing more serious injury to the country than even the burden of taxation imposed upon it. It would not have been thought possible in this Canada of ours in years agone, that any Minister of the Crown would dare to utter such sentiments in the presence of a Canadian assembly without being driven from the hustings for having insulted the people. But, Sir, this is the reliance of hon. gentlemen for getting into power. They say they will fight this issue on their National Policy. The hon. Minister who has just sat down has told us that, side issues would not be introduced. Well, let them come on, and fight it out on their policy. If they do so now, this will be the first time they have ever attempted to fight the battle out upon that policy alone. They faced the country in 1878 with their promises, and they were taken at their word. But they did not venture to fight it out upon the same line in 1882. They gerrymandered the constituencies of this country in a manner that was shameful, in a manner that no British statesman would have demeaned himself to attempt. In 1887 they introduced their Franchise Bill. I do not yet know what means will be adopted for the next contest. But we know the means they are willing to employ—promises made for support, grants to constituencies which, if just, ought to be granted, no matter whether the representative stands on the right or the left of the Speaker, and which if not founded upon justice ought not to be granted in order to secure a vote in this Chamber. Sir, the present condition of this country is, that while we rejoice that we have not actually retrograded, the Minister himself has to admit that such progress has not been made as we had a right to expect. The Ministry stand now, on the eve of going to the people, with every boast they have made, falsified. In bygone elections they attempted to entrench themselves, as I have shown. They went before the electors boasting of surpluses. They have now to face the electors confessing, notwithstanding their crushing taxation, a deficit last year, the largest in our history and this year, with a million and a half of additional taxation we do not know that they will be able to avoid another deficit. Loss of population, increased expenditure, excessive taxation, lack of progress—that is the position of Canada, this country, which ought to have gone forward by leaps and bounds ; that is the position in which the country finds itself in this year of grace 1895, after fifteen years rule of hon. gentlemen opposite and their National Policy. Sir, as I said, the result is not far in the distance. I venture no prophecy. But the hesitation of the Ministers themselves, their inability to make up their minds whether to face the people or not, their evident fear of the result, makes it seem not rash for one to venture the suggestion, that possibly before another year has rolled around men will occupy the treasury benches who will conduct the affairs of the country in a sound, economical, upright and judicious manner, giving to all parts of the country and to all classes full justice, and endeavouring to restore and elevate the moral tone so greatly lowered by hon. gentlemen opposite through their actions in the past

Mr. DICKEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES—TRANSLATION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented Second Report of the Select Committee appointed to super-

vise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present Session, as follows :—

The attention of the Committee having been directed by occasional complaints made by members of the House in reference to the delay in the publication of the French edition of the Debates, deemed it advisable, under the circumstances, to inquire into the matter with a view of remedying, if possible, the cause which has in the past tended to retard its publication.

The Committee have, after careful consideration, come to the conclusion that it would materially expedite the publication thereof if the following proposition, which they beg to submit as a recommendation, be adopted by the House, viz. :—

That beginning with the next session of Parliament the present mode of paying each translator a fixed salary of $1,000 per session be discontinued, and the translation of the Debates be paid for by the piece at the rate of $1.00 per column, but that the chief translator and an assistant be paid by salary at the present rate, and that the said chief translator be held responsible to the Committee for the quality of the translation and the due despatch of its execution, and be allowed full liberty in choosing and dismissing the translators, subject, however, to the approval of the Committee.

SEIZURE OF TOBACCO.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. Whether, in the autumn of 1892, a seizure of tobacco was made, by the Inland Revenue, on the premises of Charles Bertrand, of Isle Verte, in the county of Temiscouata ? 2. What quantity of tobacco was seized ? 3. Did the department dispose of the said tobacco, or did they return it to Mr. Bertrand ? What penalty did Mr. Bertrand pay, in view of the said seizure ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). A seizure of tobacco was made by the Inland Revenue Department on October 19, 1892, from Chas. Bertrand, of Isle Verte, P.Q. Forty-three pounds of illicit cut and 2½ pounds of plug tobacco were seized. The department disposed of the tobacco by sale to a tobacco manufacturer in Quebec. Mr. Bertrand paid no penalty.

POSTMASTER AT KEMPTVILLE.

Mr. LISTER asked, 1. Who is the postmaster at Kemptville? 2. Does he follow any occupation other than that of postmaster ? 3. Were complaints made during the year 1894 of letters being opened in that office ? 4. Were such complaints investigated ? 5. If so, by whom ? 6. Was a report made on the complaints, and does the report justify the complaint ? 7. If so, has any, and what order been made concerning it ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. H. G. Ferguson. 2. The department is not aware that he has any other occupation than that of postmaster. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. By the post office inspector at Ottawa. 6. A report was made, but the inspector did not seem satisfied that the letters had been opened before being delivered to the complainant. 7. No order was made in the matter.

EXCISE DUTY ON SPIRITS.

Mr. EDGAR asked. Under the proposed amendment of the Inland Revenue Act, section 130, subsection (a.) fixing an excise duty on distilled spirits of $1.70 per gallon of the strength of proof, what would be the excise duty upon each gallon of spirits of the following strengths :—1. Sixty-five per cent over proof ? 2. Fifty per cent over proof ? 3. Twenty per cent under proof ? 4. Twenty-five per cent under proof ?

Mr. WOOD. Sixty-five over proof, $2.80½; 50 over proof, $2.55 ; 20 under proof, $1.30 ; 25 under proof, $1.27½.

C.P.R.—CHINAMEN QUARANTINED.

Mr. PRIOR asked. 1. Has the Government received any money from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on account of the expense of feeding and guarding Chinamen who were quarantined in British Columbia in 1893 or 1894 ? 2. If so, how much has been received and when was it paid ? 3. If none has been received, what amount does the Government consider the Canadian Pacific Railway is indebted to them on that account ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The amount charged against the Canadian Pacific Railway for the expenses in question was $3,191.85. The company objected to these charges, and the Department of Agriculture set against them balances due the company for transportation, amounting to $1,900.82, leaving a balance of claim against the company for the charges in question of $1,291.03.

CUSTOMS DUTIES ON SPIRITS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Under the proposed amendment of the Act respecting the duties of Customs, 57-58 Victoria, chapter 33, section 7, subsection (a.) of schedule A, fixing the customs duty on alcohol and spirituous liquors at $2.25 per gallon of the strength of proof, what would be the customs duty upon each gallon of spirits of the following strengths :—1. Sixty-five per cent over proof? 2. Fifty per cent over proof ? 3. Twenty per cent under proof ? 4. Twenty-five per cent under proof ?

Mr. WALLACE. The duty on 65 over proof, is $3.71¼ per gallon ; 50 over proof, $3.37½ per gallon ; 20 under proof, $1.91¼ ; 25 under proof, $1.91¼.

FISHERY OVERSEER, KENT DISTRICT.

Mr. ALLAN asked, Whether Henry Smith, of Chatham, Ont., is now in the employment of the Government, or has he been em-

ployed by them during the past year? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary? Who is the fishery overseer for the Kent district, fronting on Lake Erie?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can only answer the latter part of the inquiry. Henry Linley, of Cedar Springs, is the fishery overseer for the Kent district, fronting on Lake Erie. Mr. Smith is not employed by our department.

RUSTICO BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What are the respective names of the tenderers for the repairs of the Rustico breakwater, Prince Edward Island, and the amounts of their respective tenders? To whom was the contract awarded? Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why not?

Mr. FOSTER. Two sets of tenders were received for this work. In the first set, Alexander Compton was the lowest tenderer at $2,200; J. Burns, $4,700; Heney & Smith, $4,976; L. G. & P. Gallant, $4,900. When Mr. Compton was communicated with, he being the lowest tenderer, he declined to sign the contract, owing to an error he claimed to have made, unless an addition of $1,480 was made to the price at which he tendered. This the department could not do, and tenders were called for the second time. The tenderers were: Heney & Smith, $4,276; J. Burns, $4,460; Gallant & Briott, $4,875. The lowest tenderer received the contract.

MAIL SERVICE--P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Who has the contract for carrying the mails between St. Louis Station, Prince County, P. E. I., and Palmer Road and Waterford? When was the contract for the service let again? Were tenders asked for? Who tendered? What was the amount of each tender, and was the lowest tender accepted?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Angus Shea is contractor for the Kildare Station and Palmer Road mail service, which serves Waterford en route. This contract was let on 1st October, 1894. Tenders were asked for. Angus Shea tendered at $30, and Wm. Kinch at $54. The lowest tender was accepted.

FISHWAY—MADUXNEKEAG.

Mr. COLTER asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have a fish-way placed in the dam at the mouth of the Maduxnekeag stream in the town of Woodstock, and when?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to require a passage for fish to be provided in the dam at the mouth of the Maduxnekeag River at once, and instructions have been already issued to such effect.

DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD."

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the dredge "Prince Edward" is working? If not, when will she commence operations? Is it the intention to dredge the loose rocks blasted in Cascumpeque Harbour, P.E.I., during this season? Is the Government aware that these rocks are impeding navigation considerably in said harbour? Is it the intention to dredge in Malpeque Harbour, P.E.I., during this season, or any other harbour in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. FOSTER. The dredge "Prince Edward" is not yet at work, but will commence operations on or about 15th May. It is not the intention to dredge in Cascumpeque harbour this season, owing to the large amount of money required to obtain a channel fifteen feet in depth at low water in the entrance, the estimated cost being, for work on the inner bar which is composed of rock, $21,000, and for deepening the channel through the outer bar which is composed of sand, $12,000. The loose rocks in the channel are not impeding navigation, inasmuch as the inner bar carries as much water as the other bar, namely, 10 feet 6 inches at low water spring tides which rise 3 feet. The work so far done on the inner bar has been of some benefit, as all projecting points have been removed. In any case there are no valid reasons to send the dredge to Cascumpeque, unless a vote is obtained for blasting the rock, as the blasting and dredging must go on concurrently. The programme of the work for the dredge "Prince Edward" is as follows:—1. Cardigan, 2. Souris, 3. Grand River, 4. Murray Harbour, 5. Wood Islands, 6. Crapaud, 7. Malpeque, 8. New London.

BUOYS IN SHELBURNE HARBOUR.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. For how many years have the iron can buoys been placed in Shelburne Harbour, Nova Scotia? 2. How much per year has been paid by the Government for the storage of said buoys, and to whom paid?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The records of the department show that the iron can buoys were in position previous to 1879, but the exact information as to the number of years the buoys have been in position can only be obtained from the records at Halifax. 2. The storage was included in the accounts furnished by the harbour master, Mr. John A. McGowan for painting, placing, lifting and storing. The amounts paid from the year 1881 to 1894 will be found in the annexed schedule. Since 1879 tenders have twice been called for, but none accepted, all being too high.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the privilege of voting for candidates for membership thereof should be extended to women possessing the qualifications which now entitle men to the electoral franchise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried, carried.

Mr. DAVIN Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear my hon. friends behind me say, "carried."

Mr. SOMERVILLE. "Married."

Mr. DAVIN. "Married," my hon. friend says. That probably is one way of extending the franchise to the ladies, but it is one that has not yet had my practical support. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the House to approach this question in a temper befitting so important a subject. Sir, those who oppose the extension of the franchise to women who pay taxes and exercise the duties of citizenship take so grave a view of the ultimate consequences of giving the franchise to women, that I shall ask the attention of the House while I lay before them what it is that I propose, while I show how the question stands today, and what is the opinion of the leading minds of the world upon it, and also state the positive arguments in its favour, and endeavour, so far as I can, to reply to the arguments used against it. I wish, at the outset, to anticipate the kind of reply that has been made to proposals of this kind in the English House of Commons, and, I think, even in this House of Commons. When, in the English House of Commons, a proposal of this kind has been made, people have got up and replied to a wholly different proposition. For instance, they have argued that great dissensions might be introduced into households if the man took one view of public affairs and his wife another. But, Sir, this motion does not propose to enfranchise married women, but simply to enfranchise women paying taxes and discharging the duties of citizenship.

Mr. LAURIER. Some married women do that.

Mr. DAVIN. That is quite true. And in those cases where married women are sui juris, I would give them a vote, undoubtedly. This is often regarded as part of a movement which has sometimes been described as "the revolt of woman," sometimes as the emancipation of women; and there have been questions mixed up with this in the United States and elsewhere with which I have no sympathy whatever. I have no sympathy with any social or political theories that would interfere with the home-keeping and home-duty-discharging capacities and duties of the woman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are they to be candidates?

Mr. DAVIN. This proposal does not touch that. That is another of the arguments used. But the Bill I should found on this resolution if it were carried, would not enable women to be candidates. That is a question we can afterwards discuss. Mr. Speaker, this issue, also, was raised in the English House of Commons, as I shall show. It was asked: Where are you to stop? But, Sir, the same argument was used when it was proposed to educate women. You know that last century—and even, in fact, up to within the memory of men only past middle age—the educational condition of women was simply deplorable. And a movement took place in England and in France almost simultaneously in favour of an emancipation of women, far greater and far more important than giving them the franchise—their emancipation from a ukase that had gone forth from society decreeing that, with very few exceptions, ignorance should be their lot—ignorance of literature, ignorance of history, ignorance of science, in fact, almost complete ignorance of everything except what would fit them to be useful in the house. But, Sir, about a hundred years ago a very able literary woman wrote a book which called attention of the English people to the undesirable position that women were in at that time, and pleaded for their emancipation from ignorance and for placing them in a position that, within the last thirty years, they have achieved in nearly every civilized country in the world. And the only thing that remains to complete the circle of the amelioration of their condition that was aimed at at that time is to give them the electoral franchise. Now, Sir, in France, at a very early period, the position of woman struck men like Condorcet as thoroughly indefensible, and he advocated giving to them the electoral franchise. But, to come down to a period nearer our own day, the event that gave the greatest stimulus to the movement in favour of giving the franchise to women was the meeting that took place in Freemason's Hall, in London, in 1840, to urge upon the opinion of Christendom the emancipation of the negro. Now, Sir, to that meeting, friends of the slave all the world over were invited, and some six ladies were sent as delegates from societies in the United States. But when they presented their credentials, they were not allowed to take part in the meeting. Daniel O'Connell thought they ought to be allowed to take part. Wendell Phillips, who was described by Mr. Bright as the most eloquent of English-speaking men, contended for their admission in his eloquent and forceful way, but he failed. And William Lloyd Garrison was so disgusted with the illiberality of the convention that he would not take part in the proceedings, but took his seat in the gallery. Now that nobody would think of refusing to allow six women delegates to take part in a conven-

tion of that sort—a mere public meeting—now that in any part of Christendom such a refusal would be regarded as a thing not to be tolerated for a minute, it can easily be understood how men and women came to inaugurate the movement in favour of extending the franchise to women who fulfil the duties of citizenship. Sir, as I have indicated, this was part of a movement in favour of raising the status, intellectually, morally and socially, of women the world over; and so far as that movement contemplated giving them as good an education as could be given them in their circumstances of life, so far as that movement meant to raise them morally, intellectually and socially, I have entire sympathy with it. And, Sir, what occurred? In Norway we find that movement going on, and in 1880 the women were allowed to be educated at the universities. In Sweden, in 1870, the women were allowed to enter universities; and in Denmark and Iceland they were also allowed to have a higher education. In Wyoming, something like a quarter of a century ago, they were given the electoral franchise; they are given it in South Australia, in the Isle of Man, in New Zealand, and in Austria, and in some other places. The great names in politics, in literature, in science, in the leading countries of the world, are in favour of my proposition. I will mention Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Leonard Courtney; and if we go to France, we have Jules Janin, Chateaubriand, Alexandre Dumas, Emile de Girardin, Eugène Pelletan; and in science, you have Mr. Huxley, who, I am sorry to say, is near the close of his career. Now, why is it that women are excluded? It must be either because they are unfit, or because their admission to the franchise would be a danger to the state. Nearly every claim for a right denied, or a privilege that it was thought we should have, and came ultimately to get, has been opposed upon the ground of unfitness. When first the proposition was made to extend the franchise to the middle class in England, we were told they were unfit; and when, in 1865, '66 and '67, it was contended that the franchise should be extended to others than the £10 householder, the cry again was raised that those beneath that line were unfit. Now, I consider that the burden of proof as to the unfitness of women to exercise the franchise really lies on those who make these statements. Because, what do we see? Let us look around Canada, look around the United States, look over England, and you will see women of business power managing estates, managing hotels, the responsible heads of families, and after their husbands were dead, bringing up their children well: effective as school mistresses, and in higher capacities, presiding over large educational establishments. And let us look at their activity in the world of art. Why, to-day, and for many a day, they have been among the foremost novelists, they are among the foremost in belles lettres, they are the foremost in the histrionic world; in singing, painting and sculpture they stand in the front rank. Take the profession of journalism—I doubt if there are better journalists in the world than some of the ladies have proved themselves in the past, and are proving themselves to-day. Miss Shaw, whom the "Times" sent to Australia and Canada, and whose letters from India created, and properly created, so deep an impression, has won the very highest position as a journalist. There is Miss Harriet Martineau. I remember of hearing of a lady who proposed to become a journalist, and who said to Justin McCarthy: "Why should not I be of the same profession as Harriet Martineau?" And Justin McCarthy, who was then editing one of the leading papers of London, said: "All men and women, I suppose, would like to be able to write as well as Harriet Martineau." One of the absurd things said against giving the franchise to women is that they cannot go to war, that their inability to become warriors unfits them for the franchise. Sir, even this argument shows complete ignorance of history. If you read the history of the Arabians, or read Gibbon, you will find that women have distinguished themselves as warriors; and if you go back to more ancient times you will also find that there have been women distinguished as warriors. I may read, by and by, part of a speech of the leader of the Opposition, that will probably show by implication that they have considerable force any way. Well, talking of their fitness, look at what women have done in politics. We need not go beyond our own gracious Queen; we know from what has been published of her inner life, and from the interest she takes in political matters, that she is a capable politician, and as such exercises great influence. On the same throne sat one of the greatest of women, Queen Elizabeth. On a neighbouring throne sat another illustrious queen, unfortunate in her career, but also a woman of great genius as well as of great beauty, Mary, Queen of Scots. The mother of Charles VIII. of France, and the sister of St. Louis, were great women, and ruled France in their day. Margaret of Austria was one of the ablest politicians of her age; and of the Duchess d'Angoulême, Napoleon the Great said that she was the only man the Bourbons had produced. Of the Princess Mathilde, Mr. Van Dam, who is writing the Personal History of the Third Empire, states that she played a great part in bringing Louis Napoleon to the throne of France, and up to the last she was his most trusted adviser. Catherine of Russia was a great woman, a great politician, a great ruler. Maria Thérèsa was a great politician, and a great ruler. If you

go to early history you will find women of leading talents. You have Socrates consulting, as a philosopher, a lady other than Xantippe; you find Aspasia the counsellor of the greatest statesman of his age, and who was said to have assisted him even in preparing those great speeches which swayed the fierce democracy of the city of the Vilot Crown and fulmined over Greece. Yet it was in this part of Greece where at one time, and that the period of its greatest splendour, woman did not play an important part. Yes, it was Athens. But that was only after the youth of Athens had been accustomed to go to Sardis, as at one time the youth of England were accustomed to go to Paris; and they brought back eastern customs, and the Athenian women were shut up as women are shut up in a Turkish harem to-day. But in Sparta the women played a great part, and nobody can be familiar with the dramatic literature of Greece without seeing what a free open, large life the Grecian women lived, socially as well as politically. The same, Sir, is true of Rome, but Roman history is so familiar to you that I need not give you instances. The same is true of every country in Europe, in the earlier years of our present era, during the Renaissance, and up to our own time. Now, my argument is this: If they can discharge the highest political functions, how can they be unfit to discharge one of the smallest duties they can be asked to discharge in the political sphere, namely, to say for whom they will vote to be member of Parliament? Remember we are not to judge them by an ideal standard. We must compare them with the men who vote at the present time; and, Sir, from what I have seen of the women who hold property and pay taxes, it would be a very extraordinary thing if they were not as fit as the average voter to declare who shall or shall not be a member of this House. Would there be any danger to the state, would their action be revolutionary? We know that woman is more conservative than man—her instincts are more conservative. But it is said they would be reactionary. The moment I placed this motion on the paper, one friend from Ontario said to me that the granting of the privilege of voting to women would enormously increase the power of the clergy, that the women of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches and of the Church of England would be influenced by their clergy; and then I was informed by a gentleman from Quebec that it would dangerously increase the power of the priests in that province. What that argument amounts to is this, that woman would not vote on her own individual judgment. But do the men?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. When this question came up in the English House of Commons as to whether women would vote on their individual judgment, Mr. Leonard Courtney in reply quoted some lines from Pope that one of our Princesses of our reigning house had written on the collar of her lapdog. They ran thus:

> I am Her Highness' dog at Kew.
> Pray tell me, sir, whose dog are you?

He said that a collar might be placed on the neck of the average voter to that effect.

Mr. GIBSON. Whose collar do you wear?

Mr. DAVIN. I have watched the hon. gentleman when he has occasionally orated in this House, but I must say he does not give us anything that is not very chestnutty.

Mr. GIBSON. You make such a fool of yourself.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not go that length in the sincerest form of flattery to the hon. gentleman. What do we see on this continent? What do we see in the United States and to some extent in Canada? The very minute a man is enfranchised in this country he is impatient until he has thrown off his individuality, until he has got himself a master of some kind to tell him how he shall vote. I saw in the "Citizen" this morning that a labour organization here had declared that its members should not be allowed to remain within the organization unless they voted in a certain way; and a member of the Patrons organization in one part of the country told me that if he did not vote in a given way he would be threatened with expulsion, notwithstanding that there is nothing, so far as I am informed, limiting in this respect the independent action of the members. I have been told what the principles are, and I am assured there is nothing whatever in the principles of the Patrons, to make voting coercive, and so far as their platform is concerned, all the practical planks of it seem to me to be very unobjectionable indeed, if not such as one might welcome. But in those places where the Patrons have taken that position we find that men become members of the organization and when a candidate is brought out of whom they utterly disapprove, still the members are bound to vote for him. I might mention other organizations, both in the Liberal and Conservative camps, membership of which would seem to give the men a master of some kind whom they have to obey instead of trusting to their own judgment. If the proposition is put that women would not be independent, then we would have to answer: Are the men independent? I am afraid they are not. I may say that in the early times in England women voted in counties and in some boroughs. What are the objections raised? But before going into these objections, I should like to lay before the House the position of the question at the present time in England. It was introduced into the Eng-

lish House of Commons in 1867 by Mr. John Stuart Mill, and with his views on every subject I did not agree.

An hon. MEMBER. That was unfortunate for him.

Mr. DAVIN. It was probably unfortunate for him, because he was a cultured man, a man of great genius—and it was an unfortunate thing perhaps that he did not know a man of practical views more thoroughly. As early as 1866 Mr. Disraeli gave his opinion on this subject in these words :

> In a country governed by a woman—where you allow woman to form part of the estate of the realm—peeresses in their own right, for example—where you allow a woman not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal courts—where a woman by law may be a church warden, an overseer of the poor—I do not see, where she has so much to do with the state and church, on what reasons, if you come to right, she has not a right to vote.

In the following year Mr. Mill brought forward the question in the House of Commons, having presented petitions from a large number of ladies, as did also Mr. Russell Gurney. His motion was supported by Mr. Henry Fawcett and by Mr. John Bright. I desire to call attention to the division, even at the risk of being somewhat prosy. The Yeas stood 196, Nays 73. Among the Nays were a number of men who afterwards became Cabinet Ministers. It was supported by Mr. Henry Fawcett, Lord John Hay and Mr. John Francis McGuire, member for Cork, and a strong and devoted member of the Roman Catholic Church. Sir E. W. Watkins also voted with the "Noes," and amongst others Henry Labouchere, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Bass and Sir Mortin Peto.

Mr. SCRIVER. What was the form of the motion ?

Mr. DAVIN. It was a motion for allowing women to vote. They voted on the amendment, but in England they put the substantive motion. I am sorry to say that we do not vote as they do in the English House of Commons. It would be very much better if we did, because then when we had a couple of amendments we would get a photograph of the opinion of the House. If they have an amendment, or an amendment to the amendment, they put the original motion first. The motion on which they voted was :

> That the word "man" stand part of the clause ;

whereas Mr. Mill's motion was :

> That "man" be omitted, and "person" be placed instead.

After that the question was again and again brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Jacob Bright, and supported by Sir Charles Dilke and other prominent men. A great advance was made when the Franchise Bill was passed enabling women to vote in municipalities, and then in 1869-70 Mr. Bright brought in his Woman's Disabilities Bill, the first clause of which read as follows :—

> First, that in all Acts relating to the qualification and registration of voters or persons entitled or claiming to be registered and to vote in the election of members of Parliament, wherever words occur which import the masculine gender, the same shall be held to include females for all purposes connected with and having reference to the right to be registered as voters and to vote in such election, any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now, Sir, that Bill was supported in debate by Sir Charles Dilke, who was then the rising hope of the Liberal party, but Mr. Fowler, who opposed it, said :

> I believe women have immense political influence ; I saw a good deal of it in the contested election of 1868.

Now, if women have a great deal of political influence, and if they exercise it, is it not proper that they should exercise it under the law rather than in evasion of the law ? If they exercise political influence, and if you give them the right to vote, you simply give them a responsibility which at present does not attach to their action. Mr. Fowler said:

> They have to educate their children.

Well, has not a widower to educate his children, and does that prevent his being able to vote ? One would think that voting took people the whole time away from their duty. Sir Charles Dilke in a very able speech supported Mr. Jacob Bright, and another celebrated man, Dr. Lyon Playfair, now Lord Playfair, one of the ablest men that has ever been in the House of Commons, also supported him, but on the motion for the previous question they were again defeated. Again, in 1871, this question was brought before the House of Commons in England, and on that occasion Mr. Gladstone spoke as follows :—

> The ancient law recognized the rights of women in the parish ; I apprehend they could both vote and act in the parish. The modern rule has extended the right to the municipalities, so far as the right of voting is concerned. With respect to the school boards, I own, I believe we have done wisely, on the whole, in giving both the franchise and the right of sitting on the school board to women. Then comes the question with regard to Parliament, and we have to ask ourselves whether we shall or shall not go further. I admit, at any rate, that, as far as I am able to judge, there is more presumptive ground for changing the law than some of the opponents of the measures are disposed to own. I cannot help thinking that, for some reason or other, there are various important particulars in which women obtain much less than justice under social arrangements. I may be told that there is no direct connection between this and the parliamentary franchise, and I admit it, but at the same time I am by no means sure that these inequalities may not have an indirect con-

nection with the state of law in which the balance is generally cast too much against women and too much in favour of men. There is one instance which has been quoted, and I am not sure there is not something in it—I mean the case of farms. I believe to some extent in the competition for that particular employment. Women suffer in a very definite manner in consequence of their want of qualifications to vote. I go somewhat further than this, and say that, so far as I am able to form an opinion of the general tone and colour of our law in these matters where the peculiar relation of men and women is concerned, that law does less than justice to women, and great mischief, misery and scandal result from that state of thing in many of the occurrences and events of life. If it should be found possible to arrange a safe and well adjusted alteration of the law as to political power, the man who shall attain that object, and who shall see his purpose carried onward to its consequences in a more just arrangement of the provisions of other laws bearing upon the condition and welfare of women, will, in my opinion, be a real benefactor to his country.

In 1872 again Mr. Jacob Bright brought the question before the House of Commons, and again in 1873, Mr. Henley, the Nestor of the House, one of the most influential men that ever sat in the English Parliament, and one of the most conservative of men, a man whose judgment was looked up to by men on both sides of the House, and especially by men on the front benches, ministerial and opposition, declared most emphatically in favour of the measure in the following language :—

He said he had once felt considerable doubt and dislike of the measure, but, after careful watching of the way in which women gave the local votes, he had come to the conclusion that an extension of the principle would be useful.

The votes in favour of the Bill increased on this occasion to 155, with tellers and pairs, 172, a larger number than had ever been before obtained, while the opposition remained stationary. Again, in 1875, the question was brought forward, and in 1877 Mr. Leonard Courtney spoke well and ably on the question. In 1878 the question was also before the House, Mr. Courtney speaking strongly in favour of it, and saying among other things :

The political reasons for granting the prayer of the Bill appear to me to be undeniable, but I confess they are not the reasons why I most strongly support it. I believe it will develop a fuller, freer and nobler character in women by admitting them into the sphere of the political thought and duty. Some may say, "But what is to be the end ?" I do not know that we are always bound to see the goal towards which we are moving. If we are moving on right principles ; if we are actuated by a feeling of justice ; if the hand that moves above us and leads us on is a hand in which we can place implicit confidence,—then I say, trust to that light, follow that hand, without fear of the future.

In 1879 it was again before the House, and again Mr. Courtney spoke in its favour, having charge of the Bill. His motion was pretty much the same as mine. The debate on that occasion was very animated, and the result of the division was much the same as the previous year—113, or, including tellers and pairs, 144 in its favour, and 217, or, including tellers and pairs, 248 against it. This closed the history of that subject in the Ninth Parliament of Victoria.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In 1884 the subject was up again.

Mr. DAVIN. Lord Denman brought it up again and again. I have the references here, but the reason I stop at that year —I will be perfectly frank with the House —is that I do not think the subject has made any progress in England since that time ; it about touched high water mark then. Coming to Canada, in 1885, Sir John Macdonald had a Bill before the House of Commons in which there was a clause for giving the franchise to women. Mr. Townsend moved an amendment with a view of striking out that clause. On that occasion, Sir John Macdonald said :

Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to female suffrage, I can only say that, personally, I am strongly convinced, and every year for many years I have become more strongly convinced of the justice of giving women otherwise qualified the suffrage. I am strongly of that opinion, and have been for a good many years, and I had hoped that Canada would have the honour of first placing woman in the position that she is certain eventually, after centuries of oppression, to obtain. It is merely a question of time all over the civilized world. In England the question has made marvellous progress, as we all know who have paid any attention to that subject. By slow degrees women have become owners of their own property ; they are protected as much as if they were unmarried—protected in all their rights, not only against the world, but against their own husbands. They have obtained a quasi-political position on school boards, in vestries and in municipal elections, I believe, to a certain extent ; and in every position in which they have made an advance towards equality with men, they have proved themselves so efficient that there has not been the slightest attempt to retroactive legislation to deprive them of any privileges or advantages that, after centuries of denial, they have at last obtained. I had hoped that we in Canada would have had the great honour of leading in the cause of securing the complete emancipation of women, of completely establishing her quality as a human being and a member of society with man. I say it is a mere matter of time. It is known—at least, it is believed, though I cannot speak positively on that point—but it is generally understood that the present Premier of England is in favour of female franchise. He did not allow female franchise to be imported into his late Franchise or Representation Bill, for fear it might harm the Bill as a whole.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He canvassed the House against his own proposition.

Mr. DAVIN. I know nothing about that; I was not in the House at the time ; but it seems to me an incredible statement. Sir John said further :

The argument was pressed so far in this House the other night that it was said: If you grant the privilege of electing, you must grant the privilege and right of being elected. That does not at all follow. We have at this moment various qualifications of electors here who could not themselves be elected.

And again he said:

A lady of large wealth and property said to me when I was in England a short time ago: I have no vote. My butler has a vote, my steward has a vote, my coachman has a vote, and at least fifty of my servants have votes, but I have no vote. She thought it was rather an injustice to her that she had not a vote, when so many who derived their means of living from her had votes, and were her superiors in that regard.

Mr. Coursol, who was then a member of the House, opposed woman suffrage; but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) whom I see here now, seemed to consider that women who paid taxes and discharged the duties of citizens—in fact, the women referred to in my motion—should have a vote. He said:

I say, then, that the proposition of the hon. gentleman is one that ought not to be so cavalierly dealt with as is proposed by several of his friends. I say it is entitled to the serious, the earnest consideration of this House. It is true that there are many important questions involved in the proposition which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us—what will be the effect on the relations between the men and women of this country, how far it will draw the men up in a purer atmosphere, or draw the women down from that exalted position which they occupy, and weaken the important aesthetic and moral influences they now exercise, must be considered.

Again:

I have no doubt that every one of them are highly competent; they are quite as well qualified, as far as their knowledge of public affairs go, as men are, to exercise the electoral franchise.

I think my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also supported the view that women paying taxes and discharging the duties of citizens should be allowed to vote, and several other prominent members of the Liberal party took the same position. Now, Sir, to ascertain the views of leading politicians on this subject, I have made it a point to read carefully the speeches of the hon. leader of the Opposition—in fact, I always read them,—but I have read them with much greater attention than usual during the last three or four months. This is what the hon. leader of the Opposition said at Brantford on August 21st, 1894, as reported in the "Globe":

Take, for instance, Ontario. You have to-day universal manhood suffrage, as I understand it, and I understand also that the day is not far off when you will give the franchise to the ladies. I don't object to that; but in my province we never thought of giving the franchise to the women, and for many years we will never think of it. I will give you the reason. You may, perhaps, believe that we are backward in Quebec. Since you in Ontario are ready to give the women the franchise, you will say that we are not so far advanced as you are. We never thought of giving the franchise to the women in my province, because in my province, though the women do not vote, they have been in the habit of ruling and governing for I don't know how long. (Laughter.)

If they have been ruling and govering, for I do not know how long, are you going to refuse them the power of merely casting a vote? That is utterly inconsistent.

There is not a husband in Quebec, said the leader of the Opposition at Brantford, who is not the subject of his wife. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) So that among us there is no question of giving the franchise to women, but if the people of Ontario think the time has come for granting woman's suffrage, not only have I no objection at all, but I shall welcome the event, because I know that when the women of Ontario have the right of suffrage, their first act will be to bring to an end the reign of corruption which has lasted too long at Ottawa.

When women petitioned Parliament they have declared that they would raise the tone of political life. They have both in the United States and in England said they would help to purify public life; but when the leader of the Opposition says—if I may be allowed to make an Irish bull—that the ladies will vote to a man for the Opposition, I am inclined to think that he is labouring under a false impression. I am bound to be honest, and must say that I do not share his views that the ladies would vote for the Opposition. On the contrary, I believe they would support the Conservative party.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. If you think you are right, give me your vote. I share the view that they exercise considerable influence. I have fought now some four elections, and one of the first things I always try to get is the support of the ladies, and when I know they are with me I am perfectly satisfied, and confident. Now, what are the objections? First, we are told that they do not want to vote. Well, a large number of them have petitioned this House for it; and those who do not want to use it may stay at home, and what harm will then be done? Then it is said to be contrary to received views. But it was contrary to received views only a few months ago for ladies to use the bicycle,, and yet they use it extensively, especially in the West. I am told that even a royal princess in London, uses it, and I believe in a very short time you will find all the prejudice against its use by ladies will pass away. The same argument was used with regard to the professions, and against allowing women to enter the universities. And, at one time, it was used against allowing them to become printers, or to work in factories. I may say that I

have managed a printing establishment for some years, and the most correct and cleanest printers we have had have been women. Then it is said that politics will distract them from their proper duties and cause them to neglect their home work. I do not see anything in voting incompatible with domestic duties. The duty of a father to his family is probably not quite so absorbing, but it is nearly as absorbing as that of the mother, and his duty to the children is pretty nearly as engrossing as her duty towards them. If it does not prevent him exercising the franchise, why should it prevent her? In this connection let me say that a great deal of nonsense is talked by those who quote the Bible as bearing on this question. I do not think that the Bible has much to do with the franchise or with politics. The Bible does not anywhere profess to be a guide to political opinions, and if we are to consult the Bible on this question, why, we find that St. Paul advised women not to marry at all. But clearly his advice had relation to the condition of the time when he spoke. I see that some of the advanced women, with whose views I have no sympathy, are trying to disfigure Genesis in their favour; and I read, the other day, that one lady, a very clever woman, made an argument in favour of her sex by saying that Eve ate the apple and was able to digest it, but that Adam tried to eat it, and it stuck in his throat. In Genesis, we are told that woman was made a helpmeet for man. Is she only to be a helpmeet in a small portion of his life, and is she not to be a helpmeet for him in all the more serious occupations of life, politics, and business included? It used to be said that the turmoil of an election was something a woman should not enter into. But, under our system of voting by ballot, all she would have to do is to deposit her ticket. Mr. Gladstone, who used to object to women voting, said the only objection he could see was that they would have to hustle people at the poll, but we know that now, when we have voting by ballot, voting in a polling booth is almost as dull as a debate on the tariff in this House. Then it is said they are represented by their male relatives. Is politics to be the exclusive business of one sex? What is political freedom but the control of those who make a business of politics by those who do not? That is all men do who vote, and happily men are not engaged in politics the whole time. One of the advantages of the British constitution, as compared with that of the United States, is that we need not be the whole time engrossed in politics, and the casting of her vote once every four or five years would not take a woman away from her duties. Besides, why should she seek to be represented by her male relatives if she have different opinions and special interests of her own? It is said that women have already power enough. I have already dealt with that argument. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition hinted at that; but the millionaire has power enough without voting, and a man who is worth ten or twenty millions has immense power without voting. Are you going to deprive him of his vote because he has power enough?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not?

Mr. DAVIN. I would not disfranchise a millionaire. Here is an argument that I find in the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell. He says that woman is an aesthetic product, and that we would interfere with her aesthetic character if we gave her the right to vote. I do not admit that. If we look into history, we find that those gifted women who have been great politicians and great rulers did not lose their fascination by taking an active part in politics. The larger interests apparently enhanced the quickness of their wit and their charm. I need not give names—they will occur to every educated man. Now, will politics degrade woman? If politics would in any way degrade woman, I should be very sorry to have anything to do with this proposition. I agree with Mr. Courtney that nothing of the kind would happen. I hold, on the contrary, that this reform would give woman such a position in the world that man would regard her as something more than one of the supreme objects of beauty to be admired and desired. Some cynic has asked what business any woman has in this world after she is forty years of age? Mary Woolestoncraft quotes this remark in her writings. The ideal we have always encouraged is that of woman as the supreme object of beauty and admiration is one reason why men have lost sight of the solid, heroic, sterling qualities of women, and has led us to regard her, as I say, merely as an aesthetic object. Now, Sir, I will make a reference which I specially commend to my hon. friend behind me, whose support I hope to have, and this I think should secure it indubitably. I will make a reference to the description we get of the ideal woman in the Sacred Volume. In the last chapter of Proverbs, we get a description of the highest type of woman. Is it the beauty of form, the beauty of colour that is there dwelt upon? These she possesses, but we are told mainly how she manages her household, her great executive power is given as her greatest charm. Suppose that they had had representative government in Judea, what would you think of giving the franchise to the ordinary vine dresser in that woman's employ or in the employ of her husband, and refusing it to this woman who is endowed with all the qualities of a statesman? Now, Sir, what would be the advantages of doing what I ask? In the first place, from the most intelligent half of the human race you would remove a sense of injustice, you would remove a stigma. Blackstone has

classed women with lunatics, idiots and infants, as being those who are denied the franchise. On this continent in the great Republic, the man who was a slave on the plantation not many years ago has a vote, while highly intelligent women in Philadelphia or New York are——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was it a good thing to give the slave a vote ?

Mr. DAVIN. I am not making an argument in favour of that proposition ; I am only dwelling upon the fact that while the emancipated slave gets a vote, you refuse a vote to these highly clever and instructed persons. The enfranchisement of women would elevate the tone of politics. A very eminent man on the other side of the line told me, speaking of politics as he found them : If you had a candidate for Congress who had swept the honours at Harvard or Yale, if you wanted to get that candidate elected, it would be better for you to conceal from the electorate that he was a distinguished college graduate. This, that should be a strong argument in favour of a man as a representative of the people, must not be brought forward at all, because the democratic jealousy is so great that the people would be apt to resent it. Women are quicker in their perceptions than men. In that I am upheld by the greatest men of to-day and the greatest men of the past. Plato held that opinion ; the greatest mind that Greece produced held it and all down the ages you will find the same opinion held by the brightest and most thoughtful minds. There is hardly an eminent man in Christendom who does not hold that women intellectually are equal—"in difference" to translate literally the phrase of a great French writer by which he expressed the opinion that women are not inferior in intellectual power from men. It is with mankind just as with the lower animals. Any man accustomed to horses or other domestic animals knows that in regard to the functions we get them to discharge, and which we have to teach them, the female is far more susceptible to education than the male. And a woman is undoubtedly quicker in intellect than a man. I do not say that women are superior ; but while there is a clear difference intellectually, just as there is a difference physically, there is an absolute equality, in my opinion. I think it exceedingly likely that what my friend complained of in the United States, this tendency to a minimum of excellence in the representative—that seems to be the democratic law—would not be enhanced by the admission of women to politics. On the contrary, I think it probable that to include them among the electorate would quicken the intelligence and perceptiveness of the constituency, and might tend to counteract the law which my friend said was palpably at work in the United States,—this tendency to a minimum of excellence in the representative. I believe that the result would be, to raise the woman, as Mr. Courtney said. If we look back to the last thirty years we see that in the position of the wife as holder of property, in the position of woman socially, educationally, and politically so far as municipal institutions and school boards are concerned, great progress has been made, and with advantage to the whole community. And if the House shall sanction this proposition, and so justify me in bringing in the Bill that shall translate it into law, I believe that this Parliament will take a wise step. And it will take that step with the sanction of such great names as those of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Disraeli—Lord Beaconsfield—the greatest and most conservative statesman we have had since Pitt, and of the greatest name in literature, science and art in Christendom to-day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it would be only courteous to the House, and I think the House would have the right to exact it as a duty, to be informed why the Government upon this question moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can only speak for myself personally. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in his very excellent address discussed the question from every standpoint, and gave a very great deal of material to the House which will be of great assistance to any member who desires to discuss the question thoroughly as such a question ought to be discussed in this House. I waited for some other gentleman to rise who had devoted himself specially to the subject and was prepared to discuss the question off-hand. No other gentleman having risen and desiring to speak, but not without the fullest information or without the investigation which I feel was due to the splendid effort of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, I moved the adjournment for the purpose. I acted in courtesy to my hon. friend and with the desire that I might have an adjournment rather than go on and discuss the question without proper preparation.

Mr. CHARLTON. Surely the hon. Secretary of State can scarcely take the position that this debate should be adjourned because the House is in such total ignorance of the merits of the case that time has to be taken to investigate it. I imagine there is scarcely a public question upon which members are more likely to have formed an opinion, and to be able to give a reason for their opinion, than upon this question under discussion. I can hardly look upon the proposal to adjourn this debate as anything else than an attempt on the part of the Government to shunt the discussion of a question that may possibly be rather un-

pleasant, or rather embarrassing to them. Whatever may be our views as to the merits of this question, I think it would be but fair to meet it now. It is well known to my hon. friend that the adjournment of this debate probably means the shunting of the question for the remainder of the session.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say that I only made the motion because of the circumstances which I have explained to the House. but if the House desires to debate the question now, and if my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), for instance, desires to speak upon it, I have great pleasure in withdrawing the motion, with the consent of the House.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit to the House that the Government, in this matter, as in many others, are not properly discharging the duties that belong to them. It is their duty to instruct the House upon all matters of policy which come before the House. The Government are derelict in that, whenever a matter of this kind comes up, they have no voice or no opinion to offer. It is their duty in all questions of policy to have a voice and to instruct the House. Now, this is not a new question ; it is a question that has been debated more than once, and is one, it seems to me, as to which every man in this House should be ready to express an opinion, and especially the hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches. For my part, speaking personally, I may say at once that I agree in a large measure with everything that has been said by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The days have long since passed by when it was supposed that woman was an inferior being. There was a time, indeed, when the question was discussed as to whether woman had a soul ; but these times are so far remote that it is hardly worth while recalling that fact. But it is not so many years ago, not to go beyond the commencement of the present century, when it was currently supposed that woman was unfit to discharge the duties of political life. I believe that the present sovereign of Great Britain has shown that woman is just as fit as man to discharge all the higher duties of statesmanship. There is one thing, however, to be said on the other hand. Though I acknowledge that the intellectual equality of women, and in many instances, the intellectual superiority of woman, can be easily granted, I am not sure for my part that the granting of the franchise to women would be altogether an unmixed evil. I am not sure that it would tend to the harmony or to the improvement of domestic life, which after all is the proper centre of woman's influence. There is an objection on that ground ; but to my mind there is another consideration which should prevail in a discussion of this question. Whether the suffrage is applied to women, or whether it is applied to any other class of Her Majesty's subjects, it is largely a question of education, largely a question of habit, and largely a question of social disposition. On this side of the House we have maintained, and the motion of my hon. friend is further evidence of the right position we have taken on this question, that the regulation of the franchise is a matter which more especially concerns the provinces. Let the provinces decide the question. That is the only solution which can be given to the motion of my hon. friend. There may be provinces at the present time which are ready to grant the suffrage to women ; there may be provinces, perhaps, where from the education of the people, from their social habits, it might be conducive to the general good of the country that women should be admitted to the franchise. As to the province from which I come, I must say that it is not prepared for woman suffrage. I am of French descent, and as such I claim to have just as high a regard, and, perhaps, a higher regard, for women than our fellow-citizens of British origin; but even in the Government of Quebec,as I have stated elsewhere—and my hon. friend was good enough to quote my words—if the proposition were made in the local legislature to confer the suffrage on women, I am quite sure it would be voted down at once. There is no feeling in favour of it, there is no necessity felt for it, and we are satisfied to leave things as they are. It may be that a different feeling may prevail in the province of Ontario, and in some other provinces of the confederation. But how is this to be determined ? Let the local legislature in each province determine that question for itself. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that if the province of Ontario, or the local legislature of that province, is ready to-morrow to extend the suffrage to women—and as I read public opinion, the day is not far distant when this will take place—I shall be quite willing. for my part, that woman suffrage in Ontario should be the basis of all elections, not only for the province of Ontario, but for the Dominion House as well. But let every province speak for itself. I am speaking on behalf of my own province, in which there is no such demand for this new departure in our political life. I think the way to dispose of this matter is to relegate it where it belongs, that is to say, let it be determined by the provinces. I notice one argument which was used just now by my hon. friend ; he stated that by conferring this privilege upon women we would remove a sense of injustice which is now felt by a large section of the community. Well, that may be true in some of the provinces, it is not true of all the provinces ; and speaking for the province of Quebec, I am certainly

right in saying that women do not feel it an injustice that they have no right to vote on any political question. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment that all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor :—

The question of woman suffrage is one which, like other questions concerning the suffrage, more properly belongs to provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the principle involved in that amendment is rather an amusing one, coming from the source it does, because ever since 1885, when a clause was first put into the Franchise Act giving women the right to vote, up to the present time, the leader of the Opposition and his friends in this House have invariably advocated the principle that we should accept the provincial franchise. If we accepted the principle for which hon. gentlemen opposite have been invariably contending, we would accept the provincial franchises as they are at present, and in Ontario women have, to a limited extent, the right to vote in some elections, and, therefore, would have a right to vote for members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. If you adopt provincial franchises, you must of necessity give the same franchise and allow the same voters to vote in elections for members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I am referring to the province of Ontario, where it is the case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Only as regards municipal elections, and I say this power is exercised to a limited extent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the power not exercised to a limited extent when the women to-day have a right to vote for school trustees and for municipal offices ? If we accept the present franchise, and the hon. gentleman and his friends invariably contend that the provincial franchises should be adopted as regards the election of members to this House, then women must be given the right to vote. For my part I see no objection to the present motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but I object to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. If to-day we vote for members of the Dominion Parliament on the basis of property qualification, and women own property as men do and have the same interest in preserving their right and control, why should we deny to them the right to share in the management of public affairs ? We find women to-day engaged in every occupation of life, and to the credit of the sex be it said that they are interesting themselves in the general affairs of life ; they are engaged in science and art, and are graduates of our best universities, and they are displaying equal, and in many instances, superior ability to men in law, medicine and other lines of study. We have them on the platform and in the pulpit ; and we have the noble representative of the sex, our Queen, who stands at the head of all Governments and against whose fair name no word has ever been uttered up to the present moment. Women represent the great teaching class, and, perhaps, more than any other class are responsible for giving that information to the young which will enable them in future years to carry on the affairs of life successfully and discharge their duty, both to the state and to themselves. The exercise of the franchise is based upon property qualifications so far as regards the election of members of this House, and if that is the case, and no one can deny it, why should we deny women the right to vote for members of this House ? They vote for members of the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. SPROULE. If hon. gentlemen will look at the history of other countries they will find, as has been advanced by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that some of the most able men of the day have presented strong arguments in favour of this contention. If we take the practical experience in those countries and in the States which have adopted the franchise for women, no successful argument can be advanced against their rights to vote. They possess this right in Australia, and they exercise it with great credit to themselves, and certainly without detriment to the state. In every country where they exercise this right they use it discreetly and well. It has been said that the possession of such a right might cause trouble in domestic life and result in want of domestic harmony. Such has not been the case in those countries where this power has been exercised to the limited extent to which it is used to-day. A few years ago the same arguments now presented were offered to prevent women exercising the rights to vote in elections for municipal officers and school trustees. There is no reason against extending this power to women—I have always been in favour of it—the trend of public opinion is in that direction, and the time will come when our most intelligent legislators will admit that women have the same right to exercise the franchise as is possessed by men.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has been speaking against what he fancies are the opinions of some hon. members of this House. There have been no opinions expressed on the subject, except those expressed by the hon. member for

West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member himself. If I remember rightly when the question was up in 1885 on the Franchise Bill, the hon. gentleman himself voted against extending the franchise to women.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman will find his name recorded amongst the majority who eliminated the clause proposing to give women votes at elections for members of this House. The hon. gentleman has stated that women now vote in elections for members of the Ontario Legislature. If the amendment is adopted, the hon. gentleman's present view will be given effect to so far as Ontario is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. Not for the Dominion elections ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes ; if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct as regards Ontario. The Finance Minister, I suppose, has not changed his mind since last year. The Prime Minister introduced a measure by which he proposed to supercede the present law and adopt the franchises of the various provinces and their qualifications of electors for members of this House. That was the Bill of last year. That Bill received the sanction of all the colleagues of the hon. gentleman, and it received the sanction of those hon. gentlemen who now support the Administration in this House. I assume that the measure which was introduced by the Government last year, to the principle to which the Government was committed last year, embodies a principle which the Government are prepared to accept now, and from which they are not disposed to recede. If that be so, the motion of the hon. gentleman will meet the views expressed by my hon. friend who has just spoken, because if the local legislature chose to adopt woman's suffrage, the qualification of voters for the election of members of the House of Assembly in each province would be the qualification for the members for election to this House. That being the case, if the hon. gentleman is correct in his view of the provincial law, which I am inclined to think he is not——

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is mistaken in what I said about provincial law. I said that women had a right to vote for school trustees and municipal officers. That was only in regard to municipal elections.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is quite beside the general statement which the hon. gentleman made. The hon. gentleman's statement was, that women would be entitled to vote for members of this House if the local law of Ontario were adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would only be the case if the law as regards the qualification of voters at elections for members of the Assembly became the qualification as regards the elections of members for this House. That being in the motion of my hon. friend it should be perfectly acceptable to both sides of the House. The Government Bill of last year proposed to add certain officials who cannot vote under the provincial law. I believe they are on the voters' lists in nearly all the provinces, and where they are disqualified they are disqualified by the oath which the provincial law requires ; but that was a matter about which the adoption of the local franchise by this House was to be in that respect modified. So far as the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is concerned, this motion perfectly meets it, and meets it in accord with the views expressed by hon. gentlemen last year on that side of the House, and by hon. gentlemen always on this side of the House, and, that being so, I think that the amendment of my hon. friend ought to be acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say I am rather surprised at the course the Government have taken on this question, so far. I have not seen, during the present session of Parliament, a greater exhibition of weakness and indecision from the Government than I have noticed in connection with this motion. Here is a proposition of the hon. member (Mr. Davin) which would virtually double the number of the electorate of this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes ; nearly so. He proposes that women who are entitled by the possession of property, should be placed on the voters' lists. We know perfectly well that if the law were so changed, a very large percentage of married, and a large number of unmarried women would become possessed of property, and have the right to exercise the franchise. While that is the purport of the hon. gentleman's motion, the Government sit still. The question was called, and for a moment there was not a word from the Government, and they were not prepared to express an opinion. The fact of the matter is that the Secretary of State appeared to be taken so much by surprise that he was not able to deal with the arguments of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and he proposed to adjourn the debate so that he might post himself upon the question, in order that, at some future day he would be able to deal with the arguments of the hon. member. We know that, upon a former occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) told us that he discharged the duties of a funnel to a great many members of the Cabinet. It appears that he has discharged that particular duty

on this occasion to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State virtually confesses it by proposing to adjourn the debate on the ground that he is not now capable of dealing with this very important question. I admire the submissive conduct of the Secretary of State. After having proposed to adjourn the debate, he appears for a moment to have forgotten that there is some person ahead of him and that he is not yet leader of the House, and the thought struck him that he had better consult his leader, who sits in front of him, and immediately he withdraws his motion for adjournment. It is to be hoped that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) will try and realize in future the position that he occupies. I do not wish to lecture the hon. gentleman upon that point, but he must see that his course has been rather inconsistent. I have sat in this House for some twelve sessions, and I never before saw a question of this importance come before the House when the Government were not prepared, in some way, to deal with it, and to advise a course of action to their followers. The Government, apparently, now have no opinions to express, and no views on the question, and they are prepared to sit still and let every man do as he pleases. The leader of the Opposition has urged the members of the Cabinet to express their views, but they have not yet done so. Will they do so now?

Mr. CRAIG. I am surprised that members on the opposite side of the House should avail themselves of an occasion like this to attack the Government. A few years ago, when I had the honour and pleasure to sit in the Ontario Assembly, this question was introduced there, as it was every year, and on that occasion, I remember quite well, the hon. the Premier of Ontario was in favour of granting the suffrage to women, but the Hon. Mr. Hardy, and the Hon. Mr. Fraser, two of his colleagues, made very strong speeches against it. I believe that the members of the Opposition here are very inconsistent to expect that a Government should agree on a question of this kind on which you can hardly find a unanimous agreement among any body of men. For my own part, while I admire the ingenuity of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I am a little surprised to find him advocating a measure of this kind. I would not be at all surprised to find in the mover of such a motion, a member who had shown his great appreciation of the fair sex by proposing to one of them and linking his fortunes with her. But to find a confirmed bachelor propose such a motion is, I confess, a surprise. I have a sort of an idea that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) fancies, it might, perhaps, place some men who are married in rather an awkward position. They might find that while they entertain certain views on political questions, their better halves entertain views diametrically opposite, which might not lead to amity in the household, but rather the reverse, and which might make a little difficulty in training up the children in the way they should go, especially upon political questions. But let us put aside all joking on this question—and I notice that when a question of this kind is introduced, there is always a considerable amount of jocularity, unless it is used as an occasion for attacking the Government, when it at once becomes a serious question. I notice that is the only line taken by members of the Opposition to-day. They have not dealt with this question on its merits. They think the Government should be prepared at once to state their views upon it, and debate it, and they think it a very strange thing that the hon. Secretary of State should move the adjournment of the debate. Now, I do not think it at all strange, and I thought his arguments for doing that were very reasonable. While I have not at present given this question much consideration, I have previously thought a little about it, and I will state some of the reasons why I cannot support the resolution of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I may say in advance that it is not because I have not as high an appreciation of the fair sex as my hon. friend. I think it is rather because I appreciate them still more highly. I think, Sir, that it would take away from the real charm and womanliness of women if they were given the franchise and allowed to mix in politics. It was said by the hon. member in moving his resolution that nowadays there was no hustling about, and voting was conducted very quietly. That is true: no doubt voting as it is conducted to-day under the ballot is a very quiet and tame affair; but we all know that the voting is not the most important part of an election. We know that the principal work, such as canvassing, is nearly all done before: and for my part I would have some objection to politicians coming around my house and making themselves very agreeable in order to secure my wife's vote. I can imagine that I might go home some evening, and find, instead of my being expected, with tea on the table, nothing was done, because the absorbing question of the hour was politics. I might find a very nice-looking politician sitting in the parlour soliciting a vote. I do not know that I would appreciate such a situation very much. Suppose we had not only the candidate but all his canvassers going around in that way one after another, I am afraid a good many married men would get tired of the situation. But, seriously—and this is the reason I oppose this resolution—I believe that it would take away a great deal of the charm of woman. I believe that woman's proper sphere is the home. I believe that there she has enough

room to exercise all her powers and faculties, and there she has an influence, that cannot be overestimated, over her husband and her children. This influence, I believe, would be lessened if women mixed up in political contests. The hon. member for West Assiniboia referred to the picture of the model woman in the Book of Proverbs; but I defy him to point out a line in that chapter which shows that that woman engaged in politics. All through the chapter, I find that the great characteristic of that woman was that she was looking well after the affairs of her house—after the girls in the house and after her husband's welfare, and seeing that everything was made comfortable for him; and I think that is a very good thing for woman to do. But there is not a line in that chapter to show that the model woman was engaged in politics or had the privilege of casting a vote. If the franchise were given to woman, the question would not stop there. The next thing would be that women would wish to be candidates for Parliament, and some of us would be left out in the cold. I am hardly prepared to vote for that. But there is one argument against a resolution of this kind which I think is a very strong one; that is, that women themselves do not ask for this privilege. It may be said that they do. While it is true that it is demanded by a few women who by nature are active and busy in the world, perhaps because they have nothing else to do, yet we find that the majority of women do not ask for the privilege, and I am satisfied that if it were granted to them the great majority would not exercise it. There is only one argument that I can imagine strongly in favour of this resolution: that is, that the granting of the suffrage to women would purify politics. That argument has been used very often, and it is a very plausible argument. I could understand, if all women voted, and the best women exercised their influence in politics, that it might tend in that direction; but I believe that if the suffrage were given to women we would find a few of them voting, while the great majority would not. I believe we would find that those women whom we look upon as the best women, the women who stay at home and train up their families in the way they should go, would not vote at all; so that the idea that politics would be purified would not be realized. Sir, what is the danger in our politics to-day? It is this—and we see it especially in the United States—that the best men do not control politics. We find in many cases that they stay at home, that they stand quitely aside and criticise, instead of actually controlling politics as they might do. I believe that a similar state of things would exist with regard to women if they had the franchise; the best of them would not engage in political contests; they would be too disgusted with politics to do so; they would stay at home. I would be very glad to support this motion of my hon. friend if I could do so, because I have a very high appreciation of women and of what they have done. It is impossible to estimate all that women have done, and are doing to-day, to elevate society; but I do not believe the time has come, nor do I believe it will ever come, when it will be wise to give them the suffrage.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) The reason given by the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Montague) for the adjournment of this debate are, I think, quite acceptable, and I cannot see why they have not been acquiesced in. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made lengthy remarks in connection with his motion now before us. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, it is an important and interesting question that which has reference to the woman suffrage. However, there is a most serious principle underlying it, one worthy of the most serious consideration, and which seems not to have been considered proportinately to its importance. It is a mistake. In my opinion, it would be proper to thoroughly consider this question before deciding on the motion before the House. But since the question is before the House, since it has been brought up here, I think it my duty to state my views. The hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Montague) could, in my opinion, well have stood by his motion for an adjournment of the debate, but since he was pleased to withdraw it, I will avail myself of the opportunity given me to briefly state my views in connection with the subject-matter of this debate, although I could only hear but very few of the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The hon. gentleman stated that this question of the woman suffrage was an important one. Indeed, it is, and for the sake of a principle which I also considered as important, I will oppose the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia. I listened to the first part of the speech of the hon. gentleman, that in the course of which he made the history of womankind. There was a time when a woman was a slave. Such was her condition in the ancient order of things which prevailed prior to modern civilization. After raising her up from such an abject condition, some would now put her on an equal footing with man. They want to make a man of her with respect to the rights and privileges she ought to exercise. The history of womankind which was given to us is true, but it bears with it an instructive lesson. It shows that in relation to a question such as this, one is exposed to fall into exaggeration, and after keeping for a long time womankind in a wretched servitude, some are now exposed to fall into an opposite exaggeration by raising her up too high after keeping her too low. This is the important point to which I may be allowed to call the attention of the hon. member for Assini-

boia (Mr. Davin). I may also be allowed to ask whether his motion is not an indication that we are exposed to fall into an exaggerated feeling, a feeling of which I cannot approve, neither can it be approved of by the great majority in this House. To put women on a footing of perfect equality with men seems to me an unadmissible principle, for we cannot expect that they could exercise such rights the same as men could do, whatever the hon. member for Assiniboia may say to the contrary. We cannot expect that from a political point of view, women could be as useful as men in the community. They are too liable to the inabilities inherent to their sex, they are too much enslaved to their anatomical and physiological constitution so to say, for them to be possibly put on an equal footing with men. It is in such a light that one ought to consider the part played by womankind. Otherwise we are exposed to draw false inferences which might induce us to make an improper legislation. I say women ought to be judged, as to the part they play in the community, after the attributes inherent to their sex, as men themselves ought to be. I shall not go now into details, the time would not be proper, I think, to give a scientific course of lectures on this subject, but it will be sufficient for the people and for this House to know, for the present at all events, that the position of women is not at all the same as that of men in this respect. I, therefore, cannot agree with the hon. gentleman and vote for his motion to give women a right to vote. On this question, I am induced to differ in opinion with him by a matter of principle. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, to allow women to vote is, without any necessity, to impose on them a new obligation, a new duty, in addition to those which they have already as daughters, wives and mothers, in addition, as I stated, to the numerous obligations they have as women. And why are they liable to such obligations? On account of their sex they are essentially born and organized to play a part altogether different from that of men, and though you might give them a right to vote, it would not change the character of their obligations. It would, therefore, be imposing on them a new duty, as I have just stated, and I have too much regard for women—and this is my way to show them my respect—I say I have too much regard for them to impose on them a new function, to overburden their weak shoulders, which could not bear such a heavy burden. I am not willing to impose on them obligations which could be for them a very heavy burden. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the exercise of the suffrage is not merely a mechanical or physical affair; it is an obligation causing to them new duties. A woman, in order to properly vote, will have to support her vote by serious motives and, for that purpose, she will have to devote part of her time to the study of questions which she will be called upon to decide by the exercise of her voting power. She will have to study in order to know how to decide. The hon. member for Assiniboia made a very great praise of women in order to induce us to grant them the right of suffrage. He represented them as being superior to men. If really women are superior to men, then you should examine the question most earnestly, for their vote will have more import than that of men. Therefore, such a vote will require from women protracted and important preliminary studies which would enable them to reason such an important act. Now, all this is a new duty to women, and, for that very reason, I would not like to overburden them by forcing on them a right that would require from them an increase of work. Mr. Speaker, I will go no further in my intended demonstration, as I have not heard the whole speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin). Having been compelled to leave the House, as it often happens to many amongst us, I could not listen to all the observations made by the hon. gentleman. I was anxious, however, to state some of the reasons that induce me to vote against this motion. Although I have not referred to the question as exhaustively as I could have wished, I hope I have said enough, and that with enough clearness, for the House to realize that if we wish to act fairly towards women, we should not impose on them new duties. Therefore, for these reasons, I am opposed to the very principle of the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia. This measure of the hon. gentleman would necessarily lead us to a broader legislation in the same direction, which would result in gradually increasing the suffrage for the women, for I have no doubt that before long they would come and ask for another step towards their full emancipation. Now, it seems to me that this House should forthwith deal with the question from the proper point of view, and that, instead of allowing the motion, such as it is, to pass, it should state that, in its opinion, the privilege to vote at elections ought not to be granted to women. This, in my opinion, should be moved as an amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who would like the question to be absolutely left to the provinces. It is not going far enough to leave this question to the provinces, and no member should fear to state here what his views are with respect to this important question. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I beg to state that the greatest regard one can have for women is to leave them where they now are, to the part they play as women and mothers. I hope that such an opinion as stated by me will not be misconstrued by the sex which none of us would like to offend. I even regret that such a protesta-

tion should come from a member of the province of Quebec, that is to say, from a French speaker. Perhaps I am putting myself in opposition to history, which says the French people are essentially a most courteous people, as suggested, I think, by the leader of the Opposition. I regret, I say, having to record such an opinion, but I think it is the conclusion to which the House should come.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). While I fully admit that the emancipation of woman is one of the great signs of the times, I am still disposed to think that politics is one of the last fields into which women should enter in the process of emancipation. There are many other careers open to her in which she can hope to achieve signal success. Let her devote herself to literature, where success awaits her, although I must say that the position taken in literature by the new woman is not creditable, and some of her work a disgrace to literature. No doubt, in intellectual power, woman is the equal of man, but owing to the physical limitations of her sex and to the emotional side of her nature being stronger than her reasoning power, she is not fitted for public life. If women had their say in politics to-day, the leaders of this country would, in all probability, be of the stamp of those men who advocate prohibition; and men like Mr. Spence of Toronto would probably be Ministers of Finance, and the country be ruled by emotion rather than by reason. I would like to quote the opinion of one of our ablest public men, although one with whom on this side we do not always agree. I refer to Professor Goldwin Smith, who has an article in the "North American Review," in which he says, discussing the situation in the United States:

> In America, as in England, and in the other colonies of England, the restlessness of the age has extended to the domain of sex. Some women are longing to break through the established limitations of womanhood, while they show an inclination to disparage what have hitherto been considered at once the natural duties and glories of woman. They are now seeking to grasp political power, which in their hands would be divorced from responsibility, since the burden and duty of upholding and safeguarding the state must ever remain where nature has put them—in the man. As yet, only two far western states have adopted woman suffrage in its full political form. It has suffered some defeats in other quarters, and was rejected by the Constitutional Convention of New York. On that occasion the opposition to it included a large and distinguished body of women, who thought that they foresaw the ultimate consequences to their sex of an attempt to remove the landmarks of nature. When the full tide of female emotion shall be added to the political vortex, when women shall have become political, when the female demagogue with her platform shall have become fully developed, the final trial of popular government will be near.

I heartily agree with that opinion. I believe the trial of popular government will come when woman takes part in politics. Politics are not suited to the physical limitations which surround her sex; and, although there have been women who were powerful in literature and politics, yet we find that these same women have also been obstructionists in politics and literature. Queen Elizabeth has been cited as a great queen. True, she was a great queen, but she was also a tyrant, and she insisted in forcing her own views on the statesmen by whom she was surrounded; and history proves that, although England became great during her reign, England also suffered damage from many of her acts. Her Majesty Queen Victoria is held up to us as a great queen and one of the leading politicians of Europe, but there are many who think that even her position would have been better filled by a man and her duties better performed.

Mr. DAVIN. A man like George IV.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Not necessarily. With regard to the question raised by the leader of the Opposition, namely, that we should refer this question of woman's suffrage to the provinces, I do not agree with them. We have taken the position that the federal power ought to make its own franchise. We have upheld that principle session after session. If the leader of the Opposition charges this side of the House with trying to evade this responsibility, we must also charge him with trying to evade it in some way. We must make our own franchise and shoulder the responsibility; and once we decide to give the vote to women, they will have the right to be candidates and to sit in this House and take part in our deliberative assembly. I do not think we ought to countenance any such idea. I do not believe that the women are in favour of this. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of them are decidedly opposed to it.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) upon the retrieving work which he began to-day. During a rather long and brilliant career, he always made a show of the utmost disregard for women by not even condescending to associate one of them with his life, and now he thinks that, before leaving the arena, he can atone for all his wrongs by kneeling before them and saying to them: You are worthy to lead us. I fear it is too late, and that, notwithstanding his admiration, women will not forgive him for the long suffering he inflicted upon them by his persistent single life. This question of the enfranchisement of women is an extremely important one, for it relates to one of the fundamental principles of the social question. For my part, I must say immediately that I am opposed to the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition as well as to the

main motion. And here are the reasons why. I am opposed to the provinces having a right to decide who shall come here and make laws for the whole Dominion of Canada. I do not wish to see my own province in particular, led by a class of men, women and children selected by the other provinces. I want the laws that shall govern the province of Quebec to be acceptable to the majority in that province, and I wish that we should keep the guarantee that this majority will be the outcome of elections based on the present franchise. Although the question was well threshed out, we made some mistakes here when dealing with the electoral franchise. I intend saying what these mistakes were, and how they could still be aggravated if we should leave to the provinces the right to control the Dominion franchise. The first mistake we made was this: We invaded the province of the family head when we allowed the sons of farmers to come and vote, often against the opinion of their fathers. Instead of giving to the family head a vote for each child he had, qualified to vote by the property he held: instead of increasing the prestige and influence of the family head, according to the number of children he had, we decreased that influence by saying: The more children you have, the less your vote is worth. On the other hand, we said to the young man: If your father should give you orders which you dislike, you will take revenge upon him by decreasing his influence through your franchise. By the franchise conferred to the young men under the authority of their parents, we did away with the autonomy of the family and the authority of the family head. I am well aware that they pleaded for liberty, but it is a false principle. Providence has established the family as the basis of the community, and whoever invades the province of the family by increasing the rights of the son to the detriment of those of the father does away with the family, this great basis of social security. What do they now propose to us? They propose that we should confer, not only to the young men under the authority of their parents, but even to the daughters and wives the right to come and vote along with their brothers. They wish to go further still into the family and they say to the daughter, to the sister as they said to the brother: You have all a right to thwart the wishes of your parents. The main motion goes still further, for it says to the wife of the family head: You too, can nullify the vote of your husband. They thus run the risk of sowing dissension, discord and rebellion into the family. Mr. Speaker, it is no question of disregarding the women when declining to enfranchise them. We all admit that they are the most beautiful part of humanity. They are, so to say, the point of connection between earth and Heaven. They assume something of the angel. They soothe and alleviate social evils. We all admit that, and none of us would speak against his mother, sister or daughter; but why not leave things at their proper place? What is the part played by women in this world? Were they made to bear a burden, to do hard work, to make war? I know that in some cases, Providence made use of a Joan of Arc, for instance, who was an extraordinary woman, a sublime woman. But, as a rule, the part they have to play is a more simple, more ideal, more spiritual a one, so to say; it is the part of kindness which springs from the heart. There is the true, the beautiful part of a woman, for she is made for the house, for the home of which she is an angel. There would be much imprudence to make a voter of her, to entangle her in the shovings and acts of violence which accompany our political contests, frequently at the very doors of the polling booth. Women were not made for that. Let us leave them their moral purity, their bashfulness, their sweetness, which give them in our minds so much charm, and the community will loose nothing thereby. The power of women will not grow less. That power woman exercises it with respect to every one of us when we go back home to see again our wives and our children; it is exercised through a concourse of fondness and kindness in every serious circumstance throughout life, whether joyful or painful, and always that charm is due to a magnanimous devotion, to a spirit of self-denial, to a spirit of sacrifice which increase its value. Providence intended that it should be so. A woman renders thereby a greater service to the social body than she could do by becoming a voter. It ill-becomes the community to change her sex and to degrade her by the exercise of the franchise. Not that I say that in some circumstances it would not be proper perhaps to give her such a right. For instance, I am aware that, in the province of Quebec, a woman may be enfranchised by law in municipal and school matters. And why is that, Mr. Speaker? Because in such cases the women are directly concerned, because they themselves manage an estate that is going to be taxed, because they will send their children to the school that is about to be established. And then in what cases is a woman a voter? That franchise is never granted to daughters under the authority of their parents. No. That right is granted only to a woman who manages a sufficient estate to qualify her as a voter were she a man. Therefore that provincial legislation does not go as far as the Dominion Franchise Act which enables a child to vote against his father. However, I will not discuss that point now. I stand by the resolution moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He asks us to state that "in the opinion of

this House, the privilege of voting for candidates for membership thereof should be extended to women possessing the qualifications which now entitle men to the electoral franchise." It follows from this, Mr. Speaker, that a woman living in separate maintenance with her husband and being the owner of a property, worth, say $20,000, will be entitled to vote and with her as many daughters as would be qualified by that amount. If she has five daughters, each of these will likewise be a voter. I value the admiration suddenly professed for women by my hon. friend the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and of which he so expressively acquainted us—although, by the way, he could have supported in a different way his appreciation of the great qualities of women and the admiration he has for them—but I cannot agree to put women on the same footing as men, not to change the part assigned by Providence to each of the sexes in the community. Mr. Speaker, the Government is reproached with having no policy in relation to this question. I cannot see why the Government should be bound to set forth at this moment a policy with respect to this matter. The Government moved the adjournment of the debate in order to enable the House to form an opinion on the principle at stake and its consequences. That was a fair request, and in making it the Government has voiced the feeling of the members of this House. As an evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the importance there is for the House to have time to consider this question and realize the consequences that would follow the adoption of this motion. I may say that when I explain this motion, its promoter nods to me that I put a wrong construction on it. When I say that by this resolution the wife will be a voter in the life time of her husband, and when I say to my hon. friend that the granting of his motion would confer a vote to the daughters of such a woman and generally to daughters living under the authority of their parents, he nods to me that I am not in it. That proves how necessary is an adjournment of this debate; for my part, I would like to understand the scope of the resolution now before us and to get new explanations from my hon. friend, or, at the very least, I would like to read his speech in full. I also wish that he should have time to answer the objections which we are likely to raise. It is not one of those questions as to which a Government is bound to give an opinion at five minutes' notice, and I think it would be well to adjourn the debate. I cannot argue with the hon. leader of the Opposition when he says that this matter should be left to the provinces. There is much talk now about the rights of the provinces. I think we are falling into an exaggeration in this respect. Some people have said that the provinces could and ought to select those who are to elect their representatives in this Parliament. They have not said that such a proposition bided a snare, that in some provinces thousands of citizens are disfranchised by local laws, that in some provinces they disfranchised, for party purposes and for no other reasons, thousands of voters. They would, however, enable the provinces to dictate beforehand who the people will be who will come and sit here. They offered as an excuse that such invidious laws have been in force for many years. Why have they not repealed them? It is because they succeeded in keeping into power owing to this selection, to this sorting of the people. Owing to this selection, they were able to keep a majority which they would have lost without that. Now, they would like, Mr. Speaker, to confer to the provinces, not only the right to fix the provincial qualification of the voters, but also the moral qualifications of those who shall exercise the electoral franchise; in short, to say that such a woman or such a man will or will not be a voter, I cannot agree to that. I would not like that the Dominion of Canada could practically be governed by a majority due to the Indian women of the North-west. It is the unquestionable privilege of any representative body to provide who will elect the members thereof. It would be unwise to delegate it for ever. To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I am against the amendment because it deprives this Parliament of a privilege it ought to preserve. I am against the resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) because it is too general, because it would be dangerous for women to enfranchise them, because by making men of them you deprive them of their moral purity, of their sweetness, of their bashfulness which so much add to their charms. You make men of women and you depoetize them.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not rise just now for the purpose of giving my opinion upon the principle involved in the motion of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). If ever the time arrives that it shall be necessary for me to give my opinion on this question, I hope I shall have the privilege of doing so. I rise now rather for the purpose of pointing out what seems to me a distinction and a difference between the remarks made and the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. leader of the Opposition stated, if I properly understood him, that this Parliament should not pronounce upon this question until the provinces have pronounced upon it. That is a position with which I entirely agree. I hold with the hon. leader of the Opposition that this Parliment should not pronounce upon this question or force this change upon any province until the province shall have first pronounced in favour of it. But it is a long cry from that position to the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman. The amendment moved

by the hon. leader of the Opposition gives provinces, or proposes to give them, sole control over the franchise. And that is a proposition that I must dissent from. I believe, Sir, that this Parliament has a right to control the franchise, which is the basis of its representation. I do not believe that this Parliament should be elected upon a franchise which is made by the provinces alone, and therefore I am opposed to the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition as entirely and absolutely different from the remarks he made in opposition to the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I would have only too much pleasure in voting for the hon. gentleman's amendment if he should change it in this particular, and change it so that it shall declare that the woman suffrage shall not be forced upon any province until that province is in favour of it. If he will so change it, I will vote for it; but I must dissent from it as it is, because it seeks to give the provinces the power of legislating upon the franchise with regard to representation in the Dominion Parliament. I think the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition is rather a catch amendment, if I may be permitted to use that expression; it is an amendment rather to force upon this House a declaration of principle which a large number of members of this House are opposed to, and upon that ground I am opposed to the amendment. The hon. member for West Assiniboia, in endeavouring to strengthen his position on the motion he has placed upon the paper, sought to quote Scripture. Well, Sir, if my memory serves me, there is a passage to this effect:

> The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.
> An evil soul, producing holy witness,
> Is like a villain with a smiling cheek,
> A goodly apple rotten at the heart.

They tell me that the poetry is good. I may say that I do not believe that it is entirely applicable to the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I shall oppose the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, because, I think, it seeks to establish a principle with which I cannot agree.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on this subject before the vote is taken, and, as it is now nearly six o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

LIEUT.-GOVERNOR OF MANITOBA.

Mr. McCARTHY. I rise for the purpose of saying that when we assemble again at eight o'clock, I propose to call the attention of the House to a very extraordinary document, published the day before yesterday, I think, by way of advice given to the Government of Manitoba by the Lieutenant-Governor of that province. It is a matter of such consequence, to my way of thinking, that I will move the adjournment of the House, in order that we may consider the propriety of a Lieutenant-Governor, an officer of this Dominion, taking a position I shall explain when we come to deal with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I trust the hon. member will not bring that matter up this evening. I should like to be present when it is discussed, and it will be impossible for me to attend this evening. Would the hon. gentleman bring it up some other time?

Mr. McCARTHY. What other time would suit the hon. gentleman? It is an important matter, and should not be delayed. But I should like to meet the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To-morrow afternoon.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Ottawa and Aylmer Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. McDonald, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Red Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. Pelletier.)

Bill (No. 60) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Niagara, Hamilton, and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the "Alliance Nationale."—(Mr. Lachapelle.)

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Lowell.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he introduced this Bill, told the House that he had undertaken a thankless task, that he was swimming against the stream, and beating the air. I thoroughly agree with him, and I think, also, that he was undertaking an unnecessary task. It is unnecessary for more reasons than one. I was especially surprised when that hon. member got up in this House and took the ground that he was in favour of restriction. Both he and the party with which he is identified have been telling the people of this country from time to time that they are not restrictionists; and especially are they against restriction in trade, and restriction in commerce, restriction in things than can be measured by dollars and cents. But he, a Liberal, comes forward in this House, and is in favour of an altogether different kind of restriction, he is in favour of restriction in matters of conscience, he is in favour of restriction in regard to personal immunity; and he is engaged in this House in trying to forge a yoke to put upon the necks of his fellow-citizens. I am also surprised at that hon. member, who has been identified with the Reform party, coming forward and arguing that we ought to have a federal law to regulate Sunday. If I mistake not, he and his party are champions of provincial rights in this country; and I am here to argue that the provinces are quite competent to make all the laws necessary for the due observance of Sunday. As a matter of fact, we have a first-class Sabbath law in Ontario. It is well administered, and it is administered in this very matter of Sunday newspapers. Now, I happen to be connected with a newspaper, and last January, when there was a great fire in Toronto, we did run out a Sunday edition of that paper. I was promptly brought up in the police court and fined $1 and costs therefor, and the provincial law was all that was necessary to secure the due observance of the Sabbath. The boys who sold papers on that day were also brought up in the police court; and there is plenty of law in the province of Ontario for dealing with newsboys who are charged with such a crime. They are brought into court privately, and are lectured by the magistrate; and they were lectured in this particular case. The hon. gentleman is going altogether too far in trying to pass a federal law when we have a first-class provincial law on the statute-book which covers both the cases cited by him. Another thing that struck me was that he got up in this House and told us that this was a Christian country. I thoroughly agree with him, and I hope it will always continue to be a Christian country. But it does not follow that because this is a Christian country we must put the whole Mosaic decalogue on the Canadian statute-book, and evidently that is what he intends to do, if he is allowed to do it in this House. If he wants Christian law in regard to the Sabbath, and I have no objection to have it put on the statute-book, then I would refer him to Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, chapter 2, verses 16 and 17:

> Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days.
>
> Which are a shadow of things to come.

Now, there is Christian doctrine, and we have had it laid down time after time, and we do not want the hon. member for North Norfolk, or any one else to come here and interfere with liberty of conscience and personal liberty in regard to the Sabbath. If the hon. gentleman will only adopt that Christian idea, which he will find in the Scriptures and which was taught by our blessed Master himself, he will not interfere with us, but he will leave the question of the observance of the Sabbath to each man's own conscience. Another point is this. When the hon. gentleman professed to speak from the provincial point of view he failed to remember that the people of Quebec do not hold the same views in regard to the Sabbath observance as do the people of Ontario, and the people of Quebec should have the right to observe the Sabbath to suit themselves and their consciences, and it should not be the part of this House to endeavour to pass a general law, which will be unsatisfactory to that province and several of the other provinces. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has expressed his desire to have workingmen protected in their Sunday. So am I. If the hon. gentleman will bring down the draft of the Bill declaring that a man shall work not more than six days out of seven to make a living, I will support it. That is a law such as we want in this country. If he will not introduce such a measure, I may take it on myself at a subsequent period to submit such a Bill to the House. That is what we want, not a Bill saying that the people must do so and so on Sunday, but a measure setting forth that every man shall be able, by six days' labour, to make a living and not be compelled to work on the seventh day. I, therefore, consider this Bill an unncessary one; it is an interfering measure, it is an illiberal measure, it is a reactionary mea-

sure, and above all it is a measure which a member calling himself a Liberal and professing to be against all restrictions and in favour of provincial rights should not introduce into this Federal Legislature. I therefore move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. CURRAN. With respect to the Bill now before the House, I do not think the Bill as drafted is as good a measure as the law that now exists for the preservation of order and the good observance of the Lord's day. Last year we had a very long discussion over this Bill, or a similar one, and several amendments were adopted. I do not know why the hon. gentleman did not adopt the phraseology of the first section as amended, and which proved satisfactory to the House at large. If we take the law of Ontario, which is the law of nearly all of the English-speaking provinces of the Dominion, we find it provided in the Revised Statutes, 1887, Chap. 203, that:

> It is not lawful for any merchant, tradesman, artificer, mechanic, workman, labourer or other person whatsoever on the Lord's day to sell publicly show forth or expose or offer for sale or to purchase any goods, chattels or any other personal property or real estate whatsoever, or to do or exercise any worldly labour, business or work of his ordinary calling, except as regards selling drugs or medicine, and works of necessity and works of charity.

That is so far as regards the province of Ontario, and that law covers every conceivable point that can be put in the English language so far as the prohibition of any servile work, or sale of newspapers, or any other articles whatsoever on the Lord's day is concerned. We find in the province of Quebec there is also a provision in the Revised Statutes of the province which says that:

> No shopkeeper, pediar, hawker or other person shall sell or retail any goods, wares or merchandise during Sunday, under a penalty of not more than $20 for the first offence, and not more than $40 for each subsequent offence.

In Nova Scotia servile labour of all kinds is prohibited under Cap. 159, Revised Statutes, 1894. In New Brunswick servile labour is also prohibited, and in fact such is the case in all the English provinces, in which we find laws in force founded upon the English statute of Charles II. In each province sales are prohibited in almost identical language. The only province in which there is any difference as regards the law is in the province of Manitoba, where these matters are relegated to the municipalities, which have a right within their own limits to make such regulations as they think proper for the due observance of the Lord's day. Having these provincial statutes in force, which absolutely cover everything that is aimed at by this Bill, I do not see why the hon. gentleman, if he wants to make one uniform law, did not adopt the phraseology accepted by this House last session. Instead of doing so, he has gone back to all that was objectionable in the draft Bill. Take the first clause. It says:

> Who shall on the Lord's day engage in the publication and issuing.

What kind of language is that—what does it cover? Will such language not give rise to any amount of litigation in the courts? Why not say 'whoever shall print and publish or issue"? When is the publication to begin? Supposing a newspaper is printed on Friday or Saturday and it is sold only on Sunday, is it merely the boy who sells the newspaper you are going to strike at? We have other expressions in the same section which are equally objectionable. The Bill requires more than the provincial law to constitute an offence. Publishing a newspaper under the local law is an offence now, but this Bill requires the publication and issuing. The clause goes on to say:

> Whoever shall engage in the sale of any newspaper on that day shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence; but nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the gratuitous distribution of religious publications on the Lord's day.

Where is the line to be drawn? There are religious publications containing a considerable amount of secular news, while the body of the paper may be a matter of a religious character. There are Sunday newspapers issued in some places, not many of them in Canada, in which there is a considerable quantity of religious news. Probably there is a sermon by some eminent divine, which will cover a whole side of the paper. How are the magistrates or judges to decide whether such a publication is a religious publication or not? Yet every magistrate in the country will have to decide what is a religious publication. It will be almost impossible to get a decision as to what is a religious publication in the sense indicated by the Bill, and yet magistrates and judges will be called upon to decide whether persons have been guilty of an indictable offence or not. The Bill as amended last year provided that:

> Whoever shall on the Lord's day engage in the sale of any newspaper shall be guilty of an indictable offence.

That does not, to my mind, cover the ground any more than does the present Bill, and the law as it exists in the provinces is preferable. The section of the Bill as amended last session closed with these words:

> But nothing in this section shall affect the distribution by any publisher in the ordinary way, or shall prevent the distribution of religious publications in churches, Sunday schools or religious meetings.

After a long discussion last year, after the subject had been considered by both sides

of the House, after every hon. member interested in it had applied his mind to amending the Bill so as to make it workable, and that the judges and magistrates would know exactly what the law was, it was decided that these religious publications could be distributed gratuitously in churches, Sunday schools and in religious meetings. These publications were not to be gratuitously distributed on the streets. The Bill did not define what style of paper was to be considered a religious publication. The place or places where they were to be distributed was to give them the stamp —in churches, Sunday schools and in religious meetings. After much trouble and care this decision was arrived at by the House. Now, the hon. gentleman, for reasons best known to himself, undertakes to subvert the whole action of the House at that time, and submits the draft of a Bill which would be utterly unworkable if it became law to-morrow, and would give rise to conflicting decisions throughout the length and breadth of the land. Under these circumstances I think that this House cannot be called upon to pass this Bill with section No. 1 in its present condition.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Solicitor General in his strictures upon the Bill as now presented inquires: Why not adopt the phraseology of the old Bill? You are aware, Mr. Chairman, that when this Bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole last session there was no possibility of a close consideration of it, and whatever could be obtained must be obtained then or the Bill would lie over for another session. The peculiar state of business in the House rendered it impossible to reach the Bill until the very last day that it could be acted upon, and in the hurry and confusion, various proposals were made and the Bill left this House necessarily in an imperfect condition, and it was refused the courtesy of even a reference to a committee in the Senate and was thrown out, partly because it was said to be imperfect in its character. The point was raised last year that section one would prevent the distribution of newspapers and letters in post offices in Quebec province upon the Lord's day. It was sought to obviate that difficulty. The objection was then made that the section would prevent the distribution of religious publications in Sunday schools and churches and other religious assemblies. Well, Sir, the section as it now stands in the present Bill is, in my opinion, an improvement upon the section of the Bill last year because it states more definitely what was intended, and it covers the ground intended to be covered by the alleged imperfect section in the Bill as it was sent to the Senate from this House last year. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Curran) tells us that the provincial laws are all that is necessary in reference to this matter. He quotes the provisions of the provincial law of Ontario and of Quebec and of other provinces, and he tells us that in all these provinces the hawking and the sale of merchandise is an illegal act upon the Lord's day.

Mr. CURRAN. Of any goods.

Mr. CHARLTON. Any goods. And the Solicitor General tells us that for that reason these laws provide perfectly for all that is intended to be provided for in this section. Well, Sir, none of those laws provide for the regulation of the distribution through the mails of a newspaper published on the Lord's day. That is not a sale of the paper, nor a hawking around of the paper, nor a transaction that is covered in any sense by a provincial law.

Mr. CURRAN. Oh, yes, that is provided for in the statutes of Ontario.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does my hon. friend profess to say that the law of Ontario would prevent the passage of a paper through the mails or of their distribution on the Lord's day?

Mr. CURRAN. Oh, no, I thought you said there was no exception for the mails, and there is.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said that the law with reference to the sale or hawking about of wares would not reach far enough to act efficiently in preventing the distribution or circulation or sale of Sunday newspapers. Now, Mr. Chairman, this may be, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) says, a restrictive measure. It may be a measure that interferes somewhat with his rights of conscience, and it may be a measure, in his opinion, that interferes with his liberty as a subject. But the object of laws is to conserve the public welfare and to secure the greatest possible benefit to the greatest number of people, and it is necessary in making laws for the good of the community to abridge the liberty of the subject to some extent, to prevent the subject from having the liberty to do an act that is wrong or that will be injurious to his neighbour. We must in some cases restrict the absolute liberty of the subject. Laws are made for the purpose of obliging those who are subject to these laws to pursue a particular line of conduct, and the object of law is to secure the greatest good to the greatest number. Now, Sir, that is the object of this law. In advocating this Bill I profess to say that the Sunday newspaper is a great evil. I point to the experience of a country where the Sunday newspaper has existed only for a few years, where a thousand Sunday newspapers are published, and I have the authority of Catholic prelates, and of Protestant prelates, and of public men, and that authority concurs in saying that the Sunday newspaper of the United States has debauched public sentiment and has destroyed, or nearly destroyed, the sanctity,

of the Sabbath, and has dragged that nation down from the position it occupied twenty years ago, as a nation where the Sabbath was tolerably well observed, to be a semi-infidel country to-day. I look at the influence produced by the Sunday newspapers and I say that that condition of things is one to be deplored and to be avoided by us. I say that if we apply, not a remedy for the evil existing, but a preventive now, we would be doing for the people who live in this country, and for our successors who come after us, a great service. Believing as I do, believing as Cardinal Gibbons does, believing as Archbishop Ireland does, that the Sunday newspaper is an absolute and unmitigated curse, calculated to lower the moral as well as the religious tone of any country, I think it behooves us to take measures to exclude it from Canada. I am sincerely desirous of seeing Canada start on a good foundation. We have a good population here, we have got good laws, we have good institutions, and we want to avoid the errors which our neighbours fell into when we see these errors displayed before us. If we avoid the Sunday newspapers, we certainly avoid an error that the Americans have fallen into, and if we follow their error it will produce lamentable consequences in this country. This first section provides :

1. Whoever shall upon the Lord's day, in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical, for the purpose of sale, or distribution either by carrier or through the mails upon that day, and whoever shall engage in the sale of any newspaper on that day, shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence ; but nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the gratuitous distribution of religious publications upon the Lord's day.

Now, my hon. friend the Solicitor General says that the Bill of last year provided that it should be lawful to distribute religious publications in churches, Sunday schools and religious meetings on the Lord's day. The Bill before the House now is more liberal in its provisions. It does not prevent a colporteur from distributing religious publications gratuitously on the street. It does not prevent the Salvation Army from distributing their publications, not only in the church but on the street, and it is intended to be more liberal in its provisions in this respect.

Mr. CURRAN. Last year's Bill was framed for the very purpose of meeting the Salvation Army case.

Mr. CHARLTON. The amendments of last year's Bill were drawn hastily, and the phraseology restricted the gratuitous distribution of religious publications to churches, Sunday schools and religious meetings. If a colporteur wishes to place tracts in the hands of an individual on the street, why prevent him ? If it is proper to make gratuitous distribution of religious publications in Sunday schools, why prevent it ? And so this Bill is distinctly more liberal in its provisions than the Bill of last year. It does not pretend to curtail the right of any individual to make a gratuitous distribution of religious publications on the Lord's day anywhere. I do not think the objection which my hon. friend raises against that feature of the Bill is one that will stand criticism. This Bill is designed in that respect to be more liberal than the Bill of last year. One point made by Senator Almon against the Bill of last year was that it would be an outrageous thing to fine a newsboy $50. The Bill provided that a fine might be imposed to the extent of $50. This year there is a slight change in the penal provisions. It is provided as follows :—

Any person guilty of any offence declared in section one of this Act to be an indictable offence, shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars, for the first offence, and not exceeding one hundred dollars for each subsequent offence, together with the costs,—and in default of immediate payment of such fine and costs, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month : Provided that in the case of newsboys hawking or crying newspapers for sale on the Lord's day, the punishment for the first offence shall be imprisonment for a period of not less than one day nor more than five days, and for each subsequent offence the penalty shall be imprisonment for a period of not more than ten days.

Newsboys probably not being in a good position to pay a fine. Now, the question rests upon this point : is the Sunday newspaper a thing that is likely to be beneficial to this country, or to strengthen its institutions ?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). It depends on the character of the paper, not the time of publication.

Mr. CHARLTON. Exactly. When the first Sunday newspaper was published in the United States, it made obeisance to public sentiment ; it assumed that the reader would demand a little religious reading, and it gave a column or two of religious homily and matter of a semi-religious character. That lasted for a short time, but it gradually disappeared, and to-day you will find no Sunday newspaper in the United States that gives its readers religious reading.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The fault of the people.

Mr. CHARLTON. You will find it the worst paper of the whole week, crammed full of scandal, gossip and all kinds of matter of the most pernicious character. It drives from the household the Bible and other religious literature, and creates a taste for frivolity and superficiality in the minds of the people. But aside from religious considerations, the Sunday newspaper is a curse. Violate any of God's laws, and you will go, not on the upward plane, but on the downward plane, and that has been

the course of the Sunday newspaper wherever it has been introduced; its inevitable tendency has always been to grow worse. In its nature it cannot be otherwise, because it is a violation of God's law, and it will never undertake to defend that which is an imputation upon its own existence. In the United States you will find that whenever any question regarding the observance or maintenance of the Sabbath arises, as in the case of the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, every Sunday newspaper is arrayed on the side of the devil, and fights on that side. And so it will be here if we allow the Sunday newspaper to be introduced; we can easily see what the character of the paper will be. Now, we do not want it here. It is one of the institutions of the United States which those acquainted with that country condemn as an evil influence. In this matter we should be animated by high considerations of duty to our fellowmen; we should lift ourselves above mere prejudice and the tendency to accuse of cant all men who desire to do something that God's law commends—that old immutable law which is for the good of all men, and never is violated without serious consequences. If we intend to be animated by those high considerations of duty, we ought to keep this curse from coming into Canada. We do not want to get up here and haggle about this or that little point, or split hairs. We want to exclude the Sunday newspaper, and I propose to do it by the first section of this Bill.

Mr. AMYOT. I look upon this Bill as one affecting morals, or civil or municipal rights. I suppose that this Parliament will be subject to the periodical fits of sanctity of some men, and that, although we have decided this question before, we shall every session have to oppose this Bill. My reasons for opposing it have not changed. If the hon. member wants to make it a religious Bill, as he said a moment ago, to prevent the violation of God's law, I think he goes beyond his power under our constitution. We have not been established here as a teaching school or a church. The constitution has imposed upon us no such duty. Religion in Canada is free; every one has the liberty to practice the religion he chooses, to worship his God in the way he has been taught, and in the way he prefers after study; and I deny to the hon. gentleman the right of imposing his views upon his neighbour. A great many people in this country do not believe that any church in this world had the right to change the Sabbath day to the first day of the week. They do not believe that God rested before doing his work, on the first day; they believe that he rested after having done his work, that is, on the seventh day, the Sabbath day. What the hon. gentleman calls the Lord's day has been chosen by a church, the Catholic Church. The hon. gentleman submits to that church so far as the choice of that day is concerned, but those who do not believe in submitting to the Catholic Church in that regard should not be bound by his views. I contend that the Jews and others who believe in celebrating the seventh day have quite as much right to their views under the constitution as he has to his; and by seeking to impose his views upon these people he is infringing the liberty which has been guaranteed to them under the constitution. We have no power to do that. Moreover, we have no authority to dictate to any one what his religious views should be. Now, if this is a moral law, I ask what is immoral in the act of selling a paper, a book or pamphlet? If the paper, or pamphlet, or book is moral in itself, what is immoral in the act of selling it on any day of the week? My hon. friend thinks it is immoral to sell on Sunday. Well, let him not sell. He thinks it is immoral to buy on Sunday. Well, let him not buy. But the man who thinks that the Sabbath is the first day of the week should have full liberty to hold that view. We are not allowed by the compact of confederation to impose different views upon such a man. If the book is immoral we have our penal laws which prevent the printing, binding, or selling of immoral productions, so that we do not require a special law for that purpose. But if the thing is not immoral in itself, we ought not to abuse our power as a Federal Parliament by declaring it a crime. We might as well declare immoral the act of buying an apple or taking a drive at any particular hour or on any particular day. It is in our power to give ourselves jurisdiction by declaring the thing criminal, but should we do that? If the fact of selling a paper or printing it is not immoral in itself, we ought not to abuse the power given us by the constitution by declaring it a crime. I say that this is a municipal matter, with which we have no right to deal. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman belonging to a party which boasts—and I am glad to know that it does—of its respect for provincial rights, should desire to infringe on those rights. According to section 92 of the British North America Act, the legislature of each province may exclusively make laws in relation to municipal institutions. Why, then, should we take that jurisdiction from the provinces under cover of a criminal Bill? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the province of Ontario cannot deal with municipal matters? Does he mean to say that we in Quebec are unable, without the inspiration of his divine light to know how we should conduct ourselves on Sundays in order not to break the commandment of God? Since when has the hon. gentleman been declared the inspired agent of the Almighty in this world? I maintain that in the province of Quebec we have the right to settle our own municipal matters, of

which this is one. Should the city of Quebec, where I live, be overrun by these productions, we will pass a by-law and send to jail the small boys who obstruct our streets by selling them. Municipal institutions belong to the provinces; let us leave the provinces to deal with them. The hon. gentleman says that in the States this Sunday literature has been the cause of untold corruption. Does he mean to say that if, on Sunday, a Bible, or a newspaper giving Bible texts or good sermons, or news concerning missions or concerning wars in which the Christian faith is interested, the American people must necessarily suffer in their morals? If, in the United States, these Sunday publications have brought evil, it must be because these publications are, in themselves, essentially bad. Let them publish less scandal, let the American nation give its children a better education, either by means of separate or other schools, well supervised by the parents, and you will see less scandal, less corruption and crime of all kinds, and then the ugly literature of which the hon. gentleman speaks will not be sold. If they had in the States, as we have in Canada, good newspapers and literature, the people would not be spoiled by the Sunday literature. Take any man leaving his home on Sunday morning, and what does he do? He does what his training has taught him to do. If he has been brought up with the idea that on Sunday he must go to church, he will go to church. If he has been taught to go to hotels or places where he should not go, he will go there. It is not the literature he buys on Sunday which directs his movements or his conduct, but it is his early education. It is not fair to say that the selling of literature on Sunday is the cause of those evils, and there is nothing to justify our making it a criminal matter. If it is a religious, or moral, or civil, or criminal matter, it is beyond our jurisdiction. The right to work either at home or elsewhere belongs to each individual, and is regulated by the Provincial Parliament, as provided by subsection 13 of section 92 of the British North America Act. If it is intended to make this a criminal Bill, then we will not be justified in passing it, because the Act itself is not criminal, and we thereby deprive our citizens of the right to decide for themselves in religious matters.

Mr. CURRAN. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has brought forward the question of provincial rights. I think you must all admit that the late Minister of Justice had very carefully studied this question, and was a pretty good authority as to what our powers are in that respect, and he allowed this Bill to go through. But the argument of my hon. friend has brought to my mind a point which I neglected to lay before the House a moment ago. It is this: If the House of Commons wishes to declare that any of the acts mentioned in this Bill are indictable and criminal offences, then this Bill has not been submitted in proper shape. We have a criminal code, and the Bill should have been brought in as a Bill to amend that code. Having brought all our criminal laws together, if we are to establish new offences, we should bring forward measures in such a way as to make them part and parcel of the Criminal Code, so that they may be easily found, and not have criminal laws scattered through the statutes, and thus difficult to find. Under those circumstances, I think there is still a stronger objection than ever to the Bill in its present shape. I am sorry to say my hon. friend did not answer the objections I raised to the wording of the Bill itself.

Mr. MASSON. On first reading this Bill, I did not see any great difficulty in the interpretation. But when I find two such great authorities on the subject of interpretation as the Solicitor General and the mover of this Bill differing so greatly in regard to interpretation of this section, I confess it does seem that there must be some difficulty. However, as to the objection taken by the Solicitor General, that there is a grave question as to what is meant by the expression "engaged in the publication." I would call his attention to the fact that that is not a complete clause. The whole expression is "engage in the publication and issuing of any newspaper," etc. Now, engaging in the "publication" alone and not engaging in the "issuing," would certainly bring the offence within the words of this section.

Mr. CURRAN. I object to the words "engage in," so far as issuing is concerned, as well as in regard to publication.

Mr. MASSON. Well, there can only be a very limited extent in which the proprietor can engage in the "publication" and in the "issuing." The same is true of the publisher and the manager. The duties of these three are well known to the trade, and any act done by them that would forward the "publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical, for the purpose of sale or distribution" on the Lord's day, would come within the scope of the Act. Any act that would forward the publication, any act that would forward the issuing for the purpose of sale, would certainly be an offence which this clause, as framed, would cover. Now, it is a matter for consideration whether it is the desire of this committee to pass this clause in this form. The clause, as passed last session, was confined entirely to those who were engaged in the sale. Now, as has been justly stated, under the Bill as it passed this House last session, it was only the newsboys or the news-dealers that would come within its provisions in this respect; and

the persons who published for the very purpose of selling on that day were allowed to go scott free. Now, if it is the desire of this committee to put a stop to newspapers published for the purpose of selling on Sunday, I think the framer of the Bill has done the right thing in framing it so as to strike at the chief offending persons, the proprietor, the publisher and the manager. These are clearly the persons who should be declared culpable, not the man who has a news office in a large hotel, not the small boy who sells newspapers on the street or in the hotels. The man to be reached is the man who, as proprietor, employs another as publisher, the publisher thus employed, or the man who, as manager, conducts the whole affair. I would, therefore, declare myself in favour of the Bill going the whole length, if it is desirable to pass it. I have my doubts as to its utility; I have my doubts as to its necessity and as to the advisability of making this a criminal offence at all. But, if it is desirable that the publishing and selling of newspapers on Sunday should be made a criminal offence, let us get at the head, at the chief offending person, the man who, while considered a respectable member of the community, leads the newsboys to commit a crime, encouraging them and providing them with the means and sending them forth to commit that crime. I think that there is no unnecessary complication or difficulty in putting an interpretation upon that part of the section. The hon. gentleman who introduces this Bill says that his object in going beyond the Ontario Act is to cover the distribution through the mails. I might call his attention to the fact that this clause does not do so. It says, "distribution either by carrier or through the mails upon that day." It is true that this appears in the section, but in what connection and in what way? The clause says:

1. Whoever shall upon the Lord's day, in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher, or manager, engage in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical, for the purpose of sale or distribution, either by carrier or through the mails upon that day.

It is the publication that is the offence. The offence is equally committed whether that newspaper is put in the post office for the purpose of being distributed on the Lord's day, or whether it is put into the hands of carriers. They are not forbidding or preventing the distribution of it through the mails; there is no stoppage of that. It makes it an offence for the publisher to publish with the intention of distributing in either of these ways. The remaining part of the clause is not wholly similar to that passed last session. I think the word "gratuitous" in the proviso of this clause is a mistake. The Bill says:

Whoever shall engage in the sale of any newspaper on that day, shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence; but nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the gratuitous distribution of religious publications on the Lord's day.

Now, why should we have it simply "gratuitous." I think we arrived at a better conclusion last session, when we defined when and where and under what circumstances they should be distributed—whether "gratuitous" or not did not matter. If they are religious publications, and are distributed in churches, in Sunday schools or at public meetings, then there is no reason why they should be affected by this Bill. I would call the attention of the mover of this Bill to the fact that a great many of the periodicals that are distributed in churches, Sunday schools and other religious meetings, are not entirely gratuitous. Many of them are subscribed for by the year and are distributed to the subscribers in this way. I do not think it is the hon. gentleman's intention that such religious periodicals should be stopped or that the distribution in that way should be at all interfered with. It is done for the purpose of saving expense, of saving the postage, and for other reasons. But I think it is quite a sufficient safeguard if we exempt those which are distributed in churches, at Sunday school, or at religious meetings, and I would suggest to the mover of the Bill that he strike out the word "gratuitous," and add, at the end of this clause, the words "distributed in churches, Sunday schools, or at religious meetings." It is said that this will not necessarily cover Salvation Army tracts, which, I believe, are to a large extent, distributed on the street. Well, one of the evils of Sunday work, and of Sunday doings of various kinds is not avoided when papers or periodicals, even if they are religious, are allowed to be distributed on the streets, and in crowded thoroughfares on that day. Now, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) says that if a person don't think it is right to buy a newspaper, he does not need to buy; if he does not think it right to sell, he does not need to sell. But I believe that is not the sole object of Sunday observance laws, as we have them in existence in the various provinces, and as we had them in the old province. I think it is admitted that this is a Christian country, and, being so, that Christians, as such, who believe in this day, should be protected in their enjoyment of it as they think fit. Now, there is nothing sinful, nothing criminal in tradesmen following their usual occupation. There is no more sin in selling a newspaper than there would be in selling dry goods, or hardware, or groceries, but the one is forbidden, while the other may not be. Now, it is not the intrinsic evil of the act itself which we have to consider, but it is the fact that dealing in these things interferes with the rights of others in the enjoyment of the Lord's day. If we allow the Salvation Army people, or

any other class to distribute tracts of various kinds on the Lord's day, the question then may come up, wherein are we to place the limit in the interpretation of the word "religious." It has been already pointed out that it is a very precarious definition. A few columns of the heading of the paper, an editorial of a religious character, a sermon from some noted divine may be put in the very worst class of literature. The hon. gentleman said that they had been dropped from many, I think he said all, the American issues. Perhaps so, and I must say that I agree with him when he says that the Sunday newspaper seems to cater for the very lowest grades of society. I do not know that the few samples we have in this country of newspapers that are published very late on Saturday night, whether they are called Sunday papers, or whether they are called Saturday night issues, seem to cater to the lower grades of society. They seem to think that gossip, scandal, and that sort of thing, is very proper for Sunday reading, and whether they are published Saturday night, or distributed Saturday night for Sunday reading, or whether they are distributed on Sunday morning, it matters not. It seems that the newspaper men have sounded the public taste in that respect, and they cater to it. It may be that those who go to church, that those who attend religious services, do not care about buying or about reading this class of papers, and it is for another class entirely that they are catering. But, be that as it may, I am one who believes that every effort should be put forth to make Sabbath observance in this country as complete as possible. I do not go to the extent of saying that there is anything wrong in amusements of certain kinds. It is where they infringe upon the rights of others, interfering with the sanctity of the day, or with the enjoyment of others' religious rights and privileges, that these things become wrong. If they are in a community where the people do not care for these things, then there can be no clashing on that subject. But we have only to go to some of our cities to see how quiet and how circumspect everything is on Sunday, and go to other places and find how very different they are. Now, it is contended that those who enjoy that day in an entirely different way are prevented from the full and complete exercise of their rights by the doings of others, and I, for one, will go to the extent of saying that so far as Sunday newspapers are concerned, they are no good to the community, and I believe they are a great injury. I will not go to the extent of the mover of the Bill in saying that they are the cause in the United States of all the infidelity, of all the lack of Sabbath observance, of all the lack of religious sentiment, that exist in that country. I agree rather with the hon. member for Bellechasse when he says that it is the result of their education. I think all these things will ultimately force the people to revert back to the early education. While I believe that Sunday newspapers should be stopped as they tend to increase evil, I am firmly of the belief that all these evils of infidelity, irreligion, and lack of Sunday observance, spring from a faulty early education.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the Bill itself is concerned, it may not have been drawn as artistically as it might have been, but I understand it is the duty of this committee to make a Bill, once the principle is adopted, as perfect as possible. It seems to me that the first question upon which we have to pass judgment is, whether there ought to be any law at all for the observance of the Sabbath day. If such a law should be on the statute-book, one asks himself why should newspapers be published on Sunday when the law prevents a man making a pair of boots, or a tailor making a suit of clothes, or any other man following his ordinary avocation on Sunday. The law does provide in this country that men shall not follow their ordinary avocations on Sunday. If that be the case, why should my hon. friend of the "World," or of the "Globe," or of the "Mail," or of any other paper in this country, carry on their ordinary avocation by the publication and distribution of newspapers?

Mr. HAZEN. We cannot do it now.

Mr. LISTER. Well, it is a question whether we can do it now or not. At all events, the Bill of my hon. friend proposes to make the law more clear than it has been in the past, so that a newspaper shall not be published and shall not be sold upon a Sunday. It makes the law perfectly clear so far as that is concerned. I do not go the length of the hon. gentleman in saying that the publication of a Sunday newspaper involves all the degradation that he would lead us to suppose; but I do say that newspaper men should not be exempted from any obligation that rests upon the community in general; and if a newspaper is published on a Sunday, it should be stopped, unless the same right is given to every other class in the community, the effect of which would be lamentable indeed. My hon. friend the Solicitor General took what is, to my mind, rather a technical objection to the wording of this Bill. He said that so far as section 1 is concerned, in order to convict it would be necessary to prove that the party charged not only engaged in the publication, but in the issuing of the newspaper, because the word "and" connected "publication" and "issuing." So far as that is concerned, it is easy to make two offences, making publication an offence, as well as the issuing of the paper, and this

can be done by eliminating the word "and" and inserting the word "or," when it would be an offence to publish, as well as to issue, and in that way the person responsible, the person who, in my judgment, should be punished, if any one is punished, the man who causes the paper to be published, would be reached. So far as the criminal code is concerned, I do not agree with the statement made by the Solicitor General. It is not necessary in order to give this House jurisdiction, that this Bill should in any way amend the criminal code.

Mr. CURRAN. I did not say so. I said it was a desirable way to put it.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend knows that every few years it is necessary to consolidate the criminal code and to bring within it offences created by statute which had been made such subsequent to the consolidation. That has always been done in the past, and it will be necessary in the future, because, no matter how able a man may be, and how thoroughly he may be satisfied that he has anticipated every objection, experience alone can tell where a criminal Act or any other Act is weak. In this House amendments to the criminal code have been passed during the first or second session after the passage of an Act. So it is not a substantial objection to this Bill that it is not an amendment to the criminal code. This Parliament undoubtedly has jurisdiction. It is very well for the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) to talk in a sentimental way as to this Bill interfering with the religious belief of any particular portion of the community or with the liberty of the people; but I apprehend I voice the sentiment of the whole people of Canada when I say that they will unanimously support the view that, at all events, one day in the week shall be free from work and held sacred. I agree with the mover of the Bill when he says that the reading of this kind of literature has a somewhat demoralizing effect. Surely the people can get along one day without the telegrams, which they will find in Monday's newspaper, and there is no particular loss entailed by making it illegal to publish a newspaper on the Lord's day. I repeat that the Parliament of this Dominion has undoubtedly jurisdiction in this case. It is unnecessary to argue that question. It is not part of the municipal institutions of the country; it is not pretended, and never has been pretended, that it is a portion of our municipal institutions, and comes under that category of law. It may be that the legislature of Ontario has—I have no doubt it has—power to declare it an offence, and by doing so have power to legislate so far as that province is concerned; but, as this Dominion combines many provinces, I think the mover is wise in making this Bill apply to every province, and in order to make the law uniform it is necessary that, if legislation should take place at all, it should take place in this House. Without going into a critical analysis of the section, I say unhesitatingly that the principle of the Bill is good, and it will be the duty of this Committee, if they affirm that principle, to make the phraseology of the Bill such as to give effect to the object sought to be obtained. So far as section 1 is concerned, I conceive it to be my duty in the public interest to support the measure.

Mr. HAZEN. There is a matter in connection with section 1 which I should like to bring to the attention of the introducer of the Bill and also to the attention of the Committee. It will be remembered that last year, when this Bill was before the Committee, it was criticised from this standpoint: that under the Bill there was a provision to punish the boy or person who sold the papers and distributed them, but there was no provision to punish the party who published or was interested in the publication of the paper. As I understand the explanation of the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, he said he intended to avoid that difficulty this year. I desire to point out to him that the Bill is still open this year to the same objection. The greater part of the work on papers that are sold on the Sabbath day, as I am informed, is done on the Saturday preceding the day of publication, and I submit that under this Bill it would be perfectly possible to publish a newspaper, to have that newspaper printed and run off the press on Saturday, and, if that work was all done before one o'clock on the Sabbath morning, even if the paper was sold on Sunday, the man who printed and published it could not be prosecuted, while the boy who sold it on the streets could be punished. I will point out what I mean. The paragraph says: "Whoever shall on the Lord's day." So it will be seen that this act has to be committed on the Lord's day. It continues:

> In the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, engaged in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical for the purpose of sale or distribution, either by carrier or through the mails, on that day.

That is all there is with respect to the publication of the paper, and it will be seen that in order to make any one liable under that section for publishing a paper, the actual work of publication has to be done after midnight on Saturday. It will be very easy for any publisher who wishes to put a paper on the streets on Sunday to perform all the work before twelve o'clock on Saturday night, and then he can go entirely clear and he cannot be punished for his part in it

Mr. LISTER. Eliminate the word "and" and thereby bring the publisher within the Bill.

Mr. HAZEN. I think even then this provision can be evaded. The words "shall upon the Lord's day," in my opinion, should

be omitted, and let the paragraph read in this way :

Whoever in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager engages in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical for the purpose of sale or distribution, either by carrier or through the mails, upon the Lord's day.

It seems to me this would cover the object which the hon. mover of the Bill has in view. That will cover the man who sells it, and as I expect the amendment will cover the case of the newspaper publisher. As it is at present I do not think my hon. friend has met the objection that was raised to the Bill of last session. But apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I fully agree in every respect in the idea that there should be a proper observance of the Sabbath, and while I think that the publication of newspapers upon the Lord's day as a pernicious custom, and one which I trust I will never see securing a foothold in this country, at the same time I fail to see the necessity for the passage of this legislation. However, if the Bill is going to be passed, I would like to assist my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) in making it as perfect as possible. As has been pointed out, on the statute-books of every province in the Dominion of Canada we have laws to enforce the proper observance of the Lord's day. We have heard the statement made to-night that in the province of Ontario, the editor or publisher of the "Toronto World" was fined for issuing a special edition of that paper on Sunday, giving particulars of a large fire, which occurred the previous Saturday night in that city. If that be the case, where is the necessity for passing such an Act as this, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned ?

Mr. CHARLTON. He was fined $1 which was totally inadequate.

Mr. HAZEN. That may have been inadequate, but that was a matter within the discretion of the magistrate who fined him. I presume the statute places a maximum and a minimum penalty, and the magistrate evidently took a lenient view of the case and fined him the minimum of $1. I imagine, however, that if there was a repetition of that offence, no magistrate would go on fining the publisher of a Sunday newspaper $1, and should the offence be persisted in, a higher penalty would be imposed. A day or two ago I was looking over a copy of the first Journal of the House of Assembly of the province of New Brunswick, and I found that one of the very first Acts of the members of that House of Assembly in January, 1786, was to pass a law entitled : "An Act against the profanation of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday ; and the suppression of immorality." Other similar laws have been passed in our province since that time, and in the Consolidated Statutes of New Brunswick there is a law to this effect :

Whoever shall openly desecrate the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, by shooting, gaming, sporting, playing, hunting, drinking, or frequenting tippling houses, or by servile labour, (works of mercy or necessity excepted) shall for every offence pay a fine not exceeding forty shillings, or be committed to jail for a term not exceeding four days.

I think that in that province the public are satisfied—I have heard no outcry to the contrary—with the laws that at present exist with reference to the observance of the Lord's day. The people of New Brunswick are a church-going people, the day is properly and duly observed there, and I do not think there is a demand for legislation such as this from that province. I will not say at the present moment that the law of that province would be sufficient to prevent the publication of a Sunday newspaper, for I have not looked at the subsequent Acts ; and neither am I prepared to say that the phrase "servile labour" would cover work done on a Sunday newspaper, but my impression is that it would. Be that as it may ; if any one commenced to publish a Sunday newspaper in that province, legislation would be demanded at the next session of the House of Assembly that would make it impossible for him to do so. Now there is to my mind one difficulty about passing a general Act for the observance of the Sabbath, and that is : that our people are constituted differently in the different provinces. For instance a large majority of the province of Quebec belong to a different race and creed from a large majority of the people of the other provinces. They have their own views and their own ideas concerning the observance of the Sabbath day, and considering the fact that there is no great outcry for any general law of this sort, and considering the fact that every province has its own laws—which so far as I know are satisfactory to cause the day to be properly observed—and considering also the fact that the provinces are differently made up so far as the race and creed of the population are concerned ; it seems to me that there is no necessity for the passage of this law at the present time. I believe that it would be a piece of legislation passed merely for the sake of legislating and not for the purpose of attaining any good effect. I do not wish in any way to reflect upon the motives of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) in introducing the Bill, nor to reflect upon the principle of the Bill, because I believe in the proper observance of the Sabbath, and would hate to see anything in this country approaching the continental Sabbath which is a disgrace to some countries in Europe ; but I say that there is no general necessity for the Canadian House of Commons passing this Bill at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman. I rise with a good deal of diffidence to take part in this

discussion which has assumed very largely a legal phase. I shall not touch that part of the subject very much, but at the same time, I would like to say just a word or two with reference to the sense of the clause. I think, with a great many others who have spoken, that what is aimed at by the mover of the Bill in this clause is probably pretty well covered by provincial legislation; and from a good many standpoints it might be much better to allow the provinces to deal with this, each province for itself. I am not indisposed, however, to see one advantage, that hon. gentlemen of a different view, or may be holding the same view, might urge, and that is, the benefit that would accrue from having the highest legislature, and the central Parliament of Canada, deal with the matter, even if it went no further than the reiteration of the laws which already exist on the statute-books of most of the provinces. In that respect the attention of the public would be called to it, and it would be an additional affirmation, and may be in some respects a stronger affirmation of the principle than would be a law upon each provincial statute-book. So much with reference to that. So far as the Sunday newspaper is concerned, while I do not think it is the root of all evil, for my own part I see enough of newspapers on six days of the week to heartily wish to be rid of them on the Sabbath day. Everything of course depends upon the quality of the paper. I do not know that it could not be contended that the large Saturday editions of our daily and weekly papers are to all intents and purposes Sunday papers. They are larger than the daily edition, they have a greater extension and scope of matter, a good deal of the literary and pictorial and the like of that, and I imagine that the reason why a large edition is published on the Saturday is that it gets to people on a day when they have more leisure, and that it really becomes for a great many of the homes into which it goes, a paper to be read on the Sabbath day. The quality of the paper, of course, will be the measure of the good or the evil, and a Sunday newspaper might be just as moral and good in its tone as a paper issued on a week day. The history of the United States has proved to us,—and that is the country that is nearest to us and where we have most benefit of the experiences of a Sunday newspaper,—that there is no doubt that the tendency has been for the Sunday newspaper to assume a character which is anything but salutary, and the effect,—although I do not think it goes so far as my hon. friend has stated—can easily be traced to be otherwise than salutory or beneficial. I do hope that never in Canada shall we be afflicted with the scourge of such Sunday newspapers as nine out of ten that are published in the States have proved themselves to be. I do not think that the experience of any of us will go to prove that they are getting better, but rather that their course is towards greater sensationalism and that they are on that account less beneficial. Comparing the discussion of last year with the present discussion, I must say that the first section, apart from certain criticisms that might be fairly well made upon it as it has been brought in, does not appear to me to contain very much to be quarrelled with, if we are going to accept the principle of that section. To my reading, it is less inclusive than the first section of the Bill as it passed the House last year, and being less inclusive I think it is an improvement, because it goes to the fountain head and deals with the publisher or issuer of the newspaper. If the newspaper be stopped there, of course all the subsidiary streams through which it is issued and sold on the Sabbath day are to that extent closed. I do not think, so far as my reading of it goes, that it prevents the work of preparing the Monday newspaper; but I think it would be made clearer in that respect if the suggestion offered by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) were adopted, and the phrase "the Lord's day," were placed later in the Bill, so as to make sure that that day shall be meant, and that the Bill in that respect shall not be liable to any misconstruction. With reference to the clause referring to the gratuitous distribution of religious publications on the Lord's day, that is less restrictive than the similar clause in last year's Bill as it passed the House; but I think there is some force in the criticism that that clause as it stands might—perhaps not—be taken to cut out some literature which is not gratuitous which is distributed in the Sunday schools. In very many Sabbath schools literature and periodicals are distributed which are not at all gratuitous, but which are actually paid for by the contributions either of the scholars or the officers of the schools, gathered in whatever way they are gathered. Consequently, those publications are as much paid for as if they were regularly subscribed for. That point is worth looking into, to see whether the clause really cuts out that kind of literature or not. I do not consider that it would be a good thing if it did. On the whole, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the passing of the first clause, with some such amendments as I have spoken of, if they approve themselves to the sense of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have to express my very great gratification at the fairness of the leader of the House with respect to this section. My desire, as the promoter of the Bill, is to make it a workable one, and to avoid all difficulties and weaknesses that may be pointed out, or that may suggest themselves to the combined wisdom of the House. I was very favourably impressed with the suggestion made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen). I think at the moment that the Bill would be improved by

the adoption of the phraseology he recommends, making it read thus :

Whoever in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, shall engage in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical for the purpose of sale or distribution upon the Lord's day.

I am perfectly willing also to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), to strike out the word "gratuitous," and add the words "Sunday schools, churches and religious meetings." These two changes would perhaps improve the Bill, and it would then meet the views of my hon. friend the leader of the House.

Mr. LISTER. There is just this difficulty under the section, that the prosecution would have to show not only publication, but issue. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman who promotes the Bill that it shall be unlawful to publish ? If so, to make it perfectly clear, would it not be better to erase the word "and" and insert the word "or," making the offence either the publication or the issuing of a newspaper ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. I hope the hon. gentleman has considered sufficiently carefully the effect of striking out the words in the first section, "whoever on the Lord's day shall publish," because then the offence made by the Bill would be the publishing of a newspaper with the intention of selling it on the Lord's day ; so that if you published a newspaper on Wednesday with the intention of selling it on the following Sunday you would be committing an offence in the meaning of the Bill. Surely, if you are going to pass the Bill at all, you must have the two elements in it ; you must have the work done on the Lord's day, either the issuing or publishing, but surely you are not going to make an offence of publishing a newspaper on a week-day with the purpose of selling it on Sunday. I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will agree with me that that would be the result of striking out those words.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt about that.

Mr. DICKEY. I may say that I have not in the slightest degree altered my opinion with respect to this legislation. I have spoken in the same sense before. I think it is a great pity that legislation of this character should be introduced in this House. It is, if anything can be, a matter of local concern, affecting as it does particularly the consciences of the people of the different sections of the country. The very discussion that has taken place shows how clear that is. What is the offence that is in reality aimed at here ? Is it the newsboys running around the streets or the printing-press working, or is it the reading that is objected to ? The arguments that have been heard have all been directed against the bad effects of reading Sunday newspapers. Now, is this Parliament going to undertake to supervise the morals of the people, and say that they shall not read literature of a particular class on Sunday—anything, I suppose, except the Bible or the prayer-book. This Parliament, surely, is not the proper place to deal with that subject. I think it is a great deal better that the subject, if dealt with at all, should be dealt with by the local legislatures, by men who are much nearer the issues raised by this Bill than we are. I have no doubt of our power to pass the Bill, but I think it is a mistake for us to deal with the matter at all.

Mr. JEANNOTTE (Translation). Mr. Chairman, all the speakers who have so far taken part in the discussion of this Bill have referred to their particular provinces. Some have stated that in the province of New Brunswick as well as in Nova Scotia, there is a severe law in force against any Sunday labour. Others have referred to a similar law in force in the province of Ontario. They even quoted the case of the publisher of the Toronto "Globe," who was fined one dollar for having published his newspaper on a Sunday following a big fire. If a man who published part of a newspaper on Sunday announcing that a great calamity had happened could be fined one dollar, although he caused no scandal and no wrong, I ask how it is that one can meet so many drunken men, stumbling and jostling each other, who nevertheless will not be fined at all ? In the province of Quebec we have an extremely severe law in connection with the Sunday observance ; it is chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada. I know something of it, having been an alderman in Montreal during ten years and chairman of the Police Committee, and having had as such an opportunity to enforce it. Under this law, a poor woman cannot sell sweetmeats on the street without being liable to go to jail or be fined. Not only one cannot work on Sundays, but a poor woman has no right to sell a glass of spruce beer without being liable to be fined. Yet, we are generous in Montreal, we have compassion for the poor and we delight in helping them. Now, about eight years ago, a municipal by-law was proposed to allow poor widows and women in want, living on charities, to sell sweetmeats, smoking pipes and spruce beer on Sundays. Their whole stock, as a rule, did not exceed two dollars. When this by-law was brought up before the city council, Sir John Abbott, who was then mayor of Montreal, pointed out to us that such a by-law was ultra vires, because we had in our statutes a law forbidding any traffic on Sundays. That law was chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes which I have just mentioned. It reads as follows :—

No shop-keeper, pedlar, hawker, tavern-keeper, or other person keeping a public house of any description, in any part of Lower Canada, shall sell or retail any goods, wares or merchandise, wines, spirits or any other strong liquors during the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday; and every person of the description abovesaid who sells or retails such goods, wares or merchandise, wine, spirits or other strong liquors on the Lord's day, shall incur, for the first offence, a penalty which shall not exceed twenty dollars, and for the second and every subsequent offence shall incur a penalty not less than twenty dollars nor more than forty dollars.

As the hon. mover of this Bill thinks that a fine of one dollar is not sufficient for the publishing of a newspaper on Sunday, he ought to be satisfied that in the province of Quebec we have a law bearing a sufficiently severe sanction since it exceeds even that of his own Bill. I, therefore, think that, so far as the province of Quebec in concerned at all events, we have no need of this Bill, and we are such advocates of provincial autonomy that we do not want the central power to come and force police laws upon us. We can afford to do our own police duties ourselves and we do them well. I would like to ask the hon. mover of this Bill—I know he understands French and can give me an answer—whether there were petitions from the province of Quebec asking for such a Bill as this? I am not concerned with the province of Ontario; but I think that no person in the province of Quebec ever signed a petition asking for such legislation as this. In the first section, it is provided that no newspapers shall be delivered at the post offices on Sundays, for I read the words "by carrier or through the mails upon that day." In our country places, our farmers generally go to the village on Sundays. And this is especially the case at the time of agricultural works such as this, when sowing is proceeded with, at the time of the reaping and at the time of the making of fallows. Our farmers take Sundays to go to the village, where they never fail to go to the post office and get their newspapers. How will they do if post offices are not allowed to be opened to the public upon that day and to deliver the newspapers addressed to our farmers? Our farmers make it a duty to attend religious services on Sunday, and they avail themselves of the opportunity to get from the post office what is addressed to them. Should this Bill become law, the farmer will be compelled to lose his time to do that which it is so easy for him to do now on Sundays. To lose his time is a consideration worth thinking about, for we are undergoing hard times, and the land does not produce much. Should this Bill become law, he will be compelled, on Mondays, to lose, perhaps, half a day to get his copy of "La Patrie," "Le Monde," "La Minerve," and even the "Witness," for I must not forget to mention that sanctimonious newspaper. The postmaster who will deliver a copy of the newspapers on Sundays will be liable to be fined; it is what is stated in the Bill, at least in the French version, for I do not quite understand English. Here is what the Bill provides: "Whoever shall upon the Lord's day, in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the printing, publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical, for the purpose of sale or distribution, either by carrier or through the mails upon that day, and whoever shall engage in the sales of any newspaper on that day, shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence." Then, how will our good countrymen of the rural districts, several of whom reside at even such a distance as nine miles from the village, how will they do to get their newspaper on Sundays after mass? They could not get it at the post office, the postmaster having no right to give it to them, would not run the risk by committing such a great crime.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The printing of a newspaper is not allowed on that day.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Oh! as concerns the printing of a newspaper, there is none printed on Sundays. Never was the "Witness," for instance, printed on Sundays. Morning papers are printed during the night, and I believe the work is all done before midnight on Saturdays. I have no hesitation in stating there is no newspaper printed on Sundays, at least in the province of Quebec. I will go further, and to show that there is no reason to fear for a non-observance of the Sunday's rest in our province, I will say that printers, as well as other persons working in the printing offices of the newspapers would not work on Sundays. Not only would they not work on Sundays, but they would not even work during week days more than eight hours a day. In the face of such a state of affairs, how could you suppose that the proprietor of a newspaper could find men willing to break Sunday's rest? In the province of Quebec our workingmen would not work more than eight hours a day and you would not find one willing to work on Sundays. It goes without saying that I am only referring to my own province. But my most serious objection against this Bill is, that I do not wish the central power to assume the exercise of a right which the provincial authorities are apt to exercise themselves and which, in fact, they have exercised as I have just shown. With respect to other portions at least as important as that of Sunday observance—in the present state of affairs, at all events, as regards the way our people observe that day—our friends from Ontario seem to be scandalized by the fact that there is an intention to interfere with local affairs. But I will point out that a law relating to Sunday observance would bind the Catholics as well as any other class of

citizens in this country. If it is a good thing to interfere with local affairs with respect to this portion, why should they be so much scandalized when our schools are in question? Yet I cannot see what difference there is. Our friends from Ontario are unwilling to touch the schools; then, why should we interfere with provincial police laws? The publication of our newspapers in the province of Quebec is done by companies which did not seek incorporation here; they were incorporated under local Acts and not under federal Acts. These newspapers teach our people to practice good morals, for one would not allow the publication of any newspaper in the province of Quebec which would not teach the practice of good morals. If ever a newspaper dares to follow a different course, its publication is not only condemned, but if the proprietor should persevere in such a course, he is arrested and sent to jail. Therefore, we need have no fear in this respect. I make these statements so as to tranquilize the members from the other provinces. In point of politics, our newspapers may publish what they like, but when it comes to a question of morals, our police laws are stringent enough to repress any abuse. Now, I say that, proceeding from that principle, while we contend that our newspapers are teaching no immorality, we might read them on Sundays as well as on any other day. I will not say that such reading is worth that of the Bible in any case, but it may be worth more in some cases, for I may try and read the Bible and put a bad construction on it; whereas, to read a newspaper editorial, in connection with political matters especially, it only requires that I should know how to read a little to understand it, or at all events, if I cannot understand it, I will not go astray. Therefore, I claim for the people of the province of Quebec the exclusive right to make police by-laws under the laws by which we are governed. The province of Quebec is opposed to the federal parliament forcing upon her unnecessary laws. We think that this Parliament should not interfere with local affairs, such as Sunday observance, for, in more serious matters, those for instance where the liberty of the citizens would be at stake, the federal Government could again interfere. We have not too much liberties in the provinces and we wish to persevere in the enjoyment of such as we have. Therefore, I say that this Bill should not be put in our statutes, because it will hardly have any practical effect. Indeed, section 4, which prohibits Sunday excursions, either by steamboats or by railways, under the penalty of a fine, contains a proviso which reads as follows:

Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit the ordinary carriage of passengers authorized by provincial statutes.

Then, I ask, what will be the use of this Bill, since the local legislature has a right to allow steamboats or railway companies to organize Sunday excursions in the provinces? This section 4 becomes, therefore, a dead letter. I do not quite understand why this section was put in the Bill. It seems to me this is the first time it is provided that one shall be derelict to Sunday's observance for not observing it in the same way as those who think differently than we do. It is the first time one hears that we, who are honest people and who believe we are properly filling our religious duties, are acting contrary to religion when doing what we are allowed to do on Sunday by our laws and our conscience. But then any person who entertains different views from ours, might come and say to us: If you should do such a thing on Sundays, you will sin and be punished therefor, for you will be guilty of an indictable offence. Well, if there is any liberty of conscience in the Dominion of Canada, there is no ground whatever for such a Bill as this. The Jews have a different mind than we have; Protestants have a different mind than we. Catholics, have. Have we ever seen for all that the Catholics of this Dominion of Canada set themselves up as censurers of the Protestants with respect to their way of observing Sundays? A Jew does not sin by not observing Sundays, since he observes Saturdays. Are we going to force upon him a law which has nothing to do with his conscience? Are we to compel him in his conscience to observe such a particular day as the Lord's day?

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) It is done now.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Yes; it is done with respect to his store, but at home he may do as he likes. What that Bill sanctions is neither more nor less than an illegal entrance into a man's house. Therefore, it is going a good deal too far. I will now conclude my remarks by saying that this Bill, which is well known, should not, I think, concern the province of Quebec, since we have a most clear and positive law relating to Sunday observance. Moreover, in our cities and municipalities, generally, when the law is found insufficient, we pass by-laws. I know something of this, for I had charge to see to the enforcement of by-laws of this kind passed in order to secure a better observance of the Lord's day. I always thought that Sunday was well observed. I always thought likewise that after the religious services on that day, there was no wrong whatever in reading a newspaper, of whatever political shade it might be, in smoking a cigar and taking a glass of beer honestly and peacefully. What is more, I thought that this was better than to do what some do, to go, for instance, in the hotels, meeting rooms and clubs and to spend their time there playing cards, smok-

ing and doing other things generally objectionable, because by such a course they ruin their health, because such things are disagreeable to their wives and children, and, thirdly, because by abstaining from such enjoyments, one may save money, which may help those who are dear to us. Moreover, I contend that I am doing no wrong whatever if, when walking on the street, I stop and buy a cigar, two cigars or even four, if I light one and smoke it while going to church. I even think it is a good way not to be concerned about my neighbour. That is the way, we, Catholics, observe Sundays. We smoke after the religious services are over, we believe we can enjoy ourselves and sing songs which are not quite religious songs; still, during that time, we are not talking about our neighbour. To sum up, I think this Bill is useless. I even think it never should have come before this House, as it is not likely, to commend us abroad. I am not referring to the United States, for there people are not overscrupulous. I refer to other nations. It is causing us to be known to a disadvantage by foreign people. Indeed, those who would read this Bill would think that we are neglecting our religious duties, and as I have much care for the good name of our country, I think such a Bill as this is likely to injure us abroad. So far, Canada has enjoyed the reputation of being the most religious country in the world: Catholics and Protestants alike have shared in the giving of such a good name to her. It is paying us a fine compliment. While we enjoy such a good repute, are we going through this Bill to say to those people who have such a good opinion of Canada: You are badly mistaken, what you have thought so far is erroneous. We, Catholics, as well as Protestants in the Dominion of Canada, are not filling well our religious duties. We have so imperfect a Sunday observance that a Protestant member who, of course, in religious matters, does not think as we, Catholics, do, was compelled to bring before the House, and try to have passed a Bill to compel people to better observe Sunday, and that under penalty of being sent to jail or being fined. Well, I say it is paying, Catholics as well as Protestants, a very bad compliment.

Mr. TISDALE. Before the motion is put, I must certainly object to one portion of this clause. I have always been strongly opposed to any interference by this House with the provinces, or any coercion by this House of the provinces, and, on this matter, each province has a right to legislate for itself. I object to making the selling of newspapers by newsboys an indictable offence, and subjecting those boys to imprisonment. The intellectual and moral training of the people will certainly cause them to look with great disfavour on any legislation requiring that a bare-footed newsboy offering a paper for sale should be punished as a criminal. If the opinion of the House be that the selling of newspapers should be prohibited on Sundays, I am prepared to accede to that opinion, but I shall certainly not commit myself to any clause making the act of sale by a poor newsboy an indictable offence.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman is evidently not very friendly to the Bill, and he goes a long way to find an excuse for voting against the first section. He goes down to section 5, and seeks an excuse in the fact that this section provides for the imposition of a fine on the bare-footed newsboy. Well, section 1 has no connection with section 5. When we come to the latter section, no doubt there are hon. gentlemen here who have quite as much sympathy for the bare-footed newsboy as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who will take care that no injustice is done to him. The section we are on deals with the sale of a newspaper on Sundays, or its publication on Sunday. Does he approve of such sale or publication? If he does not, he ought to have no difficulty in supporting this section.

Mr. TISDALE. I decline to commit myself to the proposition that it should be declared an indictable offence for a newsboy to sell newspapers on Sunday. If, at a later stage of the Bill, we can discuss the question of exempting the newsboy from any punishment, I would allow this section to pass; but if I am to be precluded from doing that by allowing this to pass, then I shall vote in favour of the motion.

Motion agreed to; and committee rose.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved:

That this House will, on Monday next, resolve itself again into Committee of the Whole to further consider Bill (No. 2), intituled an Act to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

He said: The action of the Committee of the Whole last night was one which could scarcely be interpreted as a deliberate condemnation of the Bill, and even if it should be, it would not be proper to accept the decision of a minority of the members—only about sixty being present—as an expression of the opinion of the full House. I think that if the principle of the Bill is to be condemned, we ought to have it condemned by a vote of the full House on an open division. The action of the committee, composed only of a small portion of the House, should not be accepted as a finality in connection with this matter. If the House is not prepared to condemn the principle of the Bill, and an early division will settle that point, then it is eminently proper the details should receive consideration. Last night only one section was considered. No action was taken on that section, and there was no manifestation on the part of the promoter that modifications or amendments would not be accepted. The motion for the committee to rise was made before the section had received consideration at all, and it was made by the first gentleman who rose in opposition to the Bill. And that motion, placed before the House without any reason that may have been given in the subsequent discussion of the Bill, was the motion which carried. There are three sections in the Bill. These were not considered last night at all. One of them was accepted last year with a modification, and the clause under consideration last night was accepted last year with a modification. One of the two remaining sections is of great importance, relating to railway transportation and traffic on the Lord's day, the importance of which entitles it, at least, to the consideration of this House. Under these circumstances, I do not desire to enter into a discussion as to the principle of the Bill at this time, but I claim that it is entitled to our consideration, and that its promoters are entitled to a formal expression as to whether the principle of the Bill is condemned or not. If hon. members are not prepared to appear on the division list, and show by their votes that they have condemned the principle of the Bill, the Bill ought to be replaced on the Order paper and receive the consideration of the House. I ask only for fair consideration to the measure. I do not stand hard and fast by its provisions. I am ready to make any reasonable concession, but I desire that the Bill should receive the courteous consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEES.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved:

That Mr. Geoffrion and Mr. Tisdale be added to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that Mr. Geoffrion and Mr. McIsaac be added to the Select Standing Committees on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines and Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the year ended the 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Costigan.)

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDED.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 68) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: As hon. gentlemen know, under the General Elections Act and amendments thereto, elections in all the constituencies are held on the same day, except in a few constituencies which are made special exceptions under the Act. These exceptions are: Algoma and Nipissing, in the province of Ontario; Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the province of Quebec: Cariboo, in the province of British Columbia. But, under the Redistributions Act passed in 1892, the district of Cariboo is united with the electoral district of Yale, the new constituency to be known as the district of Yale and Cariboo. It would not do to have the election in one half the constituency one day, and in the other half another day. Therefore, the object of this Bill is to provide that the election shall take place in the whole constituency on the same day.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 69) relating to the electoral lists. He said: I may say, for the information of the House, that this simply postpones the revision of the voters' lists until 1896.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the Franchise Act of last session, postponed from last session, is to be revived?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will answer the hon. gentleman later on as to that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUGAR IMPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. What were the total amounts of raw and refined sugar imported during the months of March and of April, respectively, in the years 1894 and 1895? 2. What were the amounts of above imported during the same periods into the several ports of Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John and Toronto?

Mr. WALLACE. In answer to the first question, I may say that the detailed state-

ment of importations furnished the Department of Customs by its officers from the various ports, for the compilation of the trade returns, is only made quarterly and shows the totals of each line of goods for the quarter; the details are not separated for each month. Therefore, imports of sugar asked for, cannot be furnished for the months of March and April separately, except by writing to each port for the information. That has now been done. The quarterly statement would show the detailed information for the quarter ended 31st March, but not for the respective months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then that part had better stand.

Mr. WALLACE. As to the second part of the question, did the hon. gentleman want the information for each month separately or the total for the two months?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want the same information as in the other case. But, of course, you cannot answer the second part, unless you can answer the first.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I can; I telegraphed to each of the ports named by the hon. gentleman, Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John and Toronto and received answers. The following will give the information asked for by the hon. gentleman:—

STATEMENT of Importations of Refined and Raw Sugars during the months of March and April in 1894 and 1895, at undermentioned Ports.

	1894.		1895.	
	Sugar above No. 16 D. S.	Sugar below No. 16 D. S.	Sugar above No. 16 D. S.	Sugar below No. 16 D. S.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Toronto—				
March	498	.....	27,861	89,480
April	650	36,944	325	44,688
Total	1,148	36,944	28,186	134,168
Montreal—				
March	689	14,606,005	1,230	11,151,774
April	532	9,280,134	225	32,156,672
Total	1,221	23,886,139	1,455	43,308,446
Quebec—				
March	49,606	.....	.....	.....
April	21	.....	.....	.....
Total	49,627	.....	.....	.....
St. John—				
March	.....	800,000	33,600	385,000
April	.....	41,000	.....	2,000
Total	.....	841,000	33,600	387,000
Halifax—				
March	372	11,002,440	.....	21,789,357
April	.....	1,160,914	439	20,233,636
Total	372	12,163,354	439	42,022,993
Grand total	52,368	36,927,437	63,680	85,852,607

REPRINTING THE ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1. Whether the Government did not, 1894, cause to be reprinted the electoral lists for the districts of Megantic and for Drummond and Arthabaska, as revised in 1891? 2. If so, by whom were the said lists so reprinted? 3. To whom did the Government entrust the printing of the preliminary lists, that is to say, the lists of names to be added and the lists of names to be struck off, for the districts of Megantic and Drummond and Arthabaska, in 1894? 4. How much did the Government pay for the printing of the said

lists; when was payment made, and to whose order was the cheque (or cheques) made payable?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that the Government did not cause the lists for those ridings which were revised in 1891, to be reprinted in 1894. The lists were printed in 1894 for the districts of Megantic, Drummond and Arthabaska. The Government paid for Megantic, $147; for Drummond, $111.14; for Arthabaska, $114.62. The three cheques were made payable to one newspaper, and the rate paid was three cents per name, which is the rate which has prevailed since 1889.

ELECTORAL LISTS OF LOTBINIERE.

Mr. RINFRET asked, Whether the electoral lists for the county of Lotbinière have been printed? If so, where and by whom were they printed?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The lists for Lotbinière are not yet printed. The finally revised proofs were not received from the revising barrister until April 26th. At that time the special staff which were employed at the Bureau for printing the lists, had been done away with, and since that time the work of the sessional printing has pressed the employees of the Bureau, so that the work has not been proceeded with for the other lists. However, I may say to my hon. friend that the lists will be printed next week.

POSTAL SERVICE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a postmaster has been appointed at St. Louis, Prince County, P.E.I., in place of Avit Poirier, deceased? If so, who is he? When was the appointment made, and what is the salary?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no post office in Prince Edward Island known by the name of St. Louis. It is presumed the question refers to the office known as Kildare Station. (1.) Yes. (2.) Miss Marguerite Poirier. (3.) 15th February, 1895. (4.) $36 per annum.

Mr. PERRY asked, Who is mail carrier from De Blois Station, Prince Edward Island, to the post office at De Blois? Was the contract let by tender? If so, was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why not? When will the present contract expire, and what is the amount paid yearly for the same?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (1.) Celestine Perry. (2.) Yes. (3.) Yes. (4.) 30th June, 1895. (5.) $20.

VALUE OF FARM LANDS—EXPLANATION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to correct a misstatement which crept into a report of what took place on Tuesday night; but as I may also say a word or two more, I will, if desired, conclude with a motion. The statement is as follows: During the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways there was, as the House perhaps recollects, some little confusion, gentlemen on one side applauding and gentlemen on the other side vigorously dissenting. The hon. gentleman made a statement in respect to one of mine with reference to the value of farm lands, which I understood to be to the following effect: I had stated that there had been a depreciation of the selling value of farm lands in Ontario to the extent of about $10 per acre, which, of course, would amount to about $200,000,000. The hon. gentleman, as I understood him, though there was considerable confusion, made the statement that instead of that being the case, the value of farm lands had risen by $95,000,000, and in confirmation thereof he appealed to the Ontario statistician. I did not hear him use the word "Mr. Blue"; if I had heard clearly, probably no difficulty would have occurred, because I was not aware that he was reported as having used Mr. Blue's name. I was aware that Mr. Blue had for many years ceased to be the statistician of Ontario, and I should be loath to appear as reflecting on a gentleman like Mr. Blue, whom I esteem very much. Of course, I merely spoke from my seat, and, as I say, there was considerable confusion. What I said was that if the statistician in Ontario or anywhere else had declared that there was an increase of $95,000,000 in the selling value of farm lands, he might take rank with our own statistician. That is what I said; but by no manner of means what I am reported to have said. As this particular matter is one of some importance, I want to make a statement about what I did actually say. I had said that since 1878 the selling value of farm lands in Ontario had declined $10 per acre; that is a minimum estimate; I made that statement after careful inquiry, extending over a period of several years, during which I myself visited two-thirds, at least, of the constituencies in Ontario, and took exceeding pains to acquaint myself with the facts, using every possible way of getting information. I repeat here that that was the information given to me by a vast number of persons who ought to be authorities on the subject. If I am mistaken I shall be glad to be put right, but I am very much afraid the fact is that I have under-estimated and not over-estimated the depreciation in the selling value, which, bear in mind, is quite a different thing from the assessed or esti-

mated value. If I entertained any doubt as to the correctness of my information it would have been removed by statements which have been made to me by gentlemen both in this House and out of it, who are entitled to be regarded as authorities; as for example, my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), who is probably as well acquainted with the selling value of land in western Ontario as any man in Canada well can be. Of course, if hon. gentlemen want to investigate the thing, they can very easily do so, there can be no trouble about that. Now, if you wish, I will conclude with a motion; if not, I will take my seat.

Mr. HAGGART. In my remarks the other evening, the statement I made was this: I understood the hon. gentleman to have said that there was a decline of $200,000,000 in the value of farm property in Ontario. I stated that there was no decline, that on the contrary, there had been a gain of $95,000,000 in 10 years. I stated that there was also an increase in the value of buildings, implements and live stock; and I gave the hon. gentleman the figures, showing that the total wealth of the agricultural classes in 1882 amounted to $882,000,000, and in 1892 to $979,000,000.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. EDGAR. On 22nd May last year a resolution looking to the settlement of international disputes between Great Britain and the United States was proposed by myself and seconded by the present Minister of Militia, supported by the late Sir John Thompson and the leader of the Opposition, and carried unanimously. I should like to know whether the Government has communicated that resolution in any way to the British Government and through them to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine the resolution passed here has been transmitted. I will make inquiries and give the hon. gentleman exact facts and the date of the transmission.

INQUIRIES RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to inquire of the Government when we may expect the returns which were ordered, as follows:—On 26th April, return for correspondence respecting the embargo on Canadian cattle; on 29th April, return in regard to the entry of cattle from Montana into the North-west Territories; on 26th April, return of correspondence connected with the application of unsettled accounts with Mr. Charlebois for the Langevin block. I also called the attention of the Secretary of State at the commencement of the session for a return ordered by the House in 1892 respecting certain manufactures in the county of York. I handed the hon. gentleman, at that time, the Votes and Proceedings of the House for the session in question, and no less than three years have elapsed since the order was granted. I should like to have that order complied with.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As regards the last subject to which the hon. gentleman has called attention, namely, return respecting manufactures in the county of York, I called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it on the same day on which the hon. gentleman spoke to me respecting the matter, and the Minister promised it would be attended to. As to the return respecting the cattle embargo, moved for on the 26th, and the return moved for on the 29th, they are being prepared, and I hope will be before the House in a few days.

Mr. OUIMET. I will call attention to the matter of the return connected with the unsettled accounts of Mr. Charlebois in connection with the Langevin block.

Mr. FRASER. I desire to call attention to a return ordered of the industries of the county of Guysboro', and a statement of the amounts expended by counties in Nova Scotia for the ten years previous. These were ordered the winter before last; if they had been ordered during the present winter I would not have pressed for them, as I desire to give the Government time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will hand me a memorandum I will make the necessary inquiries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to inquire what progress is being made with the return relating to superannuation?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know exactly when it will be brought down—it will not be long, I think.

LIEUT.-GOVERNOR SCHULTZ AND MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House to a matter to which I referred yesterday, namely, the correspondence, or rather the letter from Dr. Bourinot to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba, which was published on the 7th inst. I have to put myself in order by moving the adjournment of the House, and I shall conclude by doing so. I may say that this is the only way by which a member has the opportunity of drawing attention to a matter which appears to him to be of sufficient importance to engage some time of this House, and engage it at the earliest possible moment. It is the practice in England, as we all know, when matters of emergency arise, and when the Order paper is in such a condition that delay must necessarily take place before the question can

be discussed, to call the attention of Parliament to it by taking the course I am now doing, and that is by moving the adjournment of the House. Now, Sir, as we all know, there is at present under consideration by the legislature of Manitoba, which reassembles to-day, the question as to the remedial order. The legislature of Manitoba is now considering the order which was transmitted by His Excellency the Governor General to the legislature, and the legislature will, under the constitution, have to pass on it, it will have to say whether it will act in obedience to it, or how it will deal with it. Pending this, it appears the Lieutenant-Governor of that province visited the capital, and was here some time at the opening of the House. For what purpose he was here, whether he was summoned by the Government, or whether he came here on a visit, unbidden by them, of course we do not know. But there were sinister rumours abroad that he came here for the purpose of securing a second term, and that he was prepared to say that in order to get a second term, he would turn out the present Ministry, known as the Greenway Government. I say that rumour was current—I do not say anything more about it. I am bound to say, it is only fair to say that on His Honour being questioned, he denied the rumour.

Mr. IVES. Where was it current?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was current in the press. If the hon. gentleman does not read the papers, I cannot help it; I think he is the only member of this House who has not heard of it. That being the condition of affairs, it is quite certain that this matter which is now engaging the attention of the legislature of that province is one of deep concern. It is a matter, I venture to say, which has to be dealt with under considerations of the greatest responsibility. No man here, I think I may say, can pretend to see the end of the question, or, at all events, to see what may be the result of any course which the legislature of Manitoba may take in respect to this important matter. This is not a matter of administration, it is not a matter in which the executive of that province, the government of Mr. Greenway, has really anything to do. It is a matter solely concerning the legislature, or rather it is a matter with which the legislature itself has to deal. I am not at all desirous of taking too narrow a view of the duties and responsibilities of the Governor of a province; but it is well to bear in mind that while in all matters he is bound to act upon the advice of his Ministers, that is on all matters in regard to administration, that in matters of legislation he has really no direct say, one way or the other. This is not even a matter of legislation. The legislature of that province probably can, no doubt, and probably will, determine its course by resolution. It will be transmitted from that House to His Excellency the Governor General in Council. The answer will come in that way, unless, of course, the province thinks fit to give effect to the remedial order and to pass a Bill, in which case the Lieutenant-Governor will have the ordinary authority and the ordinary jurisdiction of the executive, to assent or dissent to the Bill. But, Sir, however that may be, there is nothing better settled in our constitutional history, in our constitutional proceedings, than that while the Government or the Ministers are bound to be loyal to the executive, whether he be His Excellency the Governor General or the Lieutenant-Governor of a province; the Lieutenant-Governor of a province is equally bound to be loyal and true to his council. He is bound to give them his cordial support, he is bound to give them his advice, if need be, his warnings, if need be; but he is required, according to our system, to be in cordial relationship with them, and so long as in point of fact they are his advisers he is bound, according to our system, to treat them in the most loyal way. Now, Sir, what do we find here? We find that when this matter is pending, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has thought fit to obtain the advice of a gentleman who, unfortunately for this discussion (perhaps it adds a little to our embarrassment, and to the indelicacy, I was going to say, of the whole situation), is the Clerk of the House. I am bound to say, although I have not had any communication with Dr. Bourinot, that I understand that Dr. Bourinot says that he understood his communication was a private one, and that it was not given to be used for political purposes. I am bound to say that, and I, Sir, most certainly believe that statement, for I can hardly imagine that the Clerk of this House would have so forgotten himself as, in a matter of very high political importance, a matter which even at that day had been agitated in no less than three or four constituencies; I cannot believe that he would have intervened and given a decision in favour of either one view or the other. I therefore do most freely accept, what I have understood and seen in the press to be the statement made by Dr. Bourinot in that regard. But, Sir, I say it probably may not be, it would not be improper for the Lieutenant-Governor to have armed himself and to have obtained the opinion of any expert in constitutional lore that he thought fit to apply to. I am not quarrelling with that. It is an intermeddling on his part in matters on which he had no concern, but he certainly had a perfect right as a citizen, as an individual, nay, perhaps as a Lieutenant-Governor to obtain the opinion of any expert he thought fit with regard to the position, a very new and very extraordinary one, which had arisen with reference to the remedial order. I am not

quarrelling with that. But, Sir, let us see what followed. The Lieutenant-Governor knowing that these rumours were afloat—because they were brought to his notice and he denied them—returns to Winnipeg, and on the very day to which I now propose to direct the attention of the House, on the very day it was said that the Government of that province had this matter under consideration with a view of determining what course they would take and what policy they would propose to the legislature of which they are the leaders; on that very day, here in Ottawa, this document, the opinion of Dr. Bourinot is handed out to the press for distribution all through the country. Now, Mr. Schultz, the Lieutenant-Governor, was not in Ottawa at that time. His Honour, it is said, had authorized the publication of the document. The statements made in the papers in which I have seen it, one in the "Mail and Empire," and the other in another principal organ of the Government, namely, the Montreal "Gazette," are as follows:—

The "Mail and Empire" says:

Ottawa, May 6th.—From private advices received here it is learned that the Manitoba Government had under consideration to-day the school question, and that there is a very strong probability that a decision will be reached to-morrow. In view of this, it is ascertained that Governor Schultz has determined to give to the press the following important deliverance from Dr. Bourinot.——

I want to inquire, and I hope the leader of the House will tell us, who ascertained that Governor Schultz "intended to give to the press" the following important deliverance from Dr. Bourinot:—

—on the constitutional bearings of the case, which that authority submitted to His Honour while he was in Ottawa recently.

The heading in the other organ of the Government is substantially the same, not quite so full, but yet substantially the same. It says:

Ottawa, May 6.—From information received here, it is understood that the Manitoba Government had the school case under consideration to-day and will probably make its decision known to-morrow. In view of this, the following opinion from Dr. Bourinot on the constitutional bearing of the case, which was given at the request of Lieutenant-Governor Schultz, and was taken back by him for the information of his government, will, no doubt, prove very interesting.

Now, Sir, I desire to be perfectly frank, and I desire to state here, so that if it is not true it may be contradicted, that these documents were in type, that they were given to the press, and given to the press by no less an individual than the Prime Minister of this country. I should be glad to hear that contradicted, and I give the statement so that an opportunity may be afforded to make the contradiction. Well, Sir, what does that disclose? It discloses the Lieutenant-Governor here, and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba being in Ottawa applies to Dr. Bourinot for this opinion on the constitutional question; not giving Dr. Bourinot the slightest idea that he intended to make any public use of it, but that it was for his private information. It discloses, also, that the Government here, when the very matter is under consideration, publishes this document throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Am I going too far, Sir, when I say: that these facts, if these be the facts, prove a case little short of a conspiracy against the rights of the legislature of the province of Manitoba. We know, Sir, that it is equally conspiracy to do what is lawful by unlawful means as it is to do unlawful acts. I think I can satisfy every member of the House—in fact I do not think any members of the House required to be satisfied—that the publication of this opinion, pointing out the course that the legislature were bound to take in the opinion of Dr. Bourinot, and published, by the Lieutenant-Governor without the authority or consent of the Government of the province of Manitoba, was an outrage such as there is no parallel to be found for, since the days of George III. at all events. What is it, Sir? The Governor whose duty it was to advise with his Government on this as other matters, whose duty it was to warn this Government, and to be frank with his Government; that Governor publishes a line of policy commanding the Government of Manitoba as it were, or forcing their hand to adopt a certain particular course. Now, Sir, that that is unconstitutional, that it calls for a prompt—if it is possible for the parties to do so who are equally guilty, namely, the Government here—that it calls on their part for prompt interference with the Lieutenant-Governor of that province, is, I think, very, very plain. Let me, Sir, fortify my statement by reference to some well-known authorities which were summarized by Sir John Macdonald in 1878, when the question of the conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier was up for discussion. He then brought to our notice what the relationship should be between the representative of the Crown and his Ministry; and these citations prove, what we have come to treat as accepted doctrine, that in matters of this kind the Government have a right to rely upon the cordial and frank acceptance of that relationship by the representative of the Crown, whoever he may be. Lord Dufferin, speaking of this matter in a general sense in 1873, said:

My only guiding star in the conduct and maintenance of my official relations with your public men is the Parliament of Canada. I believe in Parliament, no matter which way it votes; and to those men alone whom the deliberate will of the confederate Parliament of Canada may assign

me as my responsible advisers, can I give my confidence. Whether they are heads of this party or of that party must be a matter of indifference to the Governor General. So long as they are maintained, he is bound to give them his unreserved confidence, to defer to their advice, and to loyally assist them with his counsels. As a reasonable being, he cannot help having convictions on the merits of different policies, but these considerations are abstract and speculative, and devoid of practical effect in his official relations. As the head of a constitutional state, as engaged in the administration of parliamentary government, he (the Governor General) has no political friends; still less can he have political enemies. The possession, or the being suspected of such possession, would destroy his usefulness.

Let me refer to a resolution which was passed by the House of Commons in England in the days of George III., when it was whispered, by the authority of the King, that he disagreed with the policy of his Ministers; and I do not know that anything more applicable to the present case could be cited.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What year was that?

Mr. McCARTHY. 1783. The resolution which was adopted by a large majority of the House, was as follows:—

That it is now necessary to declare that to report any opinion or pretended opinion of his Majesty upon a bill or other proceeding with a view to influence the vote of the members, is a high crime and misdemeanour, dangerous to the honour of the Crown, a breach of fundamental principles of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution.

I will just close my references by a citation, which has often been made in this House, from a constitutional writer, Mr. Bagehot, for whom, as we all remember, Sir John Macdonald had the very highest opinion. Upon the relationship between the Crown and the Government, this writer says:

To state the latter shortly, the Sovereign has, under a constitutional monarchy such as ours, three rights, the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn, and a king of great sense and sagacity would want no others. He would find that his having no others would enable him to use these with singular effect. He would say to his Ministers: The responsibility of these measures is upon you. Whatever you think best shall have my full and effectual support, but you will observe that, for this reason and that reason, what you propose to do is bad; for this reason and that reason, what you do not propose is better. I do not oppose, it is my duty not to oppose, but observe that I warn.

And again:

The popular theory of the English constitution involves two errors as to the Sovereign; first, in its oldest form, at least, it considers him as an estate of the realm, a separate co-ordinate authority with the House of Lords and the House of Commons. This, and much else, the Sovereign once was, but this he is no longer. That authority could only be exercised by a monarch with a legislative veto. He should be able to reject Bills, if not as the House of Commons rejects them, at least as the House of Peers rejects them. But the Queen has no such veto. She must sign her own death warrant, if the two Houses unanimously sent it up to her. It is a fiction of the past to ascribe to her legislative power. She has long ceased to have any.

Here, as I have already pointed out, there is no question of legislative jurisdiction or legislative power. Now, Sir, what is this document, and how was it heralded through the country? I quote from the Montreal "Gazette," the more experienced organ of the two:

Duty of Manitoba—Doctor Bourinot clearly sets it forth—constitutional aspect—it demands that Manitoba obey the remedial order—not a political issue, but merely a question of remedying a wrong that the highest court has declared to be in existence.

These are the headlines to this letter or opinion of Dr. Bourinot, sent forward in the manner I have stated. Is it possible, Sir, to doubt the object of it? Is this the first step in the bargain that Mr. Schultz is said to have made here? Is this to be followed by some other step which will bring about the dismissal of the Manitoba Government, or for what purpose has the Lieutenant-Governor thought fit to travel so far afield in order to obtain advice and opinions? His Ministers are his constitutional advisers, and to them alone has he any right to go. While as an individual he may fortify himself in any way with a knowledge of affairs, it is not proper for him to attempt to force the hands of his Ministers, or to interfere with their course by outside interference. If the House of Commons, in 1783, declared that it was a high crime and misdemeanour to mention that the king was opposed to a Bill introduced by his Ministers, what would be said nowadays, a century later, if the Queen herself, or His Excellency the Governor General, should circulate documents and opinions about matters which were at the very moment under consideration? Fancy, Sir, His Excellency the Governor General obtaining the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in England about this very matter at a time when it was under the consideration of his Government, and handing that out to the press. Could you imagine anything more contrary to our system of government? So I draw attention to this matter; I cannot do more at the moment. I attribute this occurrence very much to the unfortunate habit which has crept into our affairs—and perhaps this House is somewhat to blame for tolerating it—of permitting Lieutenant-Governors to retain their position after their term of office has expired. During their term they hold their office in fee, and are not to be displaced except for cause; but when their term comes to an end, they are tenants at will, living from hand to mouth at the will of the Government here. This habit begets ambitions

for a second term, although, I suppose, we shall have stout denials that one of the objects of Mr. Schultz's visit here was his continuance in office. Now, as to this opinion, I am not going at this time to enter into any lengthened criticism; but I would have it understood that it is dealing with matters as to which there is the very greatest diversity of opinion in this country. I need not say more. In a very authoritative way, it lays down the law upon the matter as if it were perfectly plain and simple—lays it down from the constitutional student's standpoint; not from the standpoint of the lawyer or the politician, but from the calm and deliberate study of the student, as if the matter were absolutely determined and settled and clear. Sir, I beg most respectfully to dissent from this opinion in every particular. It states that the judgment of the Privy Council determined that this Government must pass the remedial order. On that point, I need not repeat my argument of the other day; but I say that to my judgment nothing is more certain than that the Governor General in Council here had absolute power to refuse the relief that was sought, and equal power to do what he did, that was to pass the remedial order. But that he was bound, in any sense of the word, by the judgment of the Privy Council, cannot, I venture to maintain, be upheld, with any consistency or reason, regard being had to the question submitted to the Supreme Court and which afterwards went in appeal to the Privy Council. Then it is stated, and here is where the mischief is:

That the legislature of Manitoba are bound to obey it, and will be acting in defiance of the constitution if they do not.

Well, it passes my humble comprehension that it should be intended that separate schools are to be re-established by this roundabout way, according to law. The simple way would be to say that they should never have been repealed. But as the right to repeal the separate school question is admitted in the case of Barrett, and the right to appeal against that is admitted by the last judgment of the Privy Council, surely it could never be intended that all this roundabout proceeding should be taken just to have this separate school system re-established. The opinion goes on to say:

The legislature of Manitoba is now constitutionally bound to decide whether it will allow the subject-matter of education, so far as the circumstances of this case require, to pass out of its direct control, or will, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the constitutional law as judicially determined, adopt such remedial measures as will remove the admitted grievances.

It is simply a difference of opinion, you may say. Certainly it is not a matter to be treated as such, and at this very moment, when the Government of Manitoba, with all the responsibility on their shoulders are proceeding to advise the legislature of Manitoba on a matter fraught with the most serious consequences to the peace and welfare of the province, and possibly of the Dominion, to have it published throughout the length and breadth of Canada that the matter has at length been determined by an impartial expert, one occupying the position which Mr. Bourinot does in this House, is a matter of very great misfortune to say the least. Again, the opinion goes on:

That by such course the legislature of Manitoba will remove a difficult question from the arena of political and sectarian animosities, exhibit their desire to do full justice to every class irrespective of sectional or religious opinions, and at the same time give conclusive evidence of their readiness to submit to the deliberative judgment of the courts in every case as a principle of action best calculated to promote in the end the security and strength of a federal union whose foundation rests on a written law which must be interpreted by judicial authority.

The law must be interpreted by the judicial authority undoubtedly, and the judicial authority did interpret to this extent, that there was the right of appeal—the right to go to the Governor in Council. That being so, the Governor in Council was invested with the authority to pass a remedial order or to reject the petition, but there is nothing in the judicial decision, nor could there be, to warrant the conclusion that a free legislature—whether it be of a province, and much less of this Dominion—shall take any particular course or adopt any particular view. And again:

That by failing to follow the course marked out for them by the law of the constitution, they would assume a most serious responsibility, since it would involve necessarily the administration of the subject of education from the jurisdiction where it must and should rest under ordinary circumstances, and the handing of it over in this special case to the authority of the Dominion Parliament, which is to be supreme to meet an emergency provided for by the constitution.

Undoubtedly that is a responsibility the legislature must assume, but the question for that legislature is whether they would prefer to cast the responsibility here rather than to re-impose or re-establish a system of education which, according to the opinion of that legislature, had proved utterly illusory and had been of great injury to a large portion of the people of Manitoba. I will not go on, though I have marked three or four passages equally objectionable, in my view. And now what has been the result? I can give it better in the words sent here from Ottawa as reported in the press. A despatch was sent from Ottawa in these words:

An Ottawa despatch published here says that Lieutenant-Governor Schultz's action is the first part of the policy that the Lieutenant-Governor intends to pursue against Mr. Greenway.

Here the despatch gives the exact words:

Dr. Bourinot said to-day that he gave an opinion for the personal guidance of Governor Schultz and not to be used as a political document. There is great jubilation in Ottawa Government circles here over the matter, and there is no longer any doubt in the minds of the followers of the Government but that Mr. Greenway will be brought to time.

There can be no doubt now of what was intended. Mr. Greenway is to be brought to time, and this is the way taken to bring him to time. A conspiracy was apparently entered into between some member of the Administration—and from what I have heard I believe it to be the Prime Minister—and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, for the purpose of bringing Mr. Greenway to time and forcing his hand in a matter in which his province is as deeply interested as in any question that ever came before it. Under the circumstances, I think the House will agree with me that I only did my duty in bringing this matter to the attention of the House at the earliest possible moment, and I conclude by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has, of course, performed what he conceived to be a duty incumbent upon him in bringing to the attention of the House at the earliest possible time a matter which he thinks of very great importance. As to its importance there may be different opinions. There may be a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself, for instance, or other members of the House, as to the magnitude this particular act has assumed. There may also be a very wide difference of opinion as to the relevancy and the aptness of the methods and manner by which the hon. gentleman has enforced his remarks. After all, the main part of the hon. gentleman's information is of a very unsubstantial and illusory character. It is taken from the headlines of newspapers and from press despatches and correspondence, and from those he proceeds to deduce the policy of the Government, the motives of the First Minister, and the motive, in fact, of what he considers this wrong action. He commenced his address by endeavouring to prejudice the House against the executive head of the province of Manitoba. The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba had a perfect right to come to Ottawa. He has a perfect right to go from one part of this Dominion to the other. Why, then, should an hon. gentleman in this House come to the conclusion that whenever a Lieutenant-Governor—Lieutenant-Governor Schultz in this case—goes from the seat of his provincial government to Ottawa, it is for some unworthy purpose or with some sinister motive? I think it was unworthy of the hon. gentleman to attempt to prejudice the House against Lieutenant-Governor Schultz, in the first place, by insinuations as to motives of which the hon. gentleman knows nothing and with respect to which he confesses that he knows nothing. In the first place, he said that he got his information simply from rumour, and then, feeling that he had gone a little too far, he said that even he himself was not disposed to believe that such was the case. He makes the insinuation to prejudice the case against the person whom he attacks, and then tries to shelter himself by saying that he himself disclaims any very definite or firm belief in the insinuations he made.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not disclaim any belief.

Mr. FOSTER. He accused the Lieutenant-Governor of having come to Ottawa, bidden or unbidden. What business was it of his? If unbidden, he was doing nothing more than he had the right to do. If bidden, he was doing nothing more than he should do under our constitution. If the First Minister of this Dominion, or the Governor General of this Dominion wishes to consult with a Lieutenant-Governor and ask him to come here—I am just taking a hypothetical case—the hon. gentleman has no right to found on that a charge against the Lieutenant-Governor. But, Sir, he went further than that. Not content with the insinuation, which, as he himself admitted, had no foundation, in fact, he goes on to make it still worse by imputing the most corrupt and unworthy motives to Governor Schultz. He says the Governor would like to remain another term in Winnipeg. How does he know? Who told him that had authority to tell him? He argued from what would be his own course, probably—because a man is led to a certain deduction from knowing what his own feeling would be under given circumstances, and what would be his own probable action in a certain case. Arguing from that, or from some other foundation, he comes to the conclusion, and gives it out in an indefinite sort of way—so as not to commit himself too far—that Governor Schultz was here to do an unworthy act, from an unworthy corrupt motive,—that of endeavouring to buy for himself the place of Governor of Manitoba for an extension of his term, or for a second term. Now, Sir, I am bound to say that that is an insinuation, amounting almost in terms to a definite charge, which the hon. gentleman ought to feel the responsibility of making before he attempts to bring it before this House. He went on in that peculiar method of his, first to make an insinuation amounting almost to an assertion, and then in order to get behind a bulwark, to shield himself from counter attack, he said that the Governor denied it; and he did not state that he was quite prepared to take the word of the Governor as a gentleman and an official of this country. Well, Sir, the gravamen of the charge, when brought down to a simple conclusion, is this

—he admits the Governor had a perfect right to inform his mind and his conscience with reference to any public matter which is at present agitating the mind of the country, which is now a subject or likely to become one in which he himself may have to advise and consult with his Ministry. The Governor has a perfect right, by applying to every source within his reach, to inform his mind and conscience with reference to a public question that is sure, or likely to come before himself and his advisers. My hon. friend did not deny that. Very well. The Governor did inform himself. He had recourse to an authority upon constitutional law. He had recourse to the Clerk of this House, who is well known as a writer of repute and an authority upon constitutional points. And the hon. gentleman himself did not deny the right of the Government to consult so eminent authority and get his opinion. Well, we are on common ground that far. Now the hon. gentleman parts from that common ground and takes this :—That Governor Schultz, while having the right to inform himself upon the matter, had no right to give that opinion to any person outside of his own Ministry. The greatest and best constitutional authority we have in the Dominion of Canada, at the suggestion and request of the Governor, wrote an opinion, entirely aside from partisan or party motives or leanings and gave it to Governor Schultz. And the gravamen of the charge is this :—That Governor Schultz did not button it up so securely in his pocket that the newspapers could not get hold of it. Now, Sir, suppose that that opinion is, as I have stated, a non-partisan opinion, a non-political opinion, a strictly constitutional opinion, given by request, what, in the settlement of a great question in which the whole of this country is vitally interested—not, I am bound to say, because of the importance of the subject itself as it appears in this special form at present with us, but because of its pervasive distribution through all classes of the country, and therefore arousing an interest everywhere—what is prejudiced by the people of Canada having access to the same constitutional opinion, the same non-partisan opinion, the same non-political dissertation upon the law and constitution in regard to it, as Governor Schultz himself ? What or who is to be injured by the revelation of that authority ? I cannot see that the proper solution of the question, if we all wish it shall be solved properly and constitutionally, is prejudiced by an action of that kind ? Therefore, leaving aside these finely-drawn legal arguments and distinctions and taking it upon the ground of broad common sense, what great injury has been done to the constitution, or to the settlement of the question at large by the divulgence of the opinion that was written by the Clerk of the House of Commons, so that the people of the country have access to it ? The hon. gentleman states that it was meddlesome for Governor Schultz to get the advice. The only answer to that, that it is necessary to give, is that the hon. gentleman, in another part of his address, said that the Governor had a perfect right to seek advice. If so it could not have been meddlesome for him to go to a constitutional authority and get the best advice he could on the matter. The hon. gentleman then comes to the point of the "conspiracy" as he calls it, and there again he has nothing but newspaper reports to rely upon. He takes certain reports in the newspapers and from these draws the conclusion that there was collusion between the Premier of the Dominion and Governor Schultz to get this opinion written by the Clerk and put into the Governor's hands, and give it out to the public of Canada. Well, Sir, the facts of the case are these,—that this opinion given by the Clerk of the House was also made known to the Premier of this Dominion. Is there anything improper in that ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Most improper.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is necessary, if it is advisable that the Governor should inform himself in reference to the point of constitutional law for his own information, is there any very great impropriety in his communicating that to the head of the Government of Canada ? It was so communicated. And when it was published in Winnipeg it was published also in the papers of this part of the Dominion. If it were once published in a newspaper in Winnipeg, it would have gone over the whole Dominion. There is, therefore, no blame, no extraordinary guilt of crime that can be imputed in the publication simultaneously or a few hours after.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say who gave it to the press ?

Mr. FOSTER. The press have their way of getting these things. In this particular instance the press got this from the Premier of the Dominion himself. Now, Sir, out of that simple relation of facts the hon. gentleman adduces something for which he has no authority, namely, that there was a conspiracy between the Premier of the Dominion and Governor Schultz to force the hand of the Ministry of Winnipeg. In what way can it force their hand ? Was there an individual opinion of Governor Schultz published to the country ? Was there a single line or a single word to show what his attitude was or would be towards any legislation which the Ministry under him had proposed or would propose. Not a word. If Governor Schultz had published an opinion in which he had animadverted upon what was going to be the proposal of his ministry, what was to be the future legislation of his legislature, then my hon. friend would have good ground for his criticism. But you have not to-day, the hon. gentleman cannot bring to the at-

tention of the House,one single line to give an inkling of what Governor Schultz's opinion is as regards this matter of remedial legislation. So I say a charge which would be a serious one if it embodied an expressed opinion of the executive head, comes to be a harmless one when it is simply the giving out to the press, to the public, of an opinion of a writer, and an authority. Suppose that the writer had written it, and it had been printed and published, and Governor Schultz had made it his own, had put it in his library with his other constitutional works, and suppose that he, after study of those, when reporters came to question him, had given them access to the pamphlet itself which contained the opinion. The pamphlet may not have been ten days old, it may have been published after this controversy arose, it may have been written and published within ten days; it would have been given, in this case, by supposition, with constitutional authorities as a constitutional authority; what would have been the grounds of objection against it then? It is not a crime, not a wrong. Is it a crime and a wrong, then, to give an opinion of a constitutional character, written by an authority, when it could not be a crime to give it if it had been printed by the authority, and was in course of publication, and had become current literature? Now, this distinction, I think, may be borne in mind when we come to consider what is really the common sense of the charge that the hon. gentleman has brought against the Government. He says that this was published without the consent of the Government of Manitoba. He has not given us any authority for that assertion, simply his own words. He may be in the counsels of that government, I am not disposed to think that he is. He has made the assertion, he has not given any proof of that assertion. After having made this charge, he ends up as he began. He insinuates again, he does not declare in just so many definite words that he believes it so, but he puts it in the form of a question; thus again, with ingenuity peculiar to his whole address, sheltering himself from a direct charge; and he says: Is this the first step in a bargain? Is the next step to dismiss the Manitoba Ministry? Is the third step to drop down in the gubernatorial seat for another term? All hypotheses, all put with a note of interrogation after them, not to commit the hon. gentleman, but showing his animus, and making, in a way which is not the most openly and manly, a charge by insinuation, which he does not care to make directly. Now, Sir, I do not see that at present the hon. gentleman's remarks call for any more criticism at my hands. Not being a lawyer, I have tried to give what I consider to be a common-sense view of this matter, I submit it to the House and to the country, and I am inclined to think that neither the country nor the House will believe that any great crime has been committed, and they will think, after calmly considering it, that, after all, this has been a tempest in a teapot.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The question that is before us by the motion for the adjournment of the debate, is wholly distinct from the merits of the question out of which this controversy has arisen. I have no intention whatever of entering into a discussion of the propriety or impropriety of the course which the legislature and Government of Manitoba have taken. That is a matter which may come before the House at a later period of the session. That subject is not before the House in the motion that is before the Chair. We have nothing whatever to do with the soundness or unsoundness of the opinion given to the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba by the Clerk of this House. He may be all right in point of law, or the hon. gentleman opposite may be partly in the right and partly in the wrong. I am not going to criticise what the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said in regard to the merits of the opinion itself; but I purpose to say something with regard to the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor in seeking, in his official character, advice and counsel from parties other than those who are his constitutional advisers. Now, Sir, the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba is the executive head of that province, a province which enjoys constitutional government; and I confess, Sir, my inability to understand how constitutional government is to be maintained if a Lieutenant-Governor feels himself at liberty to seek the advice of various parties who have no responsibility to the province for the advice which they give, and who publishes that advice abroad, while the question to which it relates is still under deliberation, on the part of both the legislature and the government. What would be thought, Sir, if this question had been before a court of law, if the court had heard argument, if the question was still under deliberation, before the court had pronounced judgment, if a party were to appear in public with a criticism dealing with the matter? Now, Sir, this case stands in very much the same position. The leader of the House accuses the hon. member for North Simcoe of making a number of mean insinuations, of putting in the form of an interrogation what he cannot, or dare not, affirm. Well, I do not know what the hon. gentleman may or dare affirm; but the hon. gentleman has put a number of questions that seem to me extremely pertinent, under the circumstances, that seem to me to emanate from the condition of things that exists at this moment. Here is a communication taking place between the First Minister of the Crown in this country, and the Lieutenant-

Governor of a province, with regard to a matter about which he should seek constitutional advice from his constitutional advisers, and not from his master, or from the parties who may, at any moment, remove him from office if he does not seek to carry out the views of the Administration, whatever those views may be. Now, Sir, look at the condition of things. I have brought the matter before this House on more than one occasion, I have pointed out that the Lieutenant-Governor holds office during pleasure, and for five years he cannot be removed except for cause, and the cause for which he is removed must be reported to this House. You allow the five years to expire, you do not renew his commission; he does not stand before the country, nor does he hold his office in the same way that he did before. He is not independent; you have him in your power. His five years have expired, and you can remove him at this moment if he does not carry out your wishes—does not betray his advisers—does not appoint political janissaries to apply the bowstring to the men who are his constitutional advisers under the law. That is the position which things present at this moment. I do not know what more appropriate name could be given to them than the name of conspiracy; for whatever hon. gentlemen may think, it does seem to me that a conspiracy is formed against the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor when you adopt such a course as this towards them. Renew his commission if you wish to retain him in office, supersede him by another if you do not wish to retain him in office; but make your Lieutenant Governor independent of the Minters of the Crown here, to the extent the law intends and then there may not be so much objection to his holding communication with the First Minister. But even then, I think the course which the hon. gentleman has taken would be a most improper one. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has expressed opinions in respect to the merits of this case and to its constitutional features. I may not agree with him, I am not going to say one word with respect to that matter; but whatever views or opinions may be formed, it is a matter which must be disposed of and dealt with in the first instance by the legislative authority in the province of Manitoba, and if we are dissatisfied with the conclusion then if it comes legally before us, the matter may be considered here. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman thinks, and other hon. gentlemen think that this legislation requires amendment; others are of a different opinion. But I believe this, that when all the facts become known it will be found that the Lieutenant-Governor himself has been conspiring against his advisers and is himself the man who is responsible for the legislation which has given rise to all the bitterness that exists at this moment on this question. I believe that if the matter is inquired into it can be shown, that there was scarcely an Order in Council, for a long period of time, submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his sanction or signature that got that sanction or signature until he telegraphed or wrote to Ottawa, and received instructions from the Government here as to the course he should take. I say a more unconstitutional, or more improper course taken by the Lieutenant-Governor in discharge of his duties was never undertaken than that pursued by the gentleman who holds office at this moment by the sufferance of hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury benches. This is not true as regards the province of Manitoba alone. This Government has been a Government of conspirators against the local governments in every case where the conduct of a local government could be attacked with any degree of success. We know when the conduct of the Quebec Government was improperly brought up in this House when complaints of misconduct in office were made against Ministers here. What was done? The conduct of the Government of Quebec in discharging their duties was dragged here, in the first place before the Senate and afterwards before this House. The Lieutenant-Governor in discharging his obligations as Lieutenant-Governor appointed a commission—to try whom? To try his subordinates in office? No. To try those who were his advisers, and who under our constitutional system should have been tried by the legislature of the province. Why did not the Lieutenant-Governor call the legislature together if he had charges to make against his Ministers? Why did he not give them an opportunity to make their defence to the inquiry into such charges? He dismissed his Ministers. Did he stop at that? No; he dissolved the legislature. Did he send his Ministers back for re-election? Not he. He formed a new government, and from December on for four months, the government was carried on without any Parliament being in existence, and without any Ministers returning for election. I turn to the writ for the holding of the new election, and what do I find? The very proclamation under which Parliament was dissolved is the same instrument by which a new Parliament is called. According to Magna Charta, that must be called within forty days. I do not know what special provision there is in the province of Quebec, but I venture to say that there is no provision which authorizes four months delay before an election is held. In England at the present time 35 days only can elapse between the issue of the writ and a new election. Why was not a new Parliament called? It was not called because they did not believe they could defeat

the old Ministers, because the old Ministers could carry the country, and time must be had sufficient to debauch the electors.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and there was no election held for four months. The law also provides that the legislature shall meet within twelve months; it is a mandatory provision, it is what the law provides; and yet just before the twelve months expired the Lieutenant-Governor, instead of convening that legislature, dissolved Parliament. Was there no connection, was there no communication between him and the Government here, for as soon as he succeeded in carrying out the policy which the Government had marked out for him, he was made a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. LISTER. And now he is going to be a Supreme Court judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me return for a moment to this question which is now before us. Let me call the attention of the House to what took place under somewhat different circumstances, and which are more favourable to the Administration than the circumstances which we are now discussing. When Lord Grey had submitted to Parliament his Reform Bill, a number of societies were formed by which that measure was being promoted, and it was said that some of those societies were ready to resort to violent methods in supporting the Bill. The Duke of Wellington, a privy councillor, a peer of the realm, who in either capacity was free, under the ancient law, to advise the Crown, addressed the King directly upon the subject; and that letter the King answered without having communicated the matter to his Ministers. And the King supported his Administration. He said he had confidence in them, that they were fully alive to the condition of affairs existing, and that they would take that course which, in their opinion, was best in the public interest. Now, Lord Grey objected to what the King did. In the first place he objected altogether under the new system of parliamentary government with responsible Ministers of the Crown, acting unitedly, to the Duke of Wellington in his capacity either as a peer or a privy councillor undertaking to advise the Sovereign. And he pointed out that very serious inconvenience would arise in case the advice became known. The King at first was disposed to defend his conduct, but afterwards he gave to his Prime Minister the assurance that in future cases, if he received advice from persons who, under the constitution were entitled to give that advice, he would give no other answer than simply an acknowledgement, without first having submitted the matter to his Ministers and leaving the subject to be dealt with by them through the proper official channels. Lord Grey informed the King that he was entirely satisfied with that course, that he had no doubt whatever it was the proper course to take, and that what he had previously done was more than questionable as regards its propriety. Then shortly afterwards, when the government resigned an attempt was made to form a new government, and the House of Commons passed a resolution and communicated it to the Sovereign advising him to take back his Ministers and to take their advice. There was no answer given to this, and when Lord Grey was recalled and the government was reinvested with office the address of the House of Commons was answered, and the King in that despatch informed the House of Commons that the reason for not answering sooner was because he had no Minister to advise him on this subject. Now, those cases go to show, that while it is important that the representative of the Crown should be well informed with regard to public matters, yet when the Crown requires special information, the Crown must receive that information from the parties constitutionally entitled to give advice and from no other parties whatever. Why, Sir, there are cases alluded to by Dr. Todd, and by other writers on parliamentary government, pointing out the great service that the Crown was sometime able to render the Ministers with regard to public matters, and Mr. Gladstone himself mentions, that the longer the Sovereign is in possession of the Throne the better qualified is the Sovereign to aid Ministers in this regard, because the Sovereign holds office continuously. Many things transpire with regard to public matters and foreign affairs, with which, while the Crown is informed, the present Ministers may not be informed, and the Crown is capable of giving information thereon to Ministers with regard to public matters which generally aids and assists them in dealing with the questions they are called upon to consider. But, Sir, that is wholly a different matter from this. Where does the Lieutenant-Governor seek advice? He seeks advice outside the province altogether. He seeks advice from a person who can have no responsibility to the people of that province and with whom they cannot deal if they disapprove of the advice given. Suppose for a moment that the Lieutenant-Governor should exercise his constitutional powers and say: I agree with the opinion of Dr. Bourinot and I do not agree with the opinion of my Attorney General, and I will dismiss my Government. How are you going to make Dr. Bourinot responsible for the advice he has given and which has led to this action of the Lieutenant-Governor? You cannot make Dr. Bourinot responsible in any sense, and that fact is sufficient to show you how improper the conduct of the Lieu-

tenant-Governor was in seeking the advice of an outside person in regard to a matter which was pending before his government, and with which the legislature would in a very short time be called upon to deal. I am not going to say more upon this subject at the present moment. One thing is perfectly clear : under our constitutional system there are certain persons designated as having the right to give advice. The Royal will is not formed by the Lieutenant-Governor, but by them. The House of Lords, the individual members of that House, as peers of the realm ; the Privy Council collectively, and the Privy Council individually ; the House of Commons in its collective capacity, and in no other, may, in conformity to law or to convention, give advice. Turn to any writer, the most elementary upon this subject, and he will tell us that the individual members of the House of Commons cannot approach the Sovereign and undertake to advise the Sovereign with regard to a particular matter. How then can it be said that an outside party would have that right ? This House is a great Council of State and as a great Council of State we speak collectively, and we may give the Sovereign such advice as we think best ; but we cannot speak individually out of this House, and much less can a party do so who has no seat in any Council of State, and who is not either individually, or as a part of a great Council, the adviser of the Sovereign or of the Sovereign's representative. Sir, it is very clear from what the hon. leader of the House has told us, that he feels it is quite proper what the Prime Minister of this country to whom the Lieutenant-Governor is subordinate, by whose advice he may be removed at any moment : it is clear, I say, that he feels that it is perfectly proper for the Lieutenant-Governor to take advice and to make this a subject of communication with a party who is his master. I utterly repudiate that doctrine. Both in permitting him to continue without a commission, and in undertaking to advise or control him when he has constitutional advisers in his province, is a most improper and most unconstitutional proceeding.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have not very much to say in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He seems to be chiefly concerned with what took place in the province of Quebec some years ago during the Mercier regime, and he went back, as is very customary with him, to the very foundations of precedents. He took us back to Magna Charta for his case, and it appears that not only during that late unfortunate Mercier regime in Quebec, which hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt, do not care to hear about——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DICKEY. It appears, I say, that during that unfortunate regime, not only were all the laws of morality and public honesty violated, but Magna Charta was also violated. Upon that occasion, it would seem according to the hon. gentleman, there was a serious fracture made in Magna Charta. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) seemed to be very much agitated over the course of the province of Quebec at that time, and I was wondering whether it was really the course that the Lieutenant-Governor took that he objected to, or the results which that course produced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DICKEY. I was wondering whether he objected so much to the particular course the Lieutenant-Governor took to discover the conspiracy, or the fact that the conspiracy was discovered and exposed to the country, much to the damage of his own party. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) said that the Governor upon that occasion disregarded the advice of his constitutional advisers. I do not propose to discuss that question at length, for, as the hon. gentleman himself admitted, it is perhaps somewhat irrelevant to the question at issue. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) stated, as I understood him, that the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec appointed a commission behind the back of his advisers to inquire into their own conduct. Well, now, the hon. gentleman will see that he is doing the late Governor of Quebec a very great injustice, because that commission was appointed at the request of the Hon. Mr. Mercier himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, under an order in council passed by the Mercier Government, and in that respect, therefore, he is doing the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec an injustice. I do not propose to discuss further the question of the Mercier Government, because I presume the hon. gentleman himself will admit that whatever were the methods by which the discovery was made, it was in the general interests of Canada that that inquiry should take place, and the exposures be made, and that the result which followed in the elections should follow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That the end justifies the means.

Mr. DICKEY. I presume the hon. gentleman will admit that. Now, coming to the question at hand, with respect to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, I must say that I cannot see that any very serious fracture of the constitution has been caused. I understand the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say that the Lieutenant-Governor has no right to seek advice anywhere outside of his constitutional advisers, and that in that respect the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba violated his

duties. Now, consider the position in which the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba was. There was a question upon which, as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says, the opinion of the country was divided. It was a question to which there was absolutely no direct constitutional precedent; it was a question of extreme difficulty; and, worse than all, it was a question that appealed to those very feelings of race and religion which, if ever the future of this country is in danger, will be the cause of that danger. So that the Lieutenant-Governor was called upon to deal with an entirely new and extremely dangerous question; and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if, under these circumstances, it would not have been extremely unfortunate if, under the constitution of this country, the Lieutenant-Governor could not have gone to a man of the calibre of the Clerk of this House—a man who is an authority for our daily proceedings here, and frequently quoted as such by hon. gentlemen opposite, a man to whose work you, Mr. Speaker, refer in ruling this House. It would have been a misfortune, I say, if the Lieutenant-Governor could not have gone to an officer of that character to obtain an independent opinion on this question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Governor General could come to us here on the same ground.

Mr. DICKEY. I am not aware of any constitutional rule whatever to prevent the Lieutenant-Governor or the Governor General of this Dominion from informing himself in a legitimate way, upon all questions of public interest. He may consult standard authorities; he may, as the leader of the House says, consult newspaper articles. Would it be improper for him to discuss this question with the Clerk of this House or with any other man who is learned in such questions?

Mr. LAURIER. As a governor, most decidedly.

Mr. DICKEY. As an individual, would he have a right to discuss it?

Mr. LAURIER. Most certainly not, if he makes it public.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not understand the hon. leader of the Opposition to adhere to the position taken by the hon. member for Bothwell. I understood the hon. member for Bothwell to maintain that it is wrong for him to seek advice anywhere. The Clerk of this House, it is true, is an officer here; but he has another character as well, namely, that of a high constitutional authority, as our former librarian had the character of a high constitutional authority; and it was in that capacity that the Lieutenant-Governor turned to him for advice. There being in that course no constitutional principle invaded, there is not the slightest evidence that the Lieutenant-Governor gave this opinion to the press, or made it public. Even if he did make it public, as the leader of the House pointed out, that would not be, in the slightest degree, committing himself to the arguments or the conclusions contained in it. The constitutional rule is that a constitutional sovereign shall not express an opinion contrary to the advice of his advisers. With regard to the precedent cited by the hon. member for Bothwell, the case of Lord Grey, it seems to me that nothing could have been wider of the case in hand, except, perhaps, Magna Charta, which he also cited. The case of Lord Grey occurred at a time when the constitution of England was in a transition state, when the old privy councillors who were not of the Cabinet claimed the right still to advise the sovereign on public questions. That was particularly the case with the Duke of Wellington, who was the father of his country at that time, and who was looked up to by all parties. The Duke of Wellington undertook to advise the king in pursuance of old practice, and he was called to account and stopped. He could not do that now—why? Because, though a privy councillor, he was a member of the party in opposition. But if he were a humble individual, an expert independent altogether of politics, to whom, simply as an expert, the sovereign could turn for advice, there would not be the slightest objection to his doing so, and informing himself as to the state of the law on any question. Now, this question has to be settled by the legislature of Manitoba as a whole. It is not to be settled by the Government of Manitoba. The Government of Manitoba, for all I know, may have no policy whatever upon the question; they may leave it entirely to the legislature to settle. The hon. member for North Simcoe said a good deal with respect to the motives of Lieutenant-Governor Schultz is coming here. I thought that was extremely unfortunate on his part. The hon. gentleman's own actions in this matter might be made the subject of very severe comment, and I should be very sorry if anybody took the opportunity when he was absent, and had not the right to make a reply, to make any statements of that sort. It is quite possible that Lieutenant-Governor Schultz was acting in what he considered to be the very best interests of this country. It is quite possible that he thought that he was able to do something towards settling a question which, irrespective of party—for party had nothing whatever to do with it—threatened to rend this country on lines of race and creed. It is possible that Lieutenant-Governor Schultz thought that he would be able, by advice, by consultation, by remonstrance, by the exercise of all those constitutional rights which a Lieutenant-Governor or a Governor General has in

dealing with his government to assist in settling this question.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he is of the opinion that the personal will of the sovereign or the sovereign's representative may find expression officially in that way?

Mr. DICKEY. I ask, how could the Lieutenant-Governor do that unless he went to his Council prepared with knowledge—unless he had informed himself beforehand so as to be able to discuss with the able men in his Cabinet the questions at issue? If he went there without informing himself, he would go as a child, and his influence for the benefit of the future of this Dominion would be nil. Therefore, it seems to me, that this can best be described as the late Sir John Macdonald described another agitation, a great cry about a very little piece of pork.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that the hon. gentleman, the leader of the House, takes the position that all the facts stated—some of them by way of suggestion—with regard to this matter by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) are true, and that the Government justifies the action of the Lieutenant-Governor. The hon. gentleman admits that the opinion of the Clerk of this House was handed out for publication by the Premier. The Premier handed out that opinion for the purpose of influencing public sentiment in the country, and, if possible, public sentiment in Manitoba. The Finance Minister urges that that was the proper course to adopt, because the gentleman who gave this opinion is a great constitutional authority, and his opinion is entitled to great weight. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has already been stated by the hon. member for Simcoe that action of this kind by the Clerk of the House, if intended by him for publication, would be most improper. I desire to express my approval of that view taken by the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Simcoe accepts the statement published in the newspapers of the intention of the Clerk of the House in giving that opinion, namely, that he gave it because it was asked from him privately for the private use of the Governor. The Finance Minister, however, following in the lead of the First Minister, proposes to make all the use he possibly can of that opinion. It is evident, therefore, that the opinion of an official of this House is being used for the purpose of giving weight to a contention which is resisted in the strongest manner by those who do not agree with it. Surely, there can be no more improper conduct than that. If the Clerk had put forward that opinion for that very purpose, he would be subject to grave censure from this House. If he gave that opinion for the private use of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and if the Lieutenant-Governor and the First Minister, violating the confidence of the Clerk, gave that out for publication, they acted most improperly. And when we find the Finance Minister coming forward and telling us, here is the Clerk's opinion, which transcends every other and settles to a large extent this question, we are at a loss to know whether we are really dealing with a responsible Government. It is quite impossible for any man, in a matter of this kind, in which principles are not admitted, and concerning which there is so much diversity of view, to give an opinion without taking a partisan course, and partisan action on the part of the Clerk of this House is something which should be resented by this House. And the attempt of the Government to make use of the opinion of the Clerk, obtained in the way this was obtained, for a party and partisan purpose cannot be too severely censured. The Finance Minister attempted—and I noticed that his remarks in this respect received very vigorous applause from hon. gentlemen opposite—to attach some blame to the hon. member for Simcoe for having attacked a gentleman who was not here to defend himself. The hon. Minister of Militia took the same ground. I wish to protest against any such pretension. If the Lieutenant-Governor of a province exceeds his duty and does something he should not do, are we to be precluded from criticising his conduct because he is not here? The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba is an official of this country. He is one of the paid servants of the Dominion. We here represent the Dominion. It is our duty, it is our right, to criticise and condemn any officer of the Dominion. And it is no answer to make, that the official whom we criticise has not a seat in this House. It has been charged in the press that the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba has undertaken to intervene in this question, now before his advisers and the legislature of which he is a part, in order to advance the ends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that his object in so doing is to obtain in return his reappointment for a second term as Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. That has been suggested, and that is perhaps the natural inference from the facts admitted here to-day. I wish, with the view of emphasizing that inference, an inference which I have every reason to believe well founded, to bring a matter before this House which I had intended to bring at an early day. In fact, I had intended to bring it before the House last session, and certainly would have brought it before this House, apart altogether from the question now under discussion, before long this session. I refer to the very question of the position of this gentleman even at present in Manitoba. I consider that the way in which the Government has dealt with this matter has, for some time, been a public scandal. Mr. Schultz was appointed

Governor of Manitoba on the 1st July, 1888. His term expired the 1st July, 1893. He has been in that office ever since, a tenant at will—most subservient to the will of the Government of the day. He has been there since the 1st July, 1893, threatened all the time, according to newspaper reports, with removal, and most desirous to remain. It has been suggested on the other side, that we have no evidence of that. Why, Mr. Speaker, as has been said, the gentleman had ten thousand reasons for desiring to remain in that office, and every one of those reasons strikes a most responsive chord in his heart. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have repelled with great indignation any suggestion that the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba would be influenced by any motives except those of the very highest nature. Now, the matters to which I referred a moment ago, which I had intended to bring before this House, and which I now desire to lay before it, show that that gentleman, in fulfilling the duties of this office, has been actuated by other than the highest motives. I charge that he has used the position of Lieutenant-Governor, since he has occupied that high and honourable office, not for the purpose of carrying out his duties as laid down in the constitution, but for the purpose of advancing his private ends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. State your point of order.

Mr. MARTIN. I say that, and I intend to prove it. Now, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba is largely interested in property in that province. He may, perhaps, be unfortunate in that respect. However that may be, he is the owner of large quantities of vacant farm lands throughout the province, and he is also the owner of a very considerable amount of property in the city of Winnipeg. Long prior to his elevation to the high post he now occupies, and ever since his incumbency in that office, he has been engaged in a most rancorous and persistent fight with every municipality in which his land is situated, with a view of escaping payment of taxes. Now, that may possibly be considered a private matter, but I will show in what way it becomes a public matter.

Mr. WELDON. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether the reflections cast by the hon. gentleman upon the Lieutenant-Governor of a province are in order?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right, if he chooses, to make a charge against any official in our employ, and, if he wishes to do so, before the people's representatives in Parliament is the place to make it.

Mr. SPEAKER. If called on to rule, I would say that questions of privilege apply only to members of Parliament themselves. Therefore, while there may be a question of taste in regard to these attacks that are made upon public officials, I cannot say that the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MARTIN. As to the question of taste, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take the responsibility. I had intended making these charges last session, but it was announced in such a definite way through the Government newspapers that the vacancy had been filled and the position would soon be occupied by another gentleman, that I thought that perhaps, as Mr. Schultz was going out of office, the best way was to leave him alone. But, Sir, I cannot do that any longer. The same man remains there; remains there in violation of the constitutional practice, as has been pointed out to-day; remains there discharging most delicate duties, duties in which hon. gentlemen opposite are most vitally interested; and he remains there at the will of the Government, either to be reappointed, or to be continued in office from day to day, as he is now. Under these circumstances any question of taste must yield precedence, in my judgment, to a question of duty. Sir, I was proceeding to say that the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba was very largely interested in property, both city and farm property, throughout the province of Manitoba, and that he had for a long time exhibited great distaste to paying his taxes on these properties. The legislature of Manitoba, of which I was then a member, passed an Act for the purpose of enabling the city of Winnipeg to sell lands for taxes. This Act was passed to overcome a mere technical difficulty which had arisen and which prevented the city from selling even those lands the taxes upon which were long in arrear. As I have said before, the Lieutenant-Governor was a large owner in the city, and his property was part of that upon which the taxes had not been paid. Under these circumstances what did the Lieutenant-Governor do? He refused to assent to the Bill, and gave no reason whatever for his conduct, leaving it to be inferred, and I do infer and do charge, that he used his high official position as Lieutenant-Governor of the province to frustrate the efforts of the legislature of Manitoba to enable the city of Winnipeg to sell his lands for the long arrears of taxes which he had neglected or refused to pay. Now, Mr. Speaker, if a man will do that, if a man will use his position in that open way, is not the suggestion that is made in the public press to-day one likely to be true? If a man will do that, if a man will degrade his position as he degraded his in this case, for a few dollars, what will he do when a question of $50,000 is at issue? I may say that there was a good deal of trouble one way and another, but I am not going to refer to any matter except matters

of this kind, where he used his office for his own purposes and for those alone. In the city of Winnipeg there was a good deal of trouble about surveys. Surveys had been made there in a hap-hazard kind of way in the early days. But when the city grew to be a great city, comparatively speaking, it was found that many of these surveys were inaccurate. We have in the province of Manitoba a registration system known as the Torrens system, by which the government of the province guarantees absolutely the title of all lands that are bought under that system. In the working of the Torrens office, it was found practically impossible to keep the government straight without having a new survey of the city of Winnipeg. An Act was passed providing for a special survey, and a special survey was made. It was provided that this survey was to take effect only after an Order in Council had been passed. The Order in Council was passed. And because the Lieutenant-Governor was interested in many of these properties where the survey had been irregular, was interested in many claims which must be affected, he deliberately stopped the operation of the Order in Council, and refused to sign it until public opinion became so strong that he was forced to yield. Strong editorials were written in the newspapers, and the town was in a ferment. I may say that in the case of large blocks of property, the titles had been held up, sales had been held back, there had been a great deal of confusion throughout the city on account of this survey. The House will understand what confusion a step of that kind would cause. I wish to say that, if the Lieutenant-Governor had any real grievance, every opportunity was provided in the Act by which he might, like any other citizen, appear before the court provided by the Act—I think it was the Attorney General for the time being—and press his claims and ask that they be adjudicated upon. He had the same right as any other citizen of the country—and in this respect he was no greater than any other—but instead of allowing the steps to be taken which were laid down in the Act which he himself had assented to, he took the unprecedented course of refusing to assent to an Order in Council. But public opinion was aroused, and it was finally announced that a mass meeting would be held to condemn the action of the Lieutenant-Governor. Then he yielded. Now, reference has been made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to the fact that Orders in Council were not signed by this gentleman. He has gone so far as to say that possibly this legislation originated from that fact. Well, I cannot support him in that, because I think that would be rather a poor reason. As I am to a certain extent responsible for that legislation, I do not rest it upon any such grounds as that ; but I do say that it had come to be such a grievance, such a difficulty, with the government, that when the Department of Education Act, which is one of the two Acts of 1890, as to which a remedial order has been promulgated,—when that Act came to be passed, we found it necessary to depart from the usual course, and instead of having it provided that matters to be carried out by the Department of Education, which of course like other departments was a department of the government, being done by Order in Council, we found it necessary to abolish Orders in Council so far as that department was concerned. If hon. gentlemen will look the matter up they will find that in that Act it is not necessary to get the Governor's signature to put into force any order of the executive government, but the orders are made by the Department of Education and go into force at once. I say that to substantiate the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell, and to show what an outrage it is upon the province of Manitoba. It is bad enough to have to stand this man for five years. In view of what was done in Quebec, and which has been alluded to here, you can understand that is is a very difficult matter to quarrel with a Lieutenant-Governor. A local government are not likely, if they can avoid it, to pick a quarrel with a man who has their political life in his hands ; therefore we had to grin and bear these matters and say nothing about them. We were in hopes that when the end of his term came in 1893, he would be promptly replaced, but we have been disappointed in that. It has been suggested that perhaps His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor does not desire to obtain a second term in that office. Well, I have made some suggestions with regard to that, and I may add another. I can say without fear of contradiction that since the 1st day of July, 1893, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been engaged most persistently and most ably too—because, whatever his faults may be, he is a most astute gentleman, a man of great ability,—he has been engaged in one object alone—and I fancy hon. gentlemen opposite could substantiate me if they were quite frank—and that object was to get another term. I may say that right from the first, his appointment was an outrage upon the people of Manitoba. You cannot find in Manitoba more than five or six men out of a population of, perhaps, 190,000 we now claim to have, who have a good word to say for that man. But it was necessary for him to make material to justify the Government in reappointing him to the position, and about a year ago he took advantage of his birthday for that purpose, and sent a young man around the city to get signatures to an address congratulating him upon his birthday. That address was hawked around the city, and although a great many refused to sign, a lot of people found it easier to write their names than to say no. This address was paraded in the newspapers with the object I mention, and

that has been the key to His Honour's actions since the 1st July, 1893. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have had this matter under consideration since that time. There have been two prominent candidates whose names have been freely mentioned as successors to His Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to point out to the House the rule of debate in relation to the question before it at the present moment. Any member, I take it, has a right to bring a matter of urgency before the House upon a motion to adjourn the House; but it is the ordinary course in England, and has been the course here, that when a question of that kind has been brought before the House, the debate should be confined to the subject brought under discussion by the member who chooses to take so unusual a course as that of moving the adjournment of the House. I would ask the hon. member, therefore, to endeavour to confine his remarks as closely as he can to the question that has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. MARTIN. I have no intention of infringing upon the rules of debate. I was under the impression that upon a motion to adjourn we could talk upon almost anything.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I do not think that is the case. Let me point this out. Upon a motion to adjourn, if the motion is in amendment to a motion before the House, then the discussion must be confined to the question before the House. The course adopted by the hon. member for Simcoe is one which is adopted only upon very urgent occasions. I can remember only two instances since I have been Speaker of this House, in which an adjournment of the House has been moved by an hon. member for the purpose of bringing up a matter of urgency. The custom in England has been that when a matter of that kind is brought before the House, the discussion is confined to the question which is submitted by the hon. member who takes the responsibility of adopting that very unusual course. In the parliamentary debates in England I notice that the Speaker made this observation:

> I must point out to the right hon. and gallant gentleman that he is going far beyond the motion of an urgent character which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chapman) proposed to bring forward.

I may say this further, that whilst the hon. member for Winnipeg was speaking, a considerable portion of his statements with regard to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor appeared to me to bear upon the question which was under discussion; but I think the hon. member is perhaps now going a little out of the way.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. LAURIER. If you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I do not at all call into dispute the ruling which you have just laid down; but you will allow me to remind you that the hon. member for Simcoe, when addressing the House a moment ago set forth the impropriety and the danger of the Government allowing a Lieutenant-Governor to remain in office beyond the expiry of his term of office; and the argument which my hon. friend from Winnipeg is now addressing to the House is likewise to show the danger of such a course.

Mr. FOSTER. The subject which the hon. member for Simcoe yesterday gave notice to the House that he would discuss, was the constitutional point involved. It was only by way of a side remark in reference to the Lieutenant-Governor which he gave utterance to in the course of his address: but surely my hon. friend does not intend that because he, by way of a side remark, made allusion to a thing of this kind, the hon. gentleman for Winnipeg may take up a subject entirely foreign, and discuss the character of the Lieutenant-Governor himself, and say what he has been doing for a long time past.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Winnipeg is quite in order. What the hon. member for Simcoe did was simply a matter of courtesy.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman has not stated to the House, and the House has not sufficient information, whether the acts of the Lieutenant-Governor of which the hon. gentleman complains, occurred prior to the expiry of his five years of office, or since that date. The hon. member for Simcoe referred to the fact that the Lieutenant-Governor was retaining his office after the expiration of his five years, but upon that fact he did not base any argument in connection with it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Simcoe made this argument, so far as I understood him, that His Honour Lieutenant-Governor Schultz, being continued in office without a reappointment, held his position at the will of the Government, and the hon. member for Simcoe argued therefrom that he might be induced to do things that, under other circumstances, he might not do, and to some extent the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg related to that phase of the case. But I think that in his more recent remarks he has gone beyond that subject.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not intend to go beyond the subject at all. The hon. member for Simcoe brought this matter before the House for the purpose of discussing a question suggested in the public press, as to whether there have been communications between the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and the Federal Government with re-

gard to his action in a matter that is now before the legislature of Manitoba. It has been suggested in the public press that His Honour Lieutenant-Governor Schultz was ready to use his high office for the purpose of coercion, that he was prepared to go to the extent, if necessary, of dismissing his Ministers and to pursue a line of conduct that would be acceptable to hon. gentlemen sitting on the treasury benches. My remarks have been directed to the history of His Honour's administration in Manitoba, to show that a suggestion of that kind is justified by what he has already done there. I desire now to go further, and to show that a suggestion of that kind, so far as the Dominion Government of the day is concerned, is also justified so far as their action has been connected with this question of filling the vacancy in the Lieutenant-Governorship of Manitoba. I was about to say that, since 1st July, 1893, when this gentleman became a mere servant, removable at the will of hon. gentlemen opposite, the question of filling this vacancy has been most prominent before the people; that all this time Lieutenant-Governor Schultz had been an active candidate for reappointment to the position, that his claims have been interfered with, or, at all events, opposed by other gentlemen who are well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, and who consider, and whose friends consider, they have great claims to the position. The Government have failed to deal with the question, they have left it open. It is, perhaps, from their standpoint, if these suggestions are correct, a fortunate circumstance that they have left the appointment open, and they have a man in office in Manitoba whose history shows him quite capable of doing anything of this kind, whose conduct shows that he is prepared to prostitute his high office for his own personal and selfish ends, and therefore is most likely to be influenced by these considerations that have been suggested, considerations connected with using his office in a certain way to suit hon. gentlemen opposite, so that in return for services rendered they may be induced to reappoint him and give him another term of five years. When we think of the province having suffered seven years, and of the prospect of another term of five years, it really seems justifiable for me to lay some stress on this matter, and endeavour to show how it appears to me and how it appears to the people of Manitoba, as I understand their sentiments and feelings. Mr. Scarth, one of my predecessors in the representation of Winnipeg, has been a prominent applicant—I will not say an applicant, but he is a gentleman whose name has been brought most prominently before the public in this connection. Since 1st July, 1893, it has been announced by the Government press that he has actually been appointed, and that an Order in Council had been passed appointing him to that position. For some reason or other, the appointment was not carried out. Another name brought most prominently before the public in connection with this office is that of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). That hon. member has also been in the fortunate position of having it announced that he had become Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and I may say that that hon. gentleman went to the extent of making very complete and extensive arrangements for entering into the vice-regal residence, or whatever it may be called, in the city of Winnipeg. For some reason, he was not appointed. I was told not long ago by a very prominent supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite that he interviewed the Minister of the Interior when he came to Winnipeg, and asked him why it was the Government were making such a muddle of this matter, why they did not fill the position, why they did not terminate the present position of affairs, under which there was a Lieutenant-Governor in office who was working for reappointment and hoping for reappointment, while there were two gentlemen who had been prominently mentioned as candidates for the position; and that the answer given by the Minister of the Interior was that the Government did not think it advisable to make an appointment in view of the Winnipeg election, as they desired to have the assistance of both Mr. Ross and Mr. Scarth on that occasion.

Mr. DALY. It is almost unnecessary to give an unqualified denial to that assertion. I never made any such statement to any one.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not care whether it is true or not.

Mr. DALY. It is on a par with your usual statements.

Mr. MARTIN. That may be. So far as I am concerned, it is true. This gentleman, a prominent supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, told me so. Whether he was telling the truth, and whether the hon. Minister of the Interior did or did not make the statement, I do not care; I put it forward as showing the state of public opinion there, and in order to show this House that I am justified in saying this matter has become a public scandal. When hon. gentlemen use high positions like that of Lieutenant-Governor for the purpose of controlling a few votes in Winnipeg at an election, when hon. gentlemen at the time had a majority in this House of 63, surely I am justified in saying that they are dallying with the question. They resolved to make an appointment, they allowed their press to announce from time to time that this gentleman or that gentleman had been appointed, that Mr. Scarth, for example, had been appointed, and some months later that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) had been appointed. It has been suggested that that gentle-

lost his chance on account of having been the first person to welcome Hon. Mr. Laurier to Manitoba last fall. Now we have a new announcement. I may say I was disappointed that the leader of the House, when he made his explanations as to the changes in the Ministry, and announced that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Patterson) had left the Government, did not tell the House whether it was true or not that that gentleman was going to fill the vacancy in the Lieutenant-Governorship of Manitoba. But we have had it put forward that the late Minister of Militia, who has gone to California, will, on his return, be appointed to fill the vacant position. At all events, we are now here considering a matter of grave importance, taking into account all these matters which I have stated, and which are true from my own personal knowledge. When these matters occurred I was a member of the Government of Manitoba, and I know of what I am speaking. Taking all these matters into consideration, the province of Manitoba has been most apprehensive for the last two or three weeks as to what would be done in regard to the local government, and I may say the local government have been most apprehensive, so far as I have been able to learn, as to what may occur in a conspiracy which is alleged to have been carried on, to the extent I have indicated, between the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and the Government of the day. The conspiracy which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) illustrates has, at any rate, got that far that the Lieutenant-Governor has gone to the Clerk of this House, who is suggested as a constitutional authority. Well, I do not know whether he is a constitutional authority or not. For my part, I will take the opinion on a constitutional question of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) ten times, yes, a hundred times over, before I would take the opinion of the Clerk of this House. But the hon. gentlemen opposite suggest that he is a great constitutional authority. He is an official of this House. It is attempted now to use that opinion of his which was given to this Lieutenant-Governor, possessed of those fine instincts of honour which I have endeavoured to show you, and which opinion of the Clerk of this House was, it is said, given him in a private and confidential way, and given to him for the purpose of informing himself for which purpose I suppose he had a right to get it. I suppose he had a right to have some information for his own guidance, but, at any rate, he got this great constitutional opinion in the belief that it was to be kept private. This opinion was then put forward, not by the Clerk of the House, but by the Government of the day, by the Premier of the Dominion, and it was put forward for what purpose? Was it for some non-partisan purpose, as stated by the hon. the Finance Minister? I would like to ask the Finance Minister if the Manitoba school question is not a party question? I would like to ask the hon. the Finance Minister if there is a question in the country to-day upon which there is more feeling, more diversified ideas, and one in which the country is more interested than the Manitoba school question?

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) one question, which will be an answer to his question. If it is a party question, on which side of it is his party?

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

After Recess.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the leader of the House who asked me a question just as 6 o'clock was announced, is not in his place. However, I may say, in answer to the hon. gentleman's question, that he seems to think that the Opposition in this House should govern the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, everybody thinks that now.

Mr. MARTIN. I am quite convinced that the country thinks that also, and is only waiting an opportunity to so declare. I would say to the Finance Minister that when that time comes, the policy of the Government of the country will be announced by the present leader of the Opposition, but, until that time comes, however reluctant the Ministry may be to announce their policy in connection with these matters, the Opposition will find it their privilege and their duty to wait until the Government has announced its policy before declaring theirs. When the Government have something to announce to the House and the country, they will find the Opposition prepared to deal with them. I understood the hon. the Finance Minister to admit that the Premier had furnished this letter of Dr. Bourinot to the newspapers, and I understood him to say that the Premier had received this letter from the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. I also understood that it was admitted, as suggested by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that the letter had been written for Dr. Schultz's personal and private information, and not for publication. Now, I have in my hand, the report of an interview with His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, in which is set forth a very different state of facts from that announced by the leader of the House. In order to anticipate objections from hon. gentlemen, I may say that I do not take this interview from those ill-informed news-

papers which have been subjected to so much criticism from Ministers of the Crown, such as the "Mail and Empire," Toronto, and the "Gazette," of Montreal, and other leading Conservative papers which hon. gentlemen opposite say are very ill-informed as to public matters; but I take this interview from a substantial and reliable authority, and one which will certainly not be disputed on this side of the House, and probably not on the other. I refer to the Toronto "Globe." The "Globe," in its Winnipeg correspondence, has the following:—

Lieutenant-Governor Schultz was seen by a reporter of the "Tribune" in reference to the report that the opinion of Dr. Bourinot was a private one, and not given for publication. His Honour said that the idea that the document was got purely for personal perusal was erroneous.

While in Ottawa, continued His Honour, I occupied some of my time in going over constitutional works in the Library, and in obtaining this opinion from what I consider an impartial source. I did not send this opinion to any Eastern newspapers, and it was given to the papers here simply as it referred to an important matter affecting the public generally. I believe that in this matter the public should have the opinion of the ablest and best qualified men, and should be able to act on the matter with the fullest possible knowledge. When interviewed on my return home as to my own opinions, I refused entirely to give them, but offered to allow any of the newspaper men who wished to do so, full access to such authorities as I possessed, which were various constitutional works in my library, and the opinion given to me, at my solicitation by Dr. Bourinot. The Dominion Government had nothing whatever to do with obtaining Dr. Bourinot's opinion, and did not know—from me, at least—that I had obtained it; nor did they know of my intention to allow the press to have access to the views expressed by Dr. Bourinot, not only in his books, but in the letter as well.

Now, there is a flat contradiction of the statement on behalf of the Premier by the leader of the House. It is perfectly clear that the First Minister obtained that letter either from Lieutenant-Governor Schultz or from Dr. Bourinot. I understand the hon. leader of the House to say that the Premier obtained it from Lieutenant-Governor Schultz. Lieutenant-Governor Schultz in this interview gives that statement a most explicit contradiction. Now the Premier must have obtained the letter either from the one source or the other. If he obtained it from Dr. Bourinot, then the letter must have been written for the purpose of publication, unless it was handed to the Premier by Dr. Bourinot confidentially, and not for publication. If this was the case, then the Premier violated his trust in that respect, and we cannot suppose that that was the case. If Dr. Bourinot did communicate that letter to the Premier for the purpose of having it published, then we must take for granted that it was written for that purpose; and if it was written for that purpose, it was a gross act of impropriety on the part of the Clerk of this House, and one that this House should resent. On the other hand, if the statement made by the hon. leader of the House is correct, that the letter was received by the Premier from the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, then I say that everything that has been said with regard to the probable existence of a conspiracy in connection with this matter, of an attempt by the Government to interfere with Manitoba in its duties and its rights through the Lieutenant-Governor taking advantage of his position, is justified. Now, I have endeavoured to show the probability of the suspicion that this conspiracy exists, by drawing the attention of the House to the manner in which Dr. Schultz has discharged the duties of the office he holds. We can say with pride that it has been demonstrated in Canada on many occasions that it is possible for gentlemen, whether connected with one political party or the other, to be active and strong partisans, and yet, after having accepted the position of Lieutenant-Governor, to discharge the duties of that position in a constitutional manner with a government of the opposite political party in power. If a suggestion of this kind were made with regard to many gentlemen who have filled, or who are to-day filling the office of Lieutenant-Governor in Canada, it would be scouted at once. For instance, it would never be suggested that the hon. gentleman now holding the position of Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, strong and active partisan as he was in this House, would lend himself to any such business as this. But when we find a gentleman having the idea of the duties of the position evidently held by Dr. Schultz, from the way in which he has discharged those duties, then there is every reason to believe, as I do believe, that he has been approached to interfere in this matter, in order to induce the Government of Manitoba to take such a course as would relieve hon. gentlemen opposite from the many difficulties in which they find themselves placed in regard to this question. A gentleman who would prostitute his high office for his own personal ends in order to save a few hundred dollars of taxes here or a few hundred dollars there, would certainly lend himself to any such understanding as that, if it were to result in his retaining his office for another period of five years. I regret very much indeed that it should be possible for any member of this House to stand up, as I have done to-day, and make the statements which I have made—which cannot be contradicted, which I know personally to be true, as to which there is a record, at any rate with regard to his refusal to assent to the Bill I have referred to, while the other is a well known matter of public notoriety in the city from which I come. I say it is a shame and a disgrace. The whole conduct of the Government in connection with this Manitoba ques-

tion has been quite in accordance with the latest phase of it—the attempt to prostitute the power they possess to fill the office of Lieutenant-Governor, for the purpose which has been described—the attempt to use a willing tool like the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba to help them out of the difficulties in which they find themselves.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the last speaker got away considerably from the question that was raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe when he moved the adjournment of the House this afternoon. I understood that the charge made by that hon. member was that the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba had been guilty of an indiscretion, if not something worse, in giving to the newspapers for publication an opinion which he had got from the Clerk of this House; and I presume that we are to infer from the remarks made by the hon. member for North Simcoe and those made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that the Clerk of this House is to be censured for having given that opinion. Now, in the first place, the hon. member for North Simcoe admitted that the Lieutenant-Governor had a perfect right to get this opinion from Dr. Bourinot, or to seek advice on the question from any person he chose. That being admitted, there is no necessity any longer to dwell on the right of the Lieutenant-Governor to obtain that opinion. In the second place, if he had, as admitted, the right to get that opinion, had he the right to get it from the Clerk of the House? and had the Clerk of the House the right to give that opinion? Sir, I do not think that anything has been advanced on the other side of the House or by the hon. member for North Simcoe to show that the Clerk of the House was not perfectly within his right in giving that opinion. On this matter we have precedents. We know that the Clerk of the House to-day is looked upon, and I think justly so, as the leading constitutional authority in Canada. He takes the place to-day of Mr. Todd, our late librarian, who contributed so ably to our literature on parliamentary government in England and in Canada; and it is in the recollection of hon. gentlemen who were in the House at the time, that it was not considered out of the way for Mr. Todd to give opinions, not simply to Lieutenant-Governors of provinces, but to Governors General of Canada. As a matter of fact, he gave opinions to Lord Dufferin during the discussions on the Pacific Scandal and to Lord Lorne during the discussion on the Letellier question. I do not think that any exception was taken by any member of this House to Mr. Todd as an officer of this Parliament in giving those opinions, and I have heard nothing to-day during this debate that would justify any one in coming to the conclusion that Dr. Bourinot was not within his clear right in giving this opinion.

Now, it seems to me that, as stated by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, this thing is a tempest in a teapot. I presume that if Mr. Bourinot's opinion had been in accord with that of the hon. member for North Simcoe, we would have heard nothing about it. But that hon. gentleman has made this matter of the Manitoba schools the one subject of his thoughts, the one subject that engrosses his ideas, and he cannot brook any difference of opinion to his own. He must not, however, run away with the idea that he is the only one in Canada that has opinions on this question. He must not imagine that he is the only lawyer in Canada who is competent to give an opinion on it. I have not the slightest doubt that the opinion of Dr. Bourinot was obtained by the Lieutenant-Governor, not for his own guidance particularly, but for the purpose of guiding both himself and his advisers, and in this he was perfectly justified. I wish to emphasize this fact, that it is not on record in this discussion that the Lieutenant-Governor did not first submit that opinion to his advisers before making it public. Before the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) make a charge of this nature, they should provide themselves with indubitable evidence to prove that Mr. Greenway and his colleagues were not made aware of the opinion by the Lieutenant-Governor before its publication. I believe that I am stating what is correct when I say that Mr. Greenway was made aware of that opinion by the Lieutenant-Governor days before it was given to the press. That being the case, had the Lieutenant-Governor not the right to make it public? What harm could its publication have done his government if they knew all about it beforehand? More than that, if the publication was made, as stated by the leader of the House, through the instrumentality of the First Minister, it must be established that the First Minister had not the permission of the Lieutenant-Governor before a charge can be made that there was any conspiracy. Where is there any evidence of conspiracy? What wrong has been done the Manitoba Government? Before any substantial charge can be made against the Lieutenant-Governor, proof must be made that his advisers were not aware of what he was doing in this matter. I am perfectly satisfied that Mr. Greenway was fully aware of that opinion before it was published.

Mr. MULOCK. How would that effect the Government's conduct? You are pleading that as an excuse.

Mr. DALY. Not at all. I do not think that the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, in seeking the advice of Dr. Bourinot, and in giving Dr. Bourinot's opinion to his advisers, was guilty of any wrong. It is admitted that the Lieutenant-Governor has

the right to seek advice outside his advisers, and the only people who have a right to complain in this matter are his advisers. Is there anything before the House to show that Mr. Greenway, or Mr. Sifton, or any other member of the Manitoba Cabinet has any complaint to make of the action of the Lieutenant-Governor? Not the slightest. Hon. gentlemen opposite have dealt entirely in generalities. After the Lieutenant-Governor got that opinion, what was his duty? No doubt it was to lay it before his advisers, and I believe he did that. The hon. member for Simcoe went entirely on newspaper comments. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) read an extract, a short time ago, from the "Globe" giving what purported to be an interview between the Lieutenant-Governor and the correspondent of the "Globe" in Winnipeg. Are we to take for gospel all that appears in the papers? Are we to believe that the correspondent of the Montreal "Herald"—that being the paper, I presume, from which the hon. member for North Simcoe quoted this afternoon—had the knowledge on which he could base his statement that the First Minister of this Dominion and the Lieutenant-Governor for Manitoba were conspiring together? No, Sir. One cannot place reliance on newspaper correspondents, particularly on matters of this kind, especially newspapers anxious to make political capital against the Government. We must have the facts before we can arrive at any proper conclusion, and I fail to see that a single fact has been adduced, or an argument based upon facts advanced, that would substantiate the charges made by the hon. member for North Simcoe this afternoon. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman was not so thin-skinned a few weeks ago with reference to the duties of public officers in matters of this kind. He charges the Lieutenant-Governor to-day with a grave indiscretion. Was the hon. gentleman himself so careful of constitutional rights and privileges, and so particular with regard to the conduct of constitutional advisers, a few weeks ago? It is in the recollection of the House that the hon. member for North Simcoe was quite willing—aye, was even the means of taking over into Haldimand the Attorney General of Manitoba, and one of the constitutional advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor, and under what particular circumstances? In addressing the House the other day, the hon. member for North Simcoe gave the House to understand that the legislature of Manitoba was not adjourned for the purpose of considering the situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Order. The hon. gentleman has no business to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. DALY. The impression has gone abroad—I have read it in the newspapers—that the hon. member for North Simcoe said that the reason the Manitoba Legislature adjourned was because the majority of the members were farmers and it was advisable that they should have the opportunity of putting in their seed and doing other farm work. That statement appeared in the newspapers as having been made by the hon. gentleman, but we have on record the reasons given by Mr. Greenway for adjourning the legislature, and this is what he said:

> The receipt of a message from the Lieutenant-Governor with a copy of the remedial order made by the Governor in Council, has raised constitutional questions exceeding in gravity and importance any constitutional question that has heretofore arisen in any legislature of Canada since confederation. These questions affect, not only Manitoba but every province in the Dominion. In view of these facts, the Government have decided to ask the House to-morrow to adjourn until the 9th May, for six weeks, in order that ample time may be given for full consideration of the matter.

The House was adjourned, not for the purpose of giving the members an opportunity to go to their farms and plant their seed, but in order that the Government might have time to fully consider the remedial order.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is completely out of order. The rule is not to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. DALY. I was not referring to a previous debate.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is merely quoting from the newspapers, but the effect is the same.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that a member cannot indirectly make reference to what it would be out of order to refer to directly.

Mr. DALY. I have just stated to the House the reasons which Mr. Greenway gave for the adjournment of the legislature, and those are the true reasons. Attorney General Sifton came down to Ontario for the purpose of consulting eminent counsel in order that he might advise the Lieutenant-Governor and his colleagues. What did he do? He arrived at Toronto, ostensibly for the purpose of seeking legal advice. Then, whether at the solicitation of the hon. member for North Simcoe or not I do not know, he went to Haldimand, took an active part in the election, took a strong stand on this question, addressed public meetings throughout the length and breadth of the riding, and although as an adviser of the Lieutenant-Governor he was sworn to keep inviolable the secrets of that Cabinet, we find him telling the people of Haldimand that the Manitoba Legislature would refuse to act upon the remedial order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is what the Manitoba Legislature would do a secret of the Council?

Mr. DALY. He spoke of what the Manitoba Government, no doubt, would advise the legislature to do. Well, the Attorney General of Manitoba, Mr. Sifton, went from one end of the riding of Haldimand to the other declaring not only what the Manitoba Legislature would or would not do, but what his opinion was on the question. And he gave it as his opinion of what should be done, and of what action the Manitoba Government would take, that they would not recede from the position they had taken. That conduct of Mr. Attorney General Sifton is much more entitled to condemnation at the hands of the Canadian people than the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor. The member for Winnipeg was not content to address himself to the question before the House, but went far afield in his discussion. That hon. gentleman, Sir, sought to make a most cowardly and contemptuous attack upon the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman stated facts in this House that he had no right to state, because, as he himself said, he could speak with authority upon the matters he discussed, because, at that time, he was a member of the Government of Manitoba. I presume that when the hon. gentleman took office he took an oath of office, and that in that oath of office he swore to keep secret all things that took place between himself and his colleagues as advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor; and he must have violated that oath this afternoon, because he could not otherwise have disclosed the facts he did. He does not seem to realize the position he occupied as adviser of the Lieutenant-Governor for the few short years he was there. I think it would be well to give the hon. gentleman an idea of how the constitutional authorities look upon a matter of that kind. I quote from Todd:

> The obligation of keeping the King's counsel inviolably secret is one that rests upon all Cabinet Ministers and other responsible advisers of the Crown, by virtue of the oath which they take when they are made members of the Privy Council.
>
> As has been already observed, this secrecy is not a mere personal privilege or protection, either to the Sovereign or to the Minister, that may be waived by mutual consent; but is based upon constitutional principle and state policy, it being of the first importance that there should be entire freedom and immunity in the confidential intercourse between the Crown and its immediate advisers, and that nothing which has passed in Council should be afterwards disclosed, so long as public injury might ensue from differences of opinion being known.
>
> Moreover, nothing that has passed between the Sovereign and his Ministers, in their confidential relations with each other, may be disclosed to any other person, or to either House of Parliament, without the express permission of the Sovereign.
>
> And this permission would only be accorded for purposes of state, as to enable a Minister to explain and justify to Parliament his political conduct. It would not be granted for the purpose of enabling Parliament to scrutinize the motives of a political act which was not itself impeachable on public grounds.
>
> Neither would it be given with a view to subject the secret counsels of the Crown to the review of an ordinary legal tribunal.
>
> The necessity for obtaining leave from the Crown to divulge past proceedings or communications between the Sovereign and his confidential servants, applies with equal force to actual Ministers and to those who have ceased to take part in the royal councils.

That shows that the obligations of secrecy does not apply only to the men who are immediately advisers of the Crown, but to men who have ceased to be advisers of the Crown. And the charges the hon. gentleman has made against the Lieutenant-Governor are made in relation to matters that he is seized of as an adviser of Her Majesty, represented by the Lieutenant-Governor, and he has violated his oath of office——

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman point out what Cabinet secret I disclosed?

Mr. DALY. The fact that the Lieutenant-Governor withheld his name from an Order in Council. No person would know that if the hon. gentleman had kept his oath inviolate. No person would be aware of that fact if the hon. gentleman and his colleagues had not violated their oaths of office. I was astonished, and I think the House was astonished that any hon. member should descend to such low tactics as those that were used by the hon. member from Winnipeg in making the attack he did upon the Lieutenant-Governor. Why, Sir, if he had the feelings he expresses towards the Lieutenant-Governor, and was in a position to prove his charges, why did he not, while a member of the Cabinet, and one of Dr. Schultz's advisers, make these charges to the Governor General, as he had a right to do. It seems extraordinary that for four long years after the hon. gentleman has ceased to be a member of the Cabinet, for five long years after the acts he speaks of took place, he never makes a charge. He admitted that he would have made the charges last session had not he thought that Dr. Schultz would soon cease to be Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. That discloses the fact that the hon. gentleman has kept these charges within his own bosom, ready to make an attack upon Dr. Schultz at the first opportunity that should arise. And he makes that attack under shelter of his position in this House. Why did he not make this attack while he was one of the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor, and a member of the legislature of Manitoba? I do not think that the oldest member of this House ever witnessed such an incident as that presented in this House this afternoon. This attack is upon a par with the tactics pursued in other matters by hon.

gentlemen opposite. We had the hon. gentleman's colleague from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) last year attacking the judges; and to-day we have the hon. member for Winnipeg attacking the Lieutenant-Governors. If these hon. gentlemen remain much longer in the cold shades of Opposition—as I am afraid they are doomed to do, as I believe that every such action of theirs as this of to-day drives a nail in their coffin—we shall probably find them making an attack on the Governor General himself on the line pursued by the hon. member for L'Islet last year, and by the hon. member for Winnipeg this year. Why, Sir, it is a most extraordinary thing that of all the men in Manitoba an attack upon the political position of the Lieutenant-Governor should come from the hon. member for Winnipeg. If there is any person who has a political record in the province of Manitoba it is that gentleman. He states that the Lieutenant-Governor declined to assent to certain legislation. Did he withhold his assent from the Act relating to the Union Square of Portage la Prairie?

Mr. MARTIN. No. I am not aware that there was any legislation in regard to Union Square.

Mr. DALY. We will produce the Act to show that there was. Will the hon. gentleman say that anything done by Dr. Schultz, in his capacity of Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba was in violation of the position he held? Will he say that any action that he attacked, any action that he disclosed, was not clearly within the constitutional authority of the Lieutenant-Governor? One would be led to understand from the arguments by the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and by the sentiments expressed by gentlemen opposite, that the Governor General in Council has nothing to do with the Lieutenant-Governor. But it is laid down as a principle that the connection between the Lieutenant-Governor and the Governor General and his advisers here should be of the nearest possible kind, that their relationship should be such that if the Lieutenant-Governor of a province wishes to get advice from the Governor General in Council as to matters coming before him he should be free to do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman say that the Lieutenant-Governor has a right to seek this advice upon matters within the exclusive jurisdiction of the province?

Mr. DALY. I was coming to that point. This is a matter of mixed jurisdiction that we are now discussing, and I think it comes clearly within the principle I shall attempt to lay down, namely, if the Lieutenant-Governor sought advice of the Governor General in this case—I am not stating that in this case he did so and I do not think he did, but I say if he desired to do so—he was perfectly within constitutional lines.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood him not to speak with respect to this particular question in his argument, but with regard to the relation which generally exists between Lieutenant-Governors and the Government here.

Mr. DALY. The trouble is the hon. gentleman did not give me time to finish, or I would have reached that. Now, it is laid down in Todd on Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies, at page 598:

> Let us now inquire into the extent to which these Lieutenant-Governors are more immediately responsible to the Governor General in Council, and into the duty which properly devolves upon the central government in any group of confederated colonies to exercise towards the subordinate provinces the degree of constitutional oversight and control which the Imperial executive maintains over the whole empire.
>
> Such supervision in Canada would, as we have seen, sometimes necessitate a direct interference with the proceedings of the provincial authorities, and the disallowing of Acts wherein they had transgressed the assigned limits of their powers, or had sought to give effect to principles which were inimical to the interests of sister provinces or of the confederation generally.
>
> But in addition to the control which, under these circumstances, would be appropriately fulfilled by the central government, there is a further duty which the existing relation between a central and a subordinate government obviously entails upon the former. Having been constitutionally empowered to represent towards subordinate provinces, associated together in confederation, the supreme authority of the Crown, and to act towards them in that behalf, the central government should be prepared to afford to the several subordinate governments the benefit of its interposition and advice on all matters, whether of administration or of legislation, wherein the same could be advantageously rendered.
>
> The extent to which such interference would be justifiable must, however, altogether depend upon the degree of self-government accorded by the sovereign power to the particular provinces. There could be no interference beyond these limits without an undue encroachment upon the confederation compact. But, even where direct and authoritative interposition would be objectionable or undesirable, the paternal position occupied by the central executive towards the provincial governments would naturally suggest the propriety of intervening by advice or remonstrance, whenever it might appear that the mature, experienced and impartial counsels of the supreme government would be helpful.

Now, I think that quotation maintains the position I took, namely, that in a matter, for instance, such as that under discussion now, if the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba sought—I do not say that he did so, I do not know that he did so—but if he sought the advice of the Government here, he was clearly within constitutional lines. The gravamen of the offence charged against the Lieutenant-Governor is that he sought extraneous advice. Now, his advisers, no doubt, could have got legal advice upon this

question, and no doubt would lay that before the Lieutenant-Governor; and if he, in a matter of such moment, saw fit to get other advice, surely he had a perfect right to do so, and having got the advice which he did from Dr. Bourinot, and having laid it before his advisers in Winnipeg, Mr. Greenway and his colleagues, I say after he had done that, he had a perfect right to do what he liked with the advice that he got from Dr. Bourinot. Now, do I understand the hon. gentleman to lay down the principle that the Clerk of this House has no right to give constitutional advice upon constitutional questions to the Lieutenant-Governors, or to any one else? I do not think so. I think it is to be admitted, in the first place, that the Lieutenant-Governor has a right to seek advice; and in the second place, that he has a right to get that advice from the Clerk of the House, or from any person else whom he chooses; and those facts being admitted, what is the charge that is now made against the Lieutenant-Governor? Simply that he published the advice that was given to him by Dr. Bourinot. Had he not the right to do so? If he had not the right to do so, will hon. gentlemen state why he had not that right? Will hon. gentlemen state wherein he did anything wrong, that was unconstitutional, in giving the opinion of Dr. Bourinot for publication? Will they say wherein his advisers have been wronged? Will they say wherein the people or the legislature of Manitoba have been wronged in connection with this matter? I have failed to be convinced up to this moment, by any statements or arguments made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the charges made by the hon. member for North Simcoe have been sustained. Sir, I regret very much, indeed, that the hon. member for Winnipeg should have taken the opportunity to make the outrageous attack that he did upon Dr. Schultz's character. I come back to the remarks that were made by the hon. gentleman, because I am reminded of the fact that in his speech he said, amongst other things, that Dr. Schultz had some person peddling around the city of Winnipeg last year an address congratulating him upon arriving at a certain birthday. Well, Sir, I have seen that address published in the papers. I do not know how that address was secured, but when I tell the House that upon that address were the names of Archbishop Taché, of the Archbishop of Rupert's Land, of the Chief Justice of Manitoba, of all the leading men in the city of Winnipeg of all denominations——

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman say of all the leading men in the city of Winnipeg?

Mr. DALY. Of course I omitted the hon. gentleman's name.

Mr. MARTIN. And you omitted a great many more.

Mr. DALY. No doubt; I am not stating the omissions, I am stating the names of the men that were upon that address to Lieutenant-Governor Schultz congratulating him upon his 50th or 60th birthday, I forget which. Sir, if Dr. Schultz, the Lieutenant-Governor, was a man of the character the hon. gentleman would lead this House and this country to believe, by the remarks he made this afternoon, how is it that men of the character and standing of those I have mentioned, like the Archbishop of St. Boniface, and the Archbishop of Rupert's Land, and others who have lived there for 25 years, and know all about the Lieutenant-Governor, know all about his character and his conduct—how is it, I say, that we find the names of such men appended to that address? All I have to say is that I think the hon. member for Winnipeg will live a good many years in the city of Winnipeg before he will get even one of those names upon any address congratulating him. I say his attack this afternoon was of a most cowardly nature. I must say it was an edifying spectacle when the hon. member for North Simcoe, who made the motion to adjourn this House, gave the hon. member for Winnipeg an opportunity to get rid of the Billingsgate he got rid of this afternoon. I am satisfied that where Dr. Schultz is known, and where the hon. gentleman is known in the city of Winnipeg, there will be but one opinion as to the feeling of the majority of the people of Manitoba. If he had been a man, if he had desired to make a manly attack against Dr. Schlutz, the opportunity was given to him, as I have said before, while he was a member of his government and a member of the legislature of Manitoba. It is an extraordinary thing that, although that hon. gentleman had the feeling towards Lieutenant-Governor Schultz that he has indicated this afternoon, he still remained a member of that government, he still remained one of his advisers. If he had entertained that feeling towards Dr. Schultz, it was his clear duty to have resigned, and to have got out of the government; and if he did not wish to do that, then it was his clear duty to have made charges to the Governor General in Council against Dr. Schultz in order that they might be investigated. But he waits four or five years, after he ceased to be a member of the government, and seizes an opportunity when, behind his rights as a member of this Parliament, he can get up and make a dastardly attack upon Dr. Schultz.

Mr. CASEY. I must rise to a point of order. This thing is going a little too far. We have heard an hon. member of this House charged with violating his oath, with being cowardly, with being dastardly, and so on. The last word used, I think, was dastardly. There have been insinuations against the character of that hon. gentleman, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule, as

you have always hitherto ruled, that such language is entirely out of order and must be retracted at once.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be well if the hon. Minister of the Interior would withdraw the word used.

Mr. CASEY. I ask your ruling that it shall be withdrawn.

Mr. DALY. Is it the word "dastardly?"

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. member for Winnipeg had to follow you, you would not use that word.

Mr. DALY. If necessary, I will withdraw the word "dastardly," and I will use the word "contemptible." Is that unparliamentary? All I can say is that I cannot find language strong enough that is parliamentary in which to say what I would like to say of the hon. gentleman's conduct this afternoon. Now, as to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), I want him to understand that I am not made of the cowardly material he is.

Mr. CASEY. Order.

Mr. DALY. That I am not the bully he is.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please keep his temper. These allegations have a tendency to arouse feelings which, I think, had better not be aroused.

Mr. DALY. Of course this thing, I suppose, is one-sided.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. DALY. Certainly, I have withdrawn. When the hon. gentleman threw insinuations across this House, I attempted to answer them, and if I have used unparliamentary language, I apologize to you, Sir, for having done so. But I say that the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton justified the language I used towards him, and I want to say to that hon. gentleman that it makes no difference whether the hon. member for Winnipeg follows me or not, I am ready to meet that hon. gentleman upon any platform before our own electors, and I hope to meet him again. I do not fear to meet him either on the floor of this House or on any platform, nor do I fear to meet the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister).

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior if his departmental duties are likely, within the near future, to allow him time to accept the challenge I offered him last session?

Mr. DALY. Not during the sitting of this House, but no doubt such an opportunity will come in the near future; I fancy it will come all too soon for the hon. gentleman, and probably we shall not see him within the precincts of this House again. However, we are getting away from the subject under discussion. I was justified in everything I said, except the unparliamentary language, which I had withdrawn, with respect to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and there were hon. gentlemen opposite who hung their heads from shame when he made the attack on Lieutenant-Governor Schultz. The House of Commons has never, at all events, in my experience, and I am sure in the experience of the older members, listened to anything in the nature of such an attack as was made on Lieutenant-Governor Schultz this afternoon. I hope that Lieutenant-Governor Schultz may be given that health and strength to enable him to meet the hon. gentleman on the platform, or in this House, if he should again become a member, and no doubt, because he does not require any defence on my part, when he measures swords with the hon. member for Winnipeg, he will be able to give him a Roland for his Oliver

Mr. FRASER. It is most edifying to see how a privy councillor conducts himself. I am sorry there are not some English statesmen here to see how one of Her Majesty's Ministers can answer the statement made by an hon. member, and discuss a question of such momentous importance as this now under consideration. Truly, I had hoped that with advancing years and the companionship of such able co-privy councillors as the hon. gentleman now enjoys, he would have learned something. But he appears to have fallen back to his old position, and does not understand what the proper rules of debate are, and what is expected from him. I regret it because even in the heat of debate a privy councillor, with the dignity that becomes his office, should discuss public questions in a different way. It was a spectacle to see the hon. gentleman, on three successive occasions, called to withdraw expressions unbecoming, not only a privy councillor, but a member of this House. I took it for granted that perhaps the training he has received from members of the Cabinet, for example, the Minister of Railways, who, I am sure, would not offend in that respect, would have enabled him the better and that he would have not so far forgotten himself, because it was evident that the hon. gentleman thought he was addressing an assembly outside the precincts of the House of Parliament. For what, after all, is this discussion? What have we to do with these matters as regards the real question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg, whether the Governor of Manitoba is the man he should be, and therefore this privy councillor should have remembered that in making the attack he did he was going far afield.

Mr. DALY. Who started it?

Mr. FRASER. Even if this discussion had been started before the hon. gentleman spoke, that does not furnish him with an answer or defence of his unparliamentary conduct. That is the way a privy councillor answers—that because some member made these statements, therefore, a privy councillor was justified in being unparliamentary. This is a strange doctrine to be laid down by a member of the Government. But even in view of all the hon. gentleman said, of all he could say, of all he attempted to say, and which he had to withdraw, in regard to the hon. member for Winnipeg, what has that to do with the question? I know nothing of the character of the hon. member for Winnipeg—I am not here to say a word respecting it, for that hon. gentleman is able to take his own part. There was nothing said, however, about the character of the Lieutenant-Governor, except as regards his official acts, which had become so public that a public meeting had to be called. Surely that was a matter for discussion in this House. Was reference to that matter wrong? There was nothing, I repeat, said about the private character of Lieutenant-Governor Schultz. Has the conduct of Mr. Sifton anything to do with the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Then if a man acts wrongly—and I am now admitting, for the sake of argument that he acted wrongly—that is supposed to be an answer to a charge made against the Lieutenant-Governor?

Mr. DALY. It is a matter of argument; it is a question of parallels.

Mr. FRASER. Ten thousand wrongs do not make a right, and you have to investigate all the circumstances. Since this discussion opened, I have seen that there are more important issues involved than appeared to be the case when it opened. The statements have been so clearly made that it is evident we have now come to a point when no hon. member regrets that the matter has been brought up. Fancy Her Majesty the Queen, who, in my estimation, holds no position higher than the Governor of a province, within his authority, going to Mr. Todd, or Sir Erskine May, and getting an opinion on any matter before consulting the Government of England, and publishing it to the world. Hon. members laugh, as well they may. But is there any difference in the two cases? Or, supposing—and this is a point lost sight of by hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this discussion—that this question might involve a conflict between two Governments, what right had Lieutenant-Governor Schultz to get that opinion? Again, supposing the Governor General was in Winnipeg, and there was a gentleman acting as Clerk of the Manitoba Legislature of equal ability to the Clerk of this House, and he obtained an opinion from the Clerk of the legislature and published it to the world. What would be thought of that action? And yet would he not have just as good a right to do so as had the Governor of Manitoba to obtain an opinion from the Clerk of this House and publish it to the world? I admit that the Governor can go anywhere to get information; but he has no right to get information and make it public. There would be no end to such proceedings. We are going far away not only from the traditions of the mother land, but even from the traditions of this country as regards the actions of a Lieutenant-Governor. Why, I would be astonished had such a case happened in a county council, and the warden obtained an opinion under such circumstances and gave it out for publication. But that is not the worst of the matter. From the statements that have been made, and which I hold to be correct, there have been wrong acts done that have not yet been revealed, because, as the hon. member for Winnipeg put it, either the Lieutenant-Governor for Manitoba must have given that opinion to the press or the Clerk of the House must have done so. The question has resolved itself down to that. If, to-morrow, the Governor of Manitoba denies this, then this statement of the case will not be correct, but, so far as the case stands now, there is only one or other alternative open. Now, I submit that whatever opinions the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba got should have been put in his own pocket. What right has he to parade opinions received by him as to his duties as Lieutenant-Governor?

Mr. MULOCK. It was done to affect public opinion.

Mr. FRASER. Then, if that be the case, in place of moving the adjournment of this debate, the resolution of this House should have been a demand for his immediate dismissal. What right has he to concern himself with public opinion? Public opinions may be against the actions of the Governor, what is that to him? It may be in his favour, but what is that to him? He has the plain duty to perform of consulting with his advisers and acting on their opinion. While the Governor of Manitoba should be censured by all right-thinking men for his action in this matter, I think there is some little apology to be made for the Premier. I am bound to say that, because the Premier was in a bad position. He needed advice; the dear knows, he needed advice, with a Cabinet such as he has. What was the Premier to do? His Minister of Justice was indisposed, and I presume the Minister of Justice was 'functus officio,' anyway, because he has decided the case before. The Solicitor General, though an expert and an

authority on old ballads, was not considered a lawyer of such standing as to give him an opinion; so what was the Premier to do? Why, he had recourse at once to the Clerk of the House, directly or indirectly as the case may be, but that does not alter the question very much. I am sure that if the Premier had been here this afternoon, and if this discussion had taken place before the letter had been made public, he never would have gone for advice beyond his Minister of the Interior. Evidently, up to this day the Premier has not appreciated that opinion sufficiently. We ought to speak more tenderly of the Premier because his position was critical; he needed information and he went to a source from which he could get that information. But it is rather peculiar that, concurrently almost with the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, the Premier of Canada should hand out his opinion to the press. I am bound to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not dignified for a Premier of Canada, with his own hand, to tender opinions to the papers. I do not think Lord Roseberry would do it. He might be interviewed, and so might our Premier, but I do not think Lord Roseberry would do anything so undignified as was done in this case. The Premier of Canada, however, may have taken this course for his own preservation, but even then I do not think that that excuse would justify it. One word more, Mr. Speaker, and I am done. This discussion, I trust, will teach not only the members of this House, but the Lieutenant-Governors of the provinces that their position is not that which they thought. It is exceedingly strange that it was found necessary for the Governor of Manitoba to come to Ottawa to get an opinion. If he were in ignorance about his duties a letter might have been addressed to him without him coming here, but as we know he came here and he consorted continuously with the members of this Government. Now, he had a right to do that, but I mention it as a strange coincidence that, taken together with the opinion from the Clerk of the House, he should have been continuously with the members of the Cabinet while in Ottawa. To say the least of it, when a critical question was under discussion, on which the Government of Manitoba was in one position and the Dominion Government in another position, it was not in good taste for the Lieutenant-Governor of a province where his own Executive had to deal with a question that came to them from the central Government—it was not in good taste, I say, that that Lieutenant-Governor should have been here in constant communication with the central Government, when at any moment there might have been a clash between the two authorities, and he would have been called upon to act with his own advisers. I submit that if the Governor of Manitoba had consulted either his own personal dignity or the dignity of the position to which he was raised by the people, he would not have done so. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) trusts that the health of Governor Schultz may be preserved, and that he may come to a seat in this House. Well, I think there may have been many gentlemen on the Ministerial benches who have long hoped, from his appearance, that his health would tend in another direction. I think there has not been on the Government benches for the last couple of years that very earnest desire that his health should be continued.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, I submit whether this is in order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He did not mean you at all.

Mr. IVES. Excuse me until I make my point of order. If the language of the hon. gentleman means anything, it means that the Minister of the Interior is desiring the speedy death of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba.

Mr. FRASER. Oh, I never thought of that. I never had the Minister of the Interior in my view at all. I never thought of such a thing. I think the Minister of the Interior is looking for higher game than that, and hence I never thought of such a thing by any means. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) spoke very flippantly about the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). Winnipeg is a large city, it is a wealthy city, it is an intelligent city, and surely the Minister must have forgotten that at the by-election it returned the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin), whom he spoke so disparagingly about, by over 400 majority. That answer ought to be sufficient, and with the challenge outstanding in that very city to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly) to meet the hon. member (Mr. Martin), when the time comes to accept the challenge, which I trust will be shortly, perhaps it will be found that the less the Minister of the Interior says about want of popularity the better for himself. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that in viewing this question we shall view it, not in the light of the particular Governor of Manitoba, but in the light of all the Lieutenant-Governors. While this Parliament shall be supreme within our constitution so far as we have authority, I want to maintain that the local legislatures shall be the same within their constitution so far as their authority is concerned, and I do not wish to see any Lieutenant-Governor saying or doing anything that would lower the dignity of his position. Perhaps, in this age, we are getting too far away from the old traditions, and I submit that the publication of that letter by the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba will do more to make the people of this country have less respect for the high position he occupies than almost anything else that could happen. In

this new country, we should have a little of the old respect which is due to those who in the older countries hold high places. But if hon. gentlemen who are raised to those high positions will themselves forget the dignity of their office for the sake of serving political ends, what can we expect? If our Lieutenant-Governors cannot be made to learn the dignity due to their office, then I submit we must get different timber from which to construct Governors, so that the people of this country will understand that these positions are filled by honourable men, who care not for party, but only to fill their office with diguity to themselves and credit to the country. I am glad that the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has brought up this question, and I hope that we shall not require to have a discussion of this kind again. I trust that Lieutenant-Governors will learn that their receiving opinions, not from where, perhaps, they ought not to receive them under other circumstances, and after receiving them publish them against good faith, will understand that the less they pursue such a course the better for the country and the better for themselves.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, the foundation principle of British justice, as I understand it, is that a man tried for high crimes and misdemeanours should at least have notice of the charges brought against him, and should be in a position to plead and to defend himself. The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba is put on his trial here to-day and charges of a most grave and serious character have been brought against him without his having been notified that these charges would be made, and without his having the slightest opportunity to plead to these charges or to defend himself. It is a well-known principle of constitutional law that the Lieutenant-Governor is presumed to do no wrong—that he is presumed to have acted on the advice of his advisers; and I would like to ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) what proof they have laid before this House that the Lieutenant-Governor, in asking for the opinion of Dr. Bourinot, and in afterwards in communicating it to the press, was not acting under the advice and with the consent of Mr. Greenway, his responsible adviser. And we can easily understand why Mr. Greenway should have asked the Lieutenant-Governor to come to Dr. Bourinot for an opinion. What man, occupying the position of Mr. Greenway was ever surrounded by circumstances so conflicting and so embarrassing? We must presume that he adjourned his legislature for six weeks in good faith for the purpose of studying this important question and taking legal advice upon it, so as to be able to give his legislature and his party some well considered opinion with regard to the course they should take. Having adjourned his legislature, he despatches the law officer of his Government to the older provinces for the purpose of obtaining advice from leading counsel in regard to this question. What does his responsible law officer do? Like Poor Dog Tray, he fell into bad company. He no sooner arrived in Toronto than he was captured by the hon. member for North Simcoe and taken away into the county of Haldimand and there made to declare for his government and for himself that that government had settled absolutely upon a policy of doing nothing in regard to this question. Disappointed and disgusted with his law officer, who had gone back on him, who had come here to obtain advice and had gone off to give advice, instead, who had, in fact, forgotten what he came here for, what did Mr. Greenway next do? He next sent another member of his government—if I mistake not, the Hon. Robert Watson—to the eastern provinces to obtain advice; and what did Mr. Watson do? He came to Ottawa, where he became at once closeted with the leader of the Opposition, and during the whole time he was here, nobody else was able to see him. He was taking the advice of the leader of the Liberal party here, and the moment he finished consulting him, and without consulting any lawyers at all, but having got the political side of the question, he started back to Winnipeg just as wise as Mr. Sifton. Then, no doubt, Mr. Greenway, despairing of getting any honest service or assistance from his colleagues, took advantage of his Lieutenant-Governor's presence in Ottawa, and wired him, or wrote him: For God's sake, see Dr. Bourinot, and get an honest opinion, free from all political bias, as to the ins and outs of this school question. Mr. Greenway's position was still more complicated by what was going on around him. The leading organ of the Liberal party in Ontario was declaring that this remedial order, so-called, was coercion, and that the province of Manitoba could not be properly called upon to act on that order.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he puts that forward as knowing it to be a fact, that Mr. Greenway asked the Lieutenant-Governor to get this opinion?

Mr. IVES. I only say that I think it is very probable. I do not think that it would be made any more probable even if the Montreal "Herald" published an item stating that it was the case. The whole case of the hon. member for North Simcoe and of hon. gentlemen opposite to-day is based on some irresponsible newspaper item.

Mr. MARTIN. My case was based on statements made by the leader of the House.

Mr. IVES. I had not the pleasure of hearing the hon. gentleman, and, therefore, I am not replying to him.

Mr. CASEY. Then, what are you doing ?

Mr. IVES. I am sorry I cannot have the pleasure of following the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), but I may have that pleasure at another time. Mr. Greenway, I say, was still more embarrassed by the opinions he was reading in the various organs of the Liberal party. He heard from the "Globe" that the remedial order was harsh, and trenched on the autonomy of the province of Manitoba. He heard from "L'Electeur," and other Grit papers in the province of Quebec, that there was nothing in the order—that it was merely the transmission of the mandament of the Privy Council, like the transmission of an order from a sheriff to a bailiff, and that he could do what he liked about obeying it. He also saw public men of reputation divided on the question. The hon. member for North Simcoe was making speeches to the effect that Mr. Greenway's Government had no option—that they must either obey the remedial order in its entirety, which, he said, meant the restoration of separate schools as they existed before 1890, or they could do nothing—that there was no compromise, no middle course open to them. He was told by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) that it did not order him to do anything, that he could do precisely what he pleased, and that it amounted to nothing. Even another phase of the question presented itself of a still more embarrassing nature to Mr. Greenway; that was, all of a sudden, as if there had been a stroke of thunder heard all over this Dominion, the whole Liberal party and Liberal press became absolutely dumb on the subject of the Manitoba school question. Even the hon. member for L'Islet, who had been bubbling and gushing perennially, was bottled up so effectually that he has not been heard even to-day on a question that you would hardly suppose he could retain his seat while hearing discussed. The hon. member for Winnipeg was able to make a speech by attacking Dr. Schutz, but without committing himself one way or the other on the school question; and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will be sorry to learn from a telegram that has come from Winnipeg to-night that they will have to continue bottled up for five or six weeks longer ; because, notwithstanding all the advice his colleagues and the Lieutenant-Governor tried to obtain for him on the subject, Mr. Greenway thinks that the question is not so easy or plain that he can deal with it at once, and, as he requires more time to consider it, he has proposed that his legislature shall adjourn for six weeks longer. So far as the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba is concerned, his position is precisely this : If Mr. Greenway, as Prime Minister, objects to what the Lieutenant-Governor did in asking for that opinion and giving it to the press, he has one constitutional way of signifying his objection. If he does not take that constitutional way he is absolutely presumed to have authorized the action of the Lieutenant-Governor. The one way in which he can constitutionally declare that he disapproves of what the Lieutenant-Governor has done is by sending in his resignation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that what Earl Grey did ?

Mr. IVES. I am not referring to ancient history, but to the present century—the last thirty or forty years ; and the hon. gentleman would not risk his reputation by making any statement to the contrary. He would not dare to put on record in "Hansard" any statement to the contrary. There is only one constitutional way for Mr. Greenway to proceed, and that is to send in his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor, giving as his reason that the Lieutenant-Governor had, without his consent, taken advice from other persons. Then the matter would come to the notice of the Governor General. If Mr. Greenway desires to disavow the act of the Lieutenant-Governor, his only course is to resign ; and if he does not take that course, the presumption is absolute, constitutionally speaking, that the Lieutenant-Governor sought the opinion of Dr. Bourinot with the consent and approval of his constitutional advisers.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Ives) has not afforded us very much food for thought, but he has let the cat out of the bag. It is evidently a part of the conspiracy to make things so uncomfortable for Mr. Greenway that he will be forced to resign and thereby carry out the wishes of the Government here. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) is in such a condition of guileless simplicity as to seriously pretend that it is very probable, indeed, that Mr. Greenway advised the Lieutenant-Governor to get an opinion contrary to his own view of the case and have it published broadcast throughout Canada. If he is still in that simple, credulous, trusting condition. I am afraid there is no use in arguing with him any longer, and I will not try to do it. Neither will I try to argue with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly). His speech was the speech of a naughty boy who needs to be talked to in a fatherly way ; and if the hon. gentleman's good old father were alive to-day and heard him using the expressions we have heard from him, I am satisfied he would have laid the hon. gentleman across the desk and reasoned with him in a fatherly manner. It is the only mode of argument in which a gentleman capable of such effervescence of evil speech can be reasoned with. It must be stern and severe argument alone

which can affect his conduct. All the speakers on the other side have complained that we are dealing only with newspaper comments. Nothing could be further from the facts. No doubt the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was moved by newspaper talk to bring this subject up in the House, but he brought it up for the purpose of getting information; and in spite of the evident desire to afford none, we have succeeded in obtaining a good deal. The Minister of the Interior made one statement which bore on the case. He said that the late Mr. Todd the librarian used to advise Lord Dufferin and Lord Lorne, without the knowledge of their constitutional advisers. The hon. gentleman, I fear, has been misinformed by somebody. I have no recollection of hearing that Mr. Todd ever advised the Governor General without the knowledge of the Government. I have known Mr. Todd frequently to have made up a memorandum at the request of the Governor, as to the meaning of some constitutional statute, the Oaths' Bill of 1873 and matters of that kind; but no case has been produced by the Minister where Mr. Todd directly advised the Governor behind the backs of his constitutional advisers. I do not think I need dilate longer on that point, when it is not seriously maintained by any body who knows anything about constitutional usage, that it is a proper thing for a Governor or Lieutenant-Governor to ask advice as to what he ought to do in a particular case, from any body but his Cabinet Ministers. A great deal has been said as to the delicacy of the situation and the necessity Governor Schultz was under of ascertaining what ought to be done. It was none of Governor Schultz's business what ought to be done. It did not concern him in the slightest degree, what the constitutional rights of Manitoba were in the matter. It was absolutely none of his business. It was for his advisers to decide what was right and fair and just. We are told that he consulted constitutional authority, that he consulted our Clerk, who has undoubtedly published some of the very best historical accounts, giving all the existing precedents about almost everything that can come up. But this is not a question that can be settled by precedent. There is no use for a constitutional historian in this matter at all, because there can be no precedent as to what should be done by the legislature of Manitoba, since no such situation ever before existed. It is a matter for the government and legislature of Manitoba to decide, not on the ground of precedents—for there are none—but on the ground of their own good sense, and opinion of what is right and what is wrong in the matter. And as it is for them to decide those matters, and not the Lieutenant-Governor at all, he had no business to consult the Clerk of this House, or the First Minister or any body else as to the constitutional aspect of the case. I will not go so far as the hon. member for Simcoe did who admitted, I think improperly, that there was no objection to the Governor's consulting the Clerk of the House, or any other authorities privately on the subject. In my opinion it was improper for him to consult privately any body or even obtain an opinion that might afterwards bias his mind, and prevent his accepting the advice tendered him by his constitutional advisers. It was not his place to have an opinion, and any course which tended to create an opinion in his mind took away to that extent from his usefulness, and his ability to fully and loyally accept the advice given him by those whose duty it is to give him such advice. The next question we have to consider is what followed the Governor's consultation with the Clerk. The hon. member for Simcoe asked for information on that point, and the leader of the House did his best to avoid giving any information. I must say that the leader of the House, although he is not a legal man, and although numbers of lawyers have spoken on this matter, was much more lawyer-like in his remarks than any of his legal supporters were. I will not say that he was more legal or constitutional, but he was more lawyer-like. His remarks partook of that character which is attributed to a "right smart" lawyer on the other side of the line. He showed much ability in saying as little as possible in a great number of words. I fear that the hon. gentleman's habit of accepting briefs is telling upon his moral and political character. We know that he has been accepting briefs from some of the greatest combinations in the country during the last year. We do not know authoritatively how long before, but he has been accepting briefs and has got into the habit of taking briefs; and he has lost wholly and I fear for ever, the ability to say anything straightforward and plain. Nothing can he tell this House that is not crooked and twisted, so as to make it very hard for us to understand it. Now, Sir, to use the words of a well known character of Shakespeare: "Away with your pribbles and your prabbles." Let us have a straight answer to these questions. Has there been a question of retaining Dr. Schultz as Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba? Did Dr. Schultz come down to see the Government here about his retention in office? Did he get any promise that he would be retained in office if he managed things so as to get rid of the Greenway Government, or of their opposition to the Dominion Government's policy? Did Dr. Schultz get that opinion from the Clerk of the House in confidence, or did he get it for publication? Did he give it to the Premier for the purpose of having it published? We know that the Premier gave it to the press. That

much was blurted out by the leader of the House in a moment of weakness in answer to a sudden question; the hon. gentleman told us that, before he realized that he was giving us information. We have only to assume, therefore, from all that we know, that Dr. Schultz obtained this opinion in a confidential way, that he gave it to the Premier, that the Premier allowed it to be published. Does the leader of this House, or do the members of this House think that is a straightforward, honest transaction on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and the Premier of this country? Now these questions did not receive a straight answer from the leader of the House, but the suggestions contained in them were all thrown out by questions, or by insinuations if you like, on the part of the hon. member for North Simcoe, and none of them were denied. That hon. gentleman stated that it would not be strongly denied that Dr. Schultz was down here asking for a renewal of his appointment. The leader of the House did not deny it either strongly or weakly. The hon. member for North Simcoe said that the opinion had been given to Dr. Schultz, he had good authority for believing, in confidence. The leader of the House did not deny that it was so given. Our general conclusion from the silence of the Minister on these points is that the statements made, whether directly or by inference, by the hon. member for North Simcoe were true, and that there was a conspiracy, as a matter of fact, to obtain an opinion from the Clerk of the House in a confidential way, which was to be used afterwards in a public manner for the benefit of this Government and to the detriment of the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. A great deal has been made of the statement that Dr. Schultz did not tell anybody that the opinion published was in accordance with his own opinion, and that he did not express any opinion of his own as to the proper course to be taken by the legislature of Manitoba. Nobody ever said that he did, nobody cares a brass farthing what Dr. Schultz's opinion on the subject is. Nobody would care a brass farthing, were it not for the outrage upon decency, if he were to trumpet his opinion through all the newspapers of America. But it would appear that he obtained and dishonourably used the opinion of a gentleman whose opinion has some weight in the country, and sought to use it for the purpose of check-mating those whose opinion he ought to take, instead of trying to make public opinion against them. In fact we charge him with manufacturing public opinion by means of the opinion of an officer of this House. We charge the Premier of this country with disloyally seeking to manufacture public opinion against the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor. A great many suppositions were stated by the hon. leader of the House, in his "right smart" way, in his attempt to dodge the question at issue. For instance, he asks what difference would it make, so far as the effect is concerned, if the clerk had written his opinion as an article in a magazine. No doubt if such an article were written it would have the same effect upon public opinion as though it had been given in answer to a request from Dr. Schultz. But there would have been this difference—Dr. Schultz would not then be in the position of improperly seeking to bolster up the Government of his masters here against his advisers in his own province. But it is hard to imagine such an article written in a magazine. I do not think that our clerk, with his sound ideas of constitutional practice, would go so far out of his course as to write a magazine article on a matter before the legislators of another province, and likely to come before this House in the future. But, if such a thing were possible, Dr. Schultz would have been clear of blame in the matter at all events. As it is now he is not clear of blame. He has used an opinion which he got privately and confidentially, for an improper purpose. Now, the hon. leader of the House wanted to know if there was any impropriety in Dr. Schultz letting the Premier know what the clerk thought about the matter. I say it was improper for the Government of the province to consult with the Premier at all about what was right in the matter, for the same reason I have given—that it was not the Lieutenant-Governor's business to know what was right in the case of his own individual opinion. But a strange vista is opened up to us by the statement read by the hon. member from Winnipeg—the statement made by Dr. Schultz in Winnipeg, that the Dominion Government did not know that he had obtained this opinion from Dr. Bourinot. Now, Sir, we have the statement of the leader of the House that the Dominion Government did know that the Premier got the information, and gave it to the press. Dr. Schultz tells the newspaper reporter that the Dominion Government did not know, and that he did not give them the information. The question arises who has been lying in the premises? Both these statements cannot be correct. Who has been transmuting the truth? It must have been either one or the other. Either the statement of Dr. Schultz is not true or the statement made to us by the hon. leader of the House is not true. It remains to be seen whether Dr. Schultz will stand to the statement alleged to have been made by him. He can put himself in harmony with the Ministers here, if he chooses, by denying the interview. But while it stands undenied, there is a straight issue of veracity between this Government and their tool in the province of Manitoba. It might be more parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, to say their "instrument" or to use some other

word. I mean to convey the impression that the Lieutenant-Governor is acting as a partisan in this matter, and in his whole dealing with the government up there. Now, Sir, the Minister of Militia made an unfortunate allusion. He referred to the Mercier regime in Quebec as an unfortunate regime. He meant, of course, to imply severe censure upon that deceased statesman and his colleagues. I am not going into their defence to-night, I am only going to say that Mr. Mercier never had a fair trial, that there was a conspiracy against Mr. Mercier, as there appears to be a conspiracy against Mr. Greenway to-day. The man who was the instrument of that conspiracy (Hon. Mr. Angers), who illegally, and unconstitutionally dismissed those men, who coerced them to submit to a commission of his own nomination, when they should have been tried by Parliament, who broke the constitution in the various ways that have been pointed out by the hon. member for Bothwell this afternoon—that hon. gentleman has received his fee, he is now a member of this Government, and has a permanent seat in the Senate, where he need never be troubled about making his own calling and election sure hereafter. It was unfortunate on the part of the Minister of Militia to call our attention to that transaction. The parallel between the two cases is too strong; the suspicion that something similar is going to be done in this case, is one that must arise in every mind. The Mercier Government, I say, whether a sinning Government or not, never was fairly tried or punished. Sir, that Government was lynched, it was subjected to lynch law, and not to any constitutional form of penalty, and we fear a similar outrage in Manitoba. Now, what I have said sufficiently expresses my opinion on the main points at issue. We are taunted with not saying anything about the Manitoba school question. I say we would be utterly out of order in saying anything about that question. We are not discussing that at this time; we are discussing something totally different, and I have tried to limit myself to the point under discussion. I believe the actions of the Lieutenant-Governor in this case, and of the Premier here, have been utterly improper and unconstitutional, and I am very glad the House has been called on, even in this way, to express an opinion about it. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior thinks that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) should have cited the Lieutenant-Governor before the Governor in Council, when he was one of his advisers. He says: Why did he not make these charges when he was one of the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor? My answer is that he had a far better appreciation of what was decent and constitutional than the Minister of the Interior. Would it not be a nice state of things if we had one of the advisers of a Lieutenant-Governor citing him before the Governor in Council for dereliction of duty, and trying to have him dismissed? Could such a state of things possibly exist, except in the disordered imagination of the Minister of the Interior? I do not think there is another brain in the House capable of originating it. Now, the hon. member for Winnipeg had nothing to do with such a mode of proceeding while he was adviser of the Lieutenant-Governor, and we have nothing to do with the school question at the present time. Our concern is with the matter I have been discussing, and I think the opinion of the House has been pretty well expressed upon it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. This discussion has been described as a tempest in a teapot by one of the speakers, and there may be some reason for that remark. I do not propose to discuss the merits of the case, but there are some facts that I would like to call to the attention of the House. We have heard a good deal of argument to-day in regard to precedents, as to how far we should be governed by precedents in this matter. Now, Sir, there is a precedent I would like to call to your attention, and which I think might be interesting, in view of the fact that the discussion has been brought about by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). As I understand it, he has taken the point that the opinion that has been published, was published with the object of influencing or forcing, so to speak, the judgment of the Government of Manitoba, and that it was an improper thing to use the opinion in that way, before the Government had given their decision. Now, I shall not discuss the question as to whether the opinion was sound, or as to whether it ought to have been used in that way; but I shall call the attention of the House to a precedent which I find in the public press, and which, it appears to me, seriously affects the position of the hon. member for North Simcoe in relation to this question. As we are all aware, that hon. gentleman was the counsel of the province of Manitoba before our privy council in the argument on that question. Mr. Ewart appeared on behalf of the minority, and the member for North Simcoe appeared on behalf of the province of Manitoba. The matter was discussed before the Privy Council for several days, between the 3rd and the 7th of March, and the decision was announced, I think, on the 20th March. Now, in the meantime, the Government were anxiously and carefully considering what judgment they should give, and, during that time a public meeting was held in the city of Toronto, which was addressed by the hon. member for North Simcoe. Sir, I must say, after

looking over the report of that meeting, that if ever there was an effort made to intimidate or to coerce those who were trying to form a fair and proper judgment upon a question, it was the effort of the hon. member for Simcoe on the occasion of that meeting in Toronto. I will not impose upon the House by reading the whole of his speech, a few references to it will show clearly what the object was. I think, with all deference to him as a lawyer, that it was a remarkable thing that he should bring forward the accusation he does to-day and at the same time have been guilty of precisely the same offence himself. This meeting, in Toronto, was held on the 11th March, after the argument before the Privy Council had taken place, but before the decision was given, and while the Government were considering the question. It was a mass meeting, called for the purpose of protesting against any interference with the Manitoba schools. The article begins by saying:

The Pavillion was well filled last evening at a mass meeting called to protest against remedial legislation being granted by the Dominion Government in the Manitoba school case.

There was a large number of gentlemen present whose names are given, a large audience, for the purpose of listening to the speeches. The speech of the evening was made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and in that speech he discusses not only the merits of the case, but he gives his strong opinion as to what he thought the judgment of the Privy Council ought to be. He says:

What consideration should actuate the Governor in Council before passing the law? The gathering he was addressing was not a party one, but one representative of Toronto, and he trusted that the Governor in Council would hearken to the protest which would go from it, and refuse to consent to any Act which would in any way interfere with the laws passed by the majority of a free people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand that language at all if it was not intended, at the time, by the hon. member for North Simcoe to influence and coerce the Privy Council of Canada, who were at the time considering the question, and trying to force them to do what he had failed in his argument before the Privy Council to induce them to do, that is, to come to a conclusion not to grant remedial legislation. He goes on to say:

The legislation which resulted in the repeal of the school laws could not be said to have been hasty, because it was not until 1889 that the laws were repealed.

Further on he says:

Not only had the French Roman Catholics asked for a system of schools in Manitoba, but the Icelanders and the Mennonites had also asked for a system. And their request had as much right to be entertained as that of the Roman Catholics. He wished to know whether Manitoba was to be governed from its own legislature or by the French hierarchy of Quebec. There was no state church in Canada, and he failed to see why the Roman Catholic Church should seek state aid when no other church did. The Church of England, or the Presbyterian Church, had as much right to demand state aid. Furthermore, there was an objection to the schools because they were not efficient.

Passing on, the hon. gentleman said:

He understood that the hierarchy had a good deal to do with elections—(laughter and applause)—and he thought it likely that they were clamouring for a session at Ottawa to have the matter settled, while the Government endeavoured to stave it off. If he was not misinformed, he believed the Government was determined to grant remedial legislation, and was quietly getting the French-Canadian vote solid. He thought they would agree with him that the matter came before the Governor General as a political and not as a judicial question.

I will not read the whole speech, which, no doubt, is very interesting, but appears to be all on the same line. Before resuming my seat, I desire to say that I am not expressing an opinion on the question of the schools or anything except upon the action of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. gentleman came here this afternoon and said, in effect, that the Government, or whoever did publish that letter, did so for the purpose of forcing a judgment on the Government of Manitoba, and they should not have done that. Without expressing any opinion on that subject, I simply desire to call attention to what appears to be a glaring inconsistency on the part of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), because while he was counsel engaged in arguing the case before the Privy Council, between March 3rd and March 7th, the decision being reserved, the matter being under consideration by the judges who were to decide it, and a decision not having been announced until March 18th or 20th, this hon. gentleman in the meantime attended a public meeting in Toronto, gathered for the express purpose of protesting against the Government giving a decision in any other than a certain way. The hon. gentleman attended there as the speaker of the evening. He asked the citizens of Toronto to protest against the Government arriving at a decision in a certain way, and thereby he did all he could to force a certain decision from the Government of the Dominion. It therefore seems to me that the point may very fairly be taken that the hon. member for Simcoe has placed himself at the disadvantage of being accused of inconsistency when he endeavoured to make out a case against the party who had this letter published, while this charge of inconsistency is clearly made out in the newspaper against himself personally.

Motion (Mr. McCarthy) to adjourn agreed to; and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Railway Rates Commission.—(Mr. Haggart.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Camp Harmony Angling Club.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 72) to consolidate and amend the Act relating to the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Calgary and Lethbridge Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

DEVELOPMENT OF SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) to encourage the development of the sea fisheries, and the building of fishing vessels. He said: The title indicates the main purpose of the Bill. At present, under the Fisheries Act, we appoint officers with powers of justices of the peace, and we wish to give them some additional powers in the administration of that Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MAIL COMMUNICATION WITH KINGSTON.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a small matter connected with the service of the House. I find that letters from Kingston and thereabouts are delivered here about six o'clock, but that the only mail that goes out appears to leave about half-past five, as I am informed. Now, I want to know whether this arrangement would admit of sending a night bag to go around by Tweed, so that letters for that region could be answered in the morning. I would be obliged if the Postmaster General would see if that can be arranged for. I do not think it is done at present, for I find there seems to be a whole day's delay, by which letters that are mailed before half-past five cannot be conveniently answered.

Mr. COATSWORTH.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad my attention has been called to the matter, and I will see whether the service can be arranged so as to meet the requirements to which the hon. gentleman has called my attention.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think on at least two occasions previously I have asked for information from the leader of the House with respect to the progress of negotiations between the Dominion and Newfoundland, with results which, to myself, are very meagre. I think the House will agree with me that the negotiations have now reached that acute stage when it is desirable and necessary that further information should be given to this House. I deprecate myself the position the Government have taken with reference to their relations to this House altogether. The fact is, we have become a kind of donkey engine to the Senate in the transmission of information which this House ought to have had given to it in the first instance, in matters where the financial obligations of the people are concerned. But I see, Mr. Speaker, in to-day's paper—and if I am transgressing, I will put myself in order by a motion—that the Newfoundland Legislature is re-opened, and the Premier, Mr. Whiteway, moved for adjournment for one week. I read:

> He said the delegates to Ottawa had not yet reported, and were not then able to report, as the reply to their ultimatum was not received from the Dominion Government, though waited for until the last moment.

Now, it appears from the information I gather from the papers published in Newfoundland, and from telegrams sent from there, that the Government of Newfoundland and this Government are not agreed upon a large number of the terms of union, and that an ultimatum has been sent from the Newfoundland Legislature, the answer to which will determine the acceptance of those terms or not. I see in one of the papers that one hon. gentleman from Newfoundland, a member of the Government, announces that if a favourable report, a favourable answer, to that ultimatum is received, the Government will be prepared to do its duty, from which I gather that the Government will be prepared to submit those terms without going to the people at all. Now, Sir, I have looked over some of the terms of union, notably those of Prince Edward Island, and I found in those terms that an express clause was inserted providing that the terms which were agreed upon respecting the entrance of that province to the Dominion, should be submitted to the people before they became law. The hon. gentleman intimated, though he did not say so in explicit terms, that no

such condition was inserted in the Newfoundland terms. If such a condition has been omitted, and that people is legislated into this union without an opportunity of expressing their opinion at the polls, a grievous wrong of an irremediable character, in my opinion, will be committed against them, no matter what the terms are. It would be an injustice, a constitutional mistake of the worst kind, if terms of any kind were agreed upon finally and carried into law without the people being allowed to express their opinion upon them. I wish to know from the Government whether such a telegram has been received from the Government of Newfoundland, asking for a reply to their ultimatum. I think I am also within my rights in asking the hon. leader of the House whether the ultimatum which the Newfoundland Government has submitted to this Government, is one which relates to financial arrangements, or whether it has reference to the French shore question, or whether it has reference to any matter outside of financial arrangements. The Newfoundland papers are discussing this matter with a degree of refreshing frankness that is wonderful. I have just received a copy of the "Evening Herald," of St. John's, Nfld., one of the strongest advocates of confederation in that colony, a paper which, I gather from its editorial, is prepared to advocate the forcing of the people into the union whether the people wish it or not, and in that paper I find some statements which I should be very sorry to believe myself, or to endorse, but for which there must be, I imagine, some foundation. In the issue which I hold in my hand it is said:

> It is an open secret that the imports (of Newfoundland) are not half as great as last year, the stocks formerly brought in by all the insolvent firms are not being replaced, and the revenue will not reach $750,000, as against $1,500,000 for 1894.

The paper goes on to say editorially:

> The condition of the colony, like that of its people, could not be worse. The generosity of the outside world has been keeping us alive all winter, and a relief commissioner is now doling charity in our midst. Our treasury is empty, our credit is gone. We want a loan of $2,000,000, and cannot raise a cent. Bankruptcy faces us on July 1st, pauperism is inevitable unless we accept confederation; railway and other work must stop, and the flood of emigration be largely augmented.

Well, Sir, I do not quote that in any sense as endorsing it. I do not know whether the statements are true or not; but I quote it as showing statements which are being submitted to the people of Newfoundland to show that they are in such a quandary that they must accept the terms, and accept them on or before the 1st July, or the alternative to be faced is bankruptcy. Now, the leader of the Government does not put such an alternative before the people; as I gather from a despatch sent here, he puts the alternative of retrenchment. That is a mode of escaping their difficulties which he submits to the people, and that, I take it, from what I know of the hon. gentleman, would be the course he would take if the Government of Canada refused to accept their ultimatum. Bnt I think when affairs have reached this acute stage, when the opinion is expressed in the Newfoundland papers that if union takes place at all it must take place before the 1st July, that we have a right to be informed at the earliest possible period what the terms are, and where an ultimatum has been sent of the character I have described, we ought to know in general terms from the hon. gentleman whether that relates to a matter of international importance such as the French shore question, or whether it relates to a matter of detail of pounds, shillings and pence. I think I may safely say that the general feeling, so far as I can gather it from the press, and so far as I can gather it from conversation with members of this House, is rather in favour of union of this kind and of making Newfoundland part of the Dominion. There is no disposition to haggle about a few dollars one way or the other; but there is a very strong disposition, a disposition which will be found so strong as to be irresistible, not, in our present financial condition to assume obligations of the character which, if the reports I have read be correct, we shall assume, if this province comes into confederation. I therefore would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister, if they have received a telegram covering an ultimatum; when that ultimatum was sent to them; have they replied to it; and whether that reply is, in effect, or not, one covering the subject-matter of French shore rights or financial questions, or to what subject it does refer?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry I cannot fully satisfy the hon. gentleman's laudable inquisitiveness in respect to this matter. He has displayed great persistency, and all I can do is to maintain a prudent silence on my part in respect to matters that are not considered in the interest of the negotiations such as can, at the present time, be made public. The hon. gentleman's policy seems to be one of pick and choose. He puts a number of hypothetical questions as to leading points, and he hopes to get my answers on possibly one, two or three of them, some in the negative, perhaps, and some in the affirmative, and from these he could come to a pretty fair conclusion as to what is the nature of the negotiations, and what the character of the terms. The hon. gentleman must be met in this case, as he was met before, with a courteous, but, at the same time, a firm refusal to place one single term of the negotiations which are passing, but are not yet concluded, between

this Government and Newfoundland, before the House, outside of the agreement of our Government with Newfoundland, and before they are ended. The hon. gentleman's course is somewhat peculiar, and it is more peculiar when taken in connection with another fact which I shall mention for the consideration of the House. The hon. gentleman professes to be very anxious that the union shall be accomplished if it can be effected on favourable terms But he takes a very peculiar course to bring it about. He read, I suppose, as gloomy an article as could possibly be penned to show the reading public of Canada, and the hon. members of this House, the direful straits, financial and otherwise, to which Newfoundland has come. If there be any inference to be drawn from that, it is that we ought not to go into union with a colony in that state. In the Island the strong argument that is used against confederation with Canada is the argument that Canada occupies a similar position to that which the writer of the extract read here to the House says Newfoundland occupies ; and if an excerpt, taken from the "Globe" newspaper of last night, from its correspondence from Newfoundland, was put simply by itself in the hands of any one he would declare it was an extract from the speech of a leading statesman of the Opposition in the House of Commons at Ottawa. It does not seem to me the cause of confederation is to be advanced by the reading of such statements, especially if unaccompanied by any comments to the contrary. I am not here today to discuss any of the points which have been brought up ; that discussion will be full and free, and the Government will be able to answer for itself when the papers are laid on the Table. Now, having refused so much, I am going to give the hon. gentleman and the House one little bit of information.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. If the leader of the Opposition objects, it is a different matter.

Mr. LAURIER. It will not be consistent.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, I do not desire to force information upon the hon. gentleman. However, I will take the responsibility of doing so. A telegram has been received, and numerous telegrams have been received, by the Government of Canada, and Canada's final answer has been sent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In order to place myself in order, I will conclude by moving a motion. The hon. Minister of Finance, it appears to me, and his colleagues are practicing gross deceit, and a deliberate deceit on this House.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very strong expression.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman told us a few days ago that he would present a full, frank and fair statement of all the liabilities of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the statement made by the hon. gentleman, that I and the Government of which I am a member, am practicing a deliberate deceit on the House, a gross deceit on the House. The hon. gentleman has no right to use such language.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is an unparliamentary expression, and I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will withdraw the word "deceit," and substitute this : That the hon. gentleman, having promised, some days ago, to bring down the Supplementary Estimates failed to do so, that he failed to bring down the Supplementary Estimates after making a specific promise to do so. That may, or may not, be deceit in parliamentary usage.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a miserable subterfuge. The hon. gentleman did not rise to refer to that subject at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister was going to make a full confession of all the liabilities which this country was going to assume, or has incurred. What I want to point out is this, that, in the course of the Budget discussion at this time proceeding, it is specially desirable and important that we should understand what the projects of the Government are likely to add to the liabilities of the Dominion. There is no shadow of doubt that no matter what terms are made with Newfoundland, they will, in all human probability, involve very large additions, indeed, to the fixed charges of this country. Before we close this Budget debate, if the hon. gentleman is going to redeem his promise, in the spirit, if not in the letter, we ought to be fully advised as to the extent of the liabilities we are likely to incur ; otherwise, we are discussing these important matters in the dark—quite in the dark. Our present liabilities, according to the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister, computing the statutory provisions, will be on the verge of $300,000,000, but not quite up to that sum. If any further amount is to be added for the purpose of bringing Newfoundland into confederation, or for any other purpose, it is the hon. gentleman's bounden duty to acquaint the House with it, and it was his bounden duty and that of his colleagues not to have called the House together until the Government were prepared to make such a statement. These negotiations should have been in such a state, if he was going to enter into them at all, that hon. members

would possess full and complete knowledge of where we are, and what possible liabilities we are going to incur. We cannot tell what these propositions may involve, whether twenty, thirty, or fifty millions additional to the total liabilities of Canada. It is a matter, therefore, of first-rate importance to the proper discussion of this question on which we are now engaged, that we should know what these negotiations are ; and I say that the hon. gentleman and the Government to which he belongs have been grossly derelict in their duty in that they did not get these negotiations into such a shape before Parliament met that they could advise us regarding them before it was necessary to bring the Budget statement down, and inform us as to what they would amount to. In order that the matter may be clearly understood, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It can hardly be said that members of the Administration do not magnify their office. These hon. gentlemen seem to forget altogether what the rights of the House of Commons are under our constitution. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read those portions of the Act of Union, which authorize the addition of Newfoundland or any other province to the union, he will see that there is no provision whatever that it shall be dealt with as an ordinary Government question. It is not a question simply of ministerial policy ; it is not provided that the terms of union shall be settled between the Government of Canada, on the one side, and the Government of Newfoundland on the other. The terms and conditions of the union are to be agreed upon between the Parliament of Canada and the legislature of the province seeking admission. These are the terms and conditions, and the hon. gentleman intends or proposes that this House shall be excluded altogether from any part or parcel in the conduct of these negotiations. The hon. gentleman has altogether mistaken his duty in this matter. The hon. gentleman is acting, if he is acting constitutionally at all, in behalf of the Government of Canada. Has not the Parliament of Canada a right to know what are the matters in dispute in these negotiations between Newfoundland and the Government of Canada ? Does Newfoundland demand large subsidies, large bounties for her fishermen ? Have the Government, in their answer, proposed to concede this demand ? Has Newfoundland demanded that the municipal indebtedness of the city of St. John's, which has no municipal institutions, in our sense, at all, shall be assumed by Canada ? Has the Government of Newfoundland asked that the Parliament of Canada shall assume the responsibility of constructing 500 miles of railway through a country where there are not 5,000 inhabitants ? If such are the propositions that are at issue between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, then I say that the people of this country have a right to know what those propositions are. Sir, the people of Canada submitted long enough to allow the Government to perform the part of masters of the people. That is the position that the hon. gentlemen have assumed, and what is the position of Canada after 15 years trial of that system ? Why, Sir, the people of Canada are embarrassed with the indebtedness incurred by the Administration, and the Government themselves scarcely know how they are to meet that indebtedness. Now the Government propose that they shall settle with the people, or with the Government of Newfoundland—for I understand that they have no intention on either side of allowing the people of Newfoundland to have any voice in the matter—whether this country shall, or not, in addition to its present serious financial burdens, assume $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 of debt and add two or three million dollars a year to the expenses of the Government of Canada. I tell the Administration : You have taxed the people of this country to such an extent that you have driven thousands of people out of the country, and you have scarcely anybody left upon whom you can impose your burdens, upon whom you dare longer to impose your burdens ; and under these circumstances you propose to defeat the public opinion of this country by introducing people who have no public opinion with regard to your conduct or misconduct in office during the past ten years. That is the position that the Government, this is what ministers have in view in the negotiations between themselves and Newfoundland ; acting on our behalf, acting without consulting this House, acting without considering whether the people of this country in the present financial condition of the country are prepared to take up this subject of union with Newfoundland or not, and undertaking to tie the hands of the people of this country and then to come to Parliament and say : We have made a bargain, and you must accept it as a whole or reject is as a whole, you cannot alter one jot or tittle of the whole arrangement, you who are entrusted under the constitution with the settlement of the terms of the union are to have no voice in saying what these terms of union may be ; you must say yes or no, but you cannot say more or less. You cannot point out that the terms are defective in this respect, or that they are defective in that respect. These hon. gentlemen opposite come here after having impoverished the country and driven out its inhabitants and embarrassed it financially, and propose to add a population of 200,000, two-fifths of whose revenue has every year for the past five years been expended on the relief of the poor in the Island of Newfoundland. That is the condition of things ; and this House would be wanting in its duty if it

allows this Government to proceed further in these negotiations without knowing what they are. The time has been, Sir, under the constitution of England, when, if a Minister of the Crown had answered a member of the House as the hon. gentleman has answered my friend to-day, he would be impeached at the bar of the House of Lords.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes. What is the position of the Government? The position is that they are masters of the situation, and are using their powers to prolong their life, may I not say by a misuse of authority. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I might say, and say with perfect parliamentary propriety, that the hon. gentlemen may find that it will be their funeral. This House is entitled to know what these negotiations are, and we are entitled to know whether the propositions are of such a character, that under no circumstances this House could, in the interests of the people of this country, for a moment entertain them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the hon. gentleman, who poses as a very great constitutional critic and constitutional lawyer, has made himself ridiculous to-day in the eyes of this Parliament, and in the eyes of this country. I do not pretend, Sir, to any constitutional authority beyond that of the humblest member of the House, but I must say that I do not think,—though I say it with bated breath so to speak—that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) means what he has said here this afternoon. We are quite accustomed in this House to see the hon. gentleman growing excited over the very smallest points which could possibly be raised in a Chamber of this kind; but I confess that I never saw my hon. friend grow so cross and grow so excited when he was so decidedly in the wrong, as he has this afternoon. Let me pause to look for a moment at the extraordinarily contradictory position which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken upon this question. We are told in the first place, that the completion of confederation, that the bringing in of the Island into the Canadian Dominion, is to be the funeral of the Conservative party in this country. Heaven knows that is what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has been praying for for so many years, and consequently he should express no regret if the time for our funeral has approached. In the next place, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) rises in this House and says that we are about to bring in a number of people who have become beggars in the Island of Newfoundland.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent me. I did not say they had become beggars. I read from the confederation organ in the province of Newfoundland in which was related the condition of the people. I took good care to say that I did not endorse the statement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In the usual way my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) quotes from somebody else and lends to that statement the authority of reading it himself in the House; but he refuses to make the statement directly and openly from his own lips. Sir, the inference to be drawn by the members of this House this afternoon was, that my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) endorsed the statement that the people of the Island were impoverished. Then, what will the members of this House think of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) immediately rising and saying: that the Government had an ulterior object in view, namely, that we had imposed taxes to the very fullest extent upon every possible soul in Canada, and then we propose to bring in a new beggared lot—as my hon. friend referred to them—from the Island of Newfoundland for the purpose of raising more funds for the Canadian treasury, and bleeding the people of Newfoundland white, who had had already,—according to the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—been bled white, many times before. Now, Sir, referring to the position which I took, that the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had made himself ridiculous, I again wish to speak for a moment upon that question. What is the only point upon which my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) has attempted to say a word of sense to the House this afternoon? Is it not this: that this House has been dragged into a bargain of which it was to know nothing, and into the settlement of a question which was not to be submitted to it. I want to tell my hon. friend, that he knows that he is talking nonsense upon that point. I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) that he knows just as well as the members of the Government do, that that confederation never can be completed until every line of it, until every tittle of that agreement is submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and discussed, and passed upon by the members of this House; and in saying, that some great harm is to be done the Dominion of Canada, my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) is saying the very worst compliment he could to the representatives of the people in this House. It is true that the majority of this House is a majority in which my hon. friend has very little confidence. It matters not, Sir, how sacred might be the cause or how good the object which was to be promoted by the members on this side of the House, we would have objections and criticisms from my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the members who surround him. But I want to tell my hon. friend that we resent the imputation cast across this Chamber, that the men who support the Government in this House are not as thoroughly patriotic and as honest as

the men who sit upon the other side. When the question of Newfoundland entering the confederation is submitted to this House, and passed upon, as it will be passed upon, by the majority of this House. I pay my hon. friends opposite the compliment of saying that they will deal as patriots with it; and I pay my hon. friends on this side of the House only the justice that is due them when I say that we will deal with the question with a due regard for the safety and the future prosperity of this Dominion. I need not declare that the Government have taken the usual position in regard to such matters. Surely it is well within the knowledge of every one who has paid the slightest attention to constitutional practice that questions of union between various sections of an empire are most delicate matters. My hon. friend from Bothwell knows as well as I know that no negotiations could ever be successfully carried on if, before a certain stage was reached, they were to become the subjects of discussion in the public legislatures and the public prints of this country; and if my hon. friend desires, as I presume he does, to see the Dominion of Canada rounded off by the last British colony on this continent being brought within the bounds of the Canadian confederation, he is adopting the very best course to prevent that consummation when he rises to endeavour to extract from the Government before the negotiations are complete, information which if given at this time might defeat the very object my hon. friend has in view. The Government of this country do not desire to hide anything from Parliament, we are in the hands of Parliament, we must abide by the judgment of Parliament, and when the time comes for these negotiations to be placed before the country, hon. gentlemen opposite will find that they have been raising a tempest in a tea-pot. They will find that the Government have conducted the negotiations with a view not only to the extension of our domain, but with a view to the safeguarding of those rights and rules which the Government have observed in years past in dealing with other great questions.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to-day with any intention of answering the harangue of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, for the remarks with which he has adorned it and the question before the House are as wide apart as the poles. The question before the House has not even been touched by the hon. gentleman. The question raised by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) was this: Has the House any right to be informed of the negotiations which have taken place between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland? That is the only question. Now, it is admitted as a rule of diplomacy between foreign nations that so long as the negotiations are pending it would not be proper to communicate to Parliament the particular nature of those negotiations. This is admitted with regard to diplomatic relations between foreign nations, but this is not the character of the present negotiations. They are not diplomatic negotiations between two countries; they are not negotiations for a treaty of peace; they are negotiations for a basis of agreement between two governments in regard to the admission of one of them into the union. More than that: we have not been able to extract it from the hon. gentlemen to-day, but we have at present this information, that the negotiations are ended.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not ended.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government of Newfoundland has sent an ultimatum here, and has received an answer to the ultimatum; so the negotiations are complete.

Mr. IVES. No.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not an ultimatum, then.

Mr. IVES. There has been no answer from Newfoundland.

Mr. LAURIER. Then the negotiations will never be complete. Here is the Premier of Newfoundland saying: "We have sent an ultimatum to Canada, and we expect an answer," and the hon. gentleman has condescended to inform the House that the answer which Newfoundland had been expecting has been sent there. Now, I ask in the name of common sense, in the name of parliamentary government, in the name of the freedom of the people, are not the Canadian people as much entitled to the confidence of their Government as the people of Newfoundland to theirs. What is the reason that an answer to their ultimatum has been asked by the Government of Newfoundland? Simply to be communicated to the legislature of Newfoundland, and I presume that as soon as the legislature of Newfoundland shall be in session again, the answer of the Canadian Government will be communicated to it, but to-day the Parliament of Canada is denied information which in a few days will be given to the legislature of Newfoundland. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Davies) did not use too strong a word when he said that this was an outrage on the Canadian people. According to the statement made by the hon. Minister a few moments ago, we are to receive this information some time. Yes, when it suits the Government's own sweet will, they will be kind enough to inform the Canadian Parliament of the negotiations. We know when that will be—when the whole thing shall be cut and dried, when everything shall have been acted upon. What will be the consequence? It is now

beyond doubt that the basis of union has been agreed upon between the two governments; only a few points remain to be settled. Even if those few points are not yet settled, I ask in the name of common sense what reason is there why they should not be at once communicated to the Canadian people to reflect as to how far they could meet the objections raised. We shall have them later, when they are cut and dried, and then we shall have to swallow them as a whole, or reject them as a whole.

Mr. IVES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? If the line of argument which the hon. gentleman is taking means anything, it means that the House should assist the Government in arranging the terms with Newfoundland, and that the advice and assistance of the Opposition should be availed of in the meantime to help to settle the terms.

Mr. LAURIER. I say that if the basis of the negotiations is good and sound, the Government would receive the assistance of the Opposition; no doubt of that. But at present I want to know what is the reason why the negotiations, together with the points of difference, if there remain any, should not be communicated to Parliament? Suppose that by and by, when the negotiations are all completed, the Canadian Parliament should be disposed not to swallow them as a whole, but to accept them in part, and reject them in part; the whole negotiations would have to be thrown away and new negotiations entered into before we could proceed with the scheme of confederation. Would it not be more logical for us to have at present information as to the points of difference? But it is evidently useless to expect information from the hon. gentlemen now on the treasury benches. They have given their answer to Newfoundland, and I see no good reason why they should not communicate it to the House. What will their position be on the subject to-morrow? How long will they remain in their present frame of mind? Some weeks ago they passed an Order in Council with reference to the Hudson Bay Railway, and they have not yet made up their minds whether or not they will ask Parliament to ratify that Order in Council. They were of one mind a few weeks ago; they were of another mind a few days ago, and at the present time they are wavering. Therefore it may be prudent on their part not to give us this information. The hon. gentleman, the leader of the House, said a moment ago that my hon. friend was gifted with persistence. It is true that is one of the qualities of my hon. friend beside me, but his power of persistence is not equal to the power of inertiae of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot allow some of the remarks that have been made to go without a reply. Now let us, without heat and in all coolness, examine the different positions taken by the hon. gentleman opposite and see how consistent they are. The policy of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and his party has been to endeavour to persuade the country that information which is vitally necessary, and which they have a perfect right to have at present, is being withheld, and by this means to create a prejudice against the Government. In pursuance of that policy they have taken up the Newfoundland matter, and they make a demand for information which, I venture to say, if it had been made in any constitutional Parliament in the world, would meet with the same persistent refusal that it does here. They endeavour by pressing for something which they know, in their own hearts, they have no right to obtain at present, to create the impression that the Government is withholding information which this Parliament is entitled to have. What is the position of the hon. member for South Oxford? He says that there is a Budget debate going on, and that it is necessary, in order to have that debate as wide and complete as possible, to know what the probable liabilities of the country are. And in this view, he claims that the negotiations which are to-day going on between Canada and Newfoundland, and which are incomplete, and which cannot without prejudice be made public until they are completed, should be made public to-day. No matter what reasons of state may exist against the publication of these negotiations, the information must be brought down, because the Budget debate is going on, and because, forsooth, the hon. gentleman wishes to know what our liabilities may be in 1897 or 1898 or in 1899, after confederation takes place with Newfoundland, if it should take place. Again, he declares that we ought not to have brought the House together until these negotiations were completed. Why, only a few days ago the hon. gentleman spoke to a different tune. When I endeavoured to give as a reason why the House met so late that negotiations were proceeding with Newfoundland and that we desired to have them as far advanced as possible, with the view of having the results placed before the House before it rose, that idea was scouted and ridiculed as being no valid reason at all for delaying the session. The hon. the leader of the Opposition tried to draw a distinction between negotiations going on with a foreign country and negotiations with the colony of Newfoundland with reference to confederation or union between the two. What is the difference? What reason exists, when negotiations are being carried on with a foreign power, for authorizing a refusal on the part of the Government to give information to Parliament, which does not exist

here. In all such matters it is essential that the negotiations should be carried on by the responsible executive alone—by the Government, which is but a committee of Parliament—as in this way alone can they be carried on with the best prospects of success; and the disclosure of those negotiations, if made prematurely, would only tend to prevent the final success. That reason admittedly holds in the case of negotiations with a foreign power, and the same reason exists for secrecy in the negotiations between Canada and Newfoundland. There is a direct parallel between the two, so far as the necessity of secrecy is concerned, until the negotiations are completed. This regard for secrecy is based on a common sense principle, and that is that the committee of the House, the responsible executive of the House, is the proper authority to carry on the negotiations can keep its own counsel, and is alone responsible to the House and the country for the results. The hon. member for Bothwell wants this legislature to carry on the negotiations. But who is the hon. member for Bothwell, and to whom is he responsible? He is responsible to the constituency of Bothwell. He would have the constituency of Bothwell conducting the negotiations with Newfoundland. My hon. friend's responsibility is a limited one, whereas the Government is responsible to the whole House and country. When these negotiations have reached such a stage that they can be brought down, the Government, in the exercise of its duties, will lay the whole matter before the House, and take the responsibility for whatever results may arise from these negotiations. But the leader of the Opposition says that if this House had the matter now put before it, as it stands at present, this House might modify the negotiations; but that if obliged to wait until the business is completed, the House will have to swallow the results, whatever they may be. He thus intimated that the Government would, by the force of its majority, compel the House to swallow the measure as a whole, or take any other course advisable. But the Government has the same majority to-day as it will have three months hence; and the Opposition are in no better position to-day than they will be, when this transaction is completed, to meet the views of the Government. The hon. gentleman's argument has therefore no force at all, and it makes no difference, as regards the compulsion of the majority, of which the hon. gentleman seems so greatly in dread, whether these negotiations are submitted piecemeal or altogether. The hon. gentleman went on to say, that the information might well be refused while the negotiations were still pending. Then, I say they are pending, they are not completed. I did not say they were, nor did I use any such word as "ultimatum." The newspapers, from which the hon. gentleman got his information, may have used it. My hon. friend opposite may have used it. But I did not. I distinctly said that we had received many telegrams from Newfoundland to which we had sent replies, and that to-day we had sent a reply to their last telegram. That may be a final telegram or it may not. But even if it should be, we must first have their answer and know their minds before we can divulge anything. My hon. friend says that the Newfoundland Legislature will meet in a few days and that the Newfoundland Government may give the Newfoundland Legislature these particulars, and that we will not have the same information. Well, Mr. Speaker, we shall be in session when the Newfoundland Legislature meets, and that legislature has not had a line of information so far. It will not have any until these negotiations are completed; and when they are completed, this Parliament and the Newfoundland Legislature will be seized of the same information and papers at the same time. I am surprised at this attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to take their stand away from sound constitutional ground and to worry the Government for information, in the hope that they may impress the country with the belief that this Government is arbitrarily and improperly withholding from Parliament information Parliament has a right to obtain. The hon. gentleman's conduct can only be interpreted in one way. They are determined to attack the Government. If they can find a fair case, they will use it; but if they cannot, they will take a case that is not fair. I see it stated in some of the papers that there is a very confident feeling on the part of the Opposition; that it has even spread from the front benches to the middle benches, and on from the middle benches to the back benches, and has submerged these back benches in a wave of enthusiastic hope that their party is soon to come into power, that they have the Government at their mercy. I want to tell my friend, the leader of the Opposition, and every man who sits beside and behind him, that they have hard work to do before they can cross this floor. They have to rid themselves of their record for incapacity in the government of the Dominion; they have to rid themselves of their record for incapacity in the provincial leaders of the party, as shown in the iniquities of Liberal Governments in the various provinces, than which there is no more disgraceful development in the legislative history of any country under the sun than in the late Administration in Quebec. They have to get away from both these records. They have to get away from their record of inconsistencies and twistings and turnings in the matter of a fiscal and tariff policy The hon. gentleman talks about the Government not knowing its own mind? Does he know his own mind? He made a speech in Winnipeg last year; he got half-

way through one sentence as to the nature of his tariff policy, but he broke off and he has not finished that sentence yet. The hon. gentleman hedges on every question with "ifs" and "buts," until he cannot see over them without getting higher than his own limbs will raise him. And these are the gentlemen who talk to us about not knowing our own minds. They have to get a better fiscal policy, something which they can explain before the people; they have to get something which they know themselves. And when the testing time comes—and we are ready for it whenever it comes—we will meet them on the hustings as we have met them before, and there they will have to tell the electors definitely what they propose to do. But, Sir, their record is not a good one. There is just one fact, if there was nothing else, for which this patriotic people opposes them—and will oppose them—the fact that not many years ago they sailed so near to treason that their own old time leader leaped from deck and swam for dear life for the shore.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has long been in doubt whether the hon. gentleman who leads the House would develop the qualities such as are presumed to be required by a gentleman who fills that position. That doubt, however, will be set aside from this day forth. The dignity, Sir, the prudence of the speech which the hon. gentleman has just made must settle that matter. Here are complicated and delicate arrangements going forward between the Dominion of Canada and the province of Newfoundland, the result of which may lay heavy financial burdens upon this country. The hon. gentleman is asked to give the House such information as, in the public interest, he may properly give with reference to these negotiations. The absolute details were not sought for. but only those facts that, in the public interest, he could and ought to give. And his reply is a bitter stump speech upon the general policy and past record of the Opposition, a speech which the hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to deliver under such circumstances. The hon. gentleman's conduct upon this occasion is unworthy of one occupying his position. We expected something better from him. We expected that his reply would be marked with a dignity and prudence and candour becoming one essaying to fill the responsible position he occupies here. He should remember, Sir, that he is not simply a party leader talking party clap-trap, but he stands here as the representative of the committee of Government to tell his masters, this House—not alone his party behind him—to what responsibilities he is committing this country. Sir, we must recollect that these questions are put in view of the gravity of a situation which we cannot ignore. The leader of the Newfounland Government tells us that these negotiations must be completed before 1st July next. The hon. gentleman talks about our being too insistent. What is the date to-day? It is now the 10th of May, and the hon. gentleman refuses to disclose a scintilla of information with reference to the negotiations which this House must decide upon for good or for ill, before the 1st of July. When are we to get the information on which we are to give a decision? This is not a party question and ought not to be a party question, although the hon. gentleman has made a most indelicate attempt to force it into the party arena. It is not for this House, or for the members of this House alone, that we want this information. There is a power outside this House before which even the hon. gentleman must bow, great man as he has lately assumed to be—the power of the people who will have to bear the obligations he is putting upon this country; and it is for their interests and for their information that we ask for these facts. and not for ourselves alone. These negotiations and terms of this union must be received and discussed by us and discussed by those who are to assume these obligations. The hon. gentleman talks about the meeting of this House. If he had any political shame he would be ashamed to mention that epoch in this country's history. The hon. gentleman in this matter, as in all others, vacillated between one course and another. There was no head to the Government in this as there was no head to it in anything else. One party wanted a meeting of the House, while another party was afraid to call that meeting. The Finance Minister was afraid to announce his deficit, while another party wanted to go to the country upon the school question. The Government dilly-dallied and waited. They sent out their parties hither and thither, carrying on a political campaign, but refusing to take the people into their confidence. The month of January came, when we ought to have met, when those who sat behind the hon. gentleman know, we ought to have met, and that month passed by, and then February, and then March, and we were well into the month of April when at last, at long last, and against the public interest, they make up their minds to call a session of the House. It is disgraceful to have two hundred and odd men meeting at this time, considering the personal sacrifices they have to make, and all for party purposes. I tell him that it is because of the imminence of the date at which, as the leader of the Newfoundland Government says, these negotiations must be completed or set on one side, that we press for this information. If this were a matter which was to go over until next year, if there were no imperious pressing necessity upon us, I would say the hon. gentleman was acting within his right in asking us still further to possess our souls in patience. But we have the statement

of the Premier of Newfoundland that the terms must be agreed to before the 1st July. He declares that they have sent their ultimatum to the Canadian Government. The hon. gentleman, in answer to a question, stated that this Government had sent its answer. That being so the negotiations were closed, and a telegram from the hon. gentleman to the Premier of Newfoundland would have enabled him, without a breach of courtesy, to lay these terms before the House, and, therefore, before the people who are to assume the obligations and pay the bill. And who is this committee of council that arrogates to themselves the right to determine, before consultation with the people, what these terms shall be? My hon. friend the leader has put it in a nutshell. The leader of the House wants to submit the terms to us at a period when we cannot judge or modify one of them. We will have to take the terms as a whole, and either accept them holus bolus or reject them holus bolus. It won't be in our power, as the Secretary of State says, to reject them, it won't be in our power to suggest a fair and honest modification. If so, Sir, when these terms come down to us, as agreed upon between the Dominion and the province of Newfoundland, our position will be that simply of ratifying what has been agreed upon, or refusing it altogether, and not of going into the terms to consider how far they may be modified or improved. Is that a fair position to put the representatives of the people in, or the tax-payers in? My position is this: That at the earliest possible period, allowing a reasonable and fair time, these proceedings, now having been finally closed, should be laid before us, published in the papers, submitted to the electorate, thoroughly discussed by them, so that when we come to vote, we may come with an intelligent idea of what we are voting for, with knowledge whether or not we have behind us the wishes or the votes of those whom we represent. That is the position we take, it is the true Liberal policy, and I say it is one in defiance of which the hon. gentleman is flying directly.

Mr. IVES. We have just witnessed the spectacle of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat reproving my hon. friend the leader of the House for having made a stump speech when he himself has just concluded a stump speech, for if the deliverance of the hon. member who has just taken his seat was not a stump speech, it lacks the one good quality that I think his friends would be disposed to give it. There is no constitutional law about it, there certainly is no common sense about it, and if it is not a good stump speech, and has not had an elevating effect upon the back benches, there certainly was no excuse for taking up the time of the House today in making it. The hon. gentleman, if he knows anything, must know that the Government can take but the one course, unless he is prepared to take the position that the whole House of Commons, as representing the people of Canada, have a right to take part in the negotiations of this treaty, because it is a treaty, with the colony of Newfoundland, and to discuss the terms pro and con, and to settle them before they can be agreed upon with Newfoundland. If that is not his view, then I say there is not the slightest sense in the position which he takes when he says: Let us know what you are doing before you have cut and dried and settled this matter, so that we may help you and advise you. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, and I would like to ask his leader, when he thinks that Canada and Newfoundland could come to an arrangement which the people of Canada, and the people of Newfoundland would ratify, if the arrangement was being made publicly, subject to newspaper comment, and to newspaper falsehoods, as well as to discussions in this House?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman is asking me a question, I will tell him. In the case of the negotiations which were carried on between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, that course was taken, and the terms were submitted to the people, and the people passed upon them, and they were discussed at every hustings in Prince Edward Island after the legislature had passed upon them.

Mr. IVES. After the terms were agreed upon, and not before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Before the terms were agreed to by the legislature, they were submitted to the people.

Mr. IVES. That is another question. What you are asking for now is that the House of Commons should be taken into the confidence of the Government, should be asked to go into the Privy Council chamber, should be asked to sit down with the Government and discuss the terms of this treaty. Now, I ask, when, under those circumstances, would this treaty ever be made? You have your party newspapers, for the sake of compromising the Government, pitching into this proposition, pitching into that proposition; and the Newfoundland papers that are opposing confederation, would take advantage of this proposition, and of that proposition, and no possible arrangement could be made, and the hon. gentleman knows it as well as anybody else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are afraid to trust the people.

Mr. IVES. We are not prepared to abdicate the functions of government. The hon. gentleman thought he had got very near the treasury benches, he thought he had a

fair prospect of coming here, and he is so much in a hurry to come that he wants to take a hand in making this arrangement. The hon. gentleman has to go through the ceremony of a general election, he has to take his chances in the county of Bothwell, and I am sorry for his sake to hear that they are so much complicated. But he has to take those chances in a rough and tumble way. Possibly the hon. gentleman may have this justification, that if he ever has an opportunity to discuss this treaty, it will have to be before the prorogation of the present Parliament. Now, I cannot help but express my wonder that the hon. gentlemen, who mourn every day of the session that the members should be brought here at such an inconvenient time of the year, should consume three-fourths of the time of this House with such clap-trap motions, and general motions to adjourn the House, as we have had yesterday and to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The motion was carried yesterday.

Mr. IVES. The House naturally adjourned. It is the first motion the hon. gentlemen have carried for seventeen years, and they were enabled to carry that only by talking it out until midnight, and until my hon. friend the leader of the House was obliged to go home, otherwise, we should have adjourned the House ourselves. I say I cannot help but wonder that hon. gentlemen who are constantly remarking upon the inconvenience of bringing the House together at this season of the year, should be consuming two-thirds of the time of the House and making this an expensive session, when it need not be an expensive one, by making and talking upon these clap-trap motions. I think, Sir, you will have seriously to consider the question as to whether a motion to adjourn can be made by any member of the House on any occasion he chooses, and the discussion continued upon any possible question which may be taken up; and I give this notice, that I intend, upon the next occasion, to raise the point whether a motion to adjourn is a proper motion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it would be right to let this opportunity pass without some reply to the Minister of Finance. He has charged the Opposition with incompetency, he says that they are incapable of discharging the duties that devolve upon them as an Opposition, and that it would be a reproach upon the country to permit them to occupy the treasury benches. I can tell the Minister of Finance that the general opinion throughout this country with regard to the ability of those who happen to occupy the treasury benches is not of the highest. There is in this country very grave doubts as to the capacity of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I have read that on a recent occasion—I do not know whether it was the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Railways, or whether it was the President of the Council, who, I understand, very often goes to Texas to inspect a ranch he has got there——

An hon. MEMBER. The Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know which of them, or how many of them were together.

Mr. IVES. I understand the hon. gentleman is a money lender, and I would like to borrow something on my Texas grant. I do not want, however, to pay 24 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to make advances so soon as I understand what are the hon. gentleman's collaterals.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is your rate of interest.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that when some hon. gentlemen opposite went on one of their trips to the United States, they entered a hotel where a long, lanky Yankee was sitting.

Mr. IVES. May I ask if he is any relation of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell the hon. gentleman that I did not inquire as to whether he was a distant relation to the Minister of Trade and Commerce or not. But I understand he inquired who the visitors were, and some persons present informed him that they were Her Majesty's Privy Council from Canada. After taking a good look at these gentlemen and drawing a long breath, he said: "Well, if these are the Queen's Privy Council from Canada, I say from the bottom of my heart, and for the first time, here and now, 'God save the Queen'." I thought I would give the hon. gentlemen that opinion, as the Finance Minister appeared to challenge the abilities possessed by the Opposition. Now, I have given hon. gentlemen opposite an opinion of a stranger, one residing outside of Canada, and one altogether independent.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. DICKEY. The diplomatic episode having closed, it becomes my duty to say a few words on the motion in amendment to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and I

am afraid I shall have to strike a somewhat lower key than did the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and I think I shall have a good deal of difficulty in making such a subject as the Budget interesting after the very warm addresses to which the House has just listened. However, I desire to offer a few remarks with respect to the arguments addressed to the House by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I was disappointed to find the hon. gentleman had fallen, to some extent, into the old rut of the prophet Jeremiah, bewailing the condition of Canada in the good old set terms. I do not propose this afternoon to weary the House with any detailed figures, because, in the very able addresses presented on both sides of the House on this question this year and on previous years, the subject has been discussed at very great length; but there are one or two points in the remarks offered by the hon. member for Brant to which I wish to direct attention. The hon. gentleman, in proof of the bad condition of affairs in Canada, referred to the foreign trade in 1894, as compared with the foreign trade in 1874. It was said, I believe, by Mr. Mills, not our esteemed friend from Bothwell, but a gentleman who has acquired some fame in the American Republic, that figures will not lie, but figures will lie. I should be very sorry, indeed, to class the hon. member for Brant in the category of those figurers; but there is a way of handling figures which certainly does not convey really a correct impression, and I hardly think that hon. gentleman was exactly candid in picking out the year 1874 and comparing it with 1894. What was the hon. gentleman's object in referring to the figures connected with the trade of the country? I suppose it was, to some extent, to indicate the business carried on. If that was his object, why did he not refer to the internal trade of the country, that trade which far exceeds in every country, and in Canada as well, both in volume, in profit and in general good the foreign trade many times over. If the hon. gentleman wished to show the progress which this country had made, why did he not refer to the internal trade? We had no statistics of that trade, but we have railway and shipping returns, the great corporations, of course, keep returns of their traffic, and it is well known that the internal business of the country has enormously developed during the last few years. The tons of freight carried on the railways were four times, in 1894, the number carried in 1875, the coast shipping in 1894 was twice that in 1878. Ships do not sail and trains do not run for amusement, but to do business, and taking these examples, they show that the actual work done by the people has enormously increased since the Conservative party has been governing the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Taking the coastwise shipping: Does the hon. gentleman include inland shipping as well?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman at the moment. I think it is sea-coast shipping entirely.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In the hon. gentleman's return of railway tonnage carried, was that tonnage carried between interprovincial points?

Mr. DICKEY. No, it was the total tonnage.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman, I understood, stated that there was four times the tonnage carried as regards interprovincial trade. How does he arrive at that conclusion? Has not the hon. gentleman included tonnage carried from one part of the United States to another, and given that as proof of increased trade?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not give these figures as showing the exact ratio of tonnage carried between one year and another. I gave these facts as affording an indication of the general increase of trade done by the people, and I said that the amount of freight carried on the railways is four times as much to-day as it was some years ago. That, I submit, is a perfectly legitimate argument to use. Does the hon. gentleman say that it does not show that there has been an increase? He will scarcely do so, I think. The hon. gentleman, in taking the foreign trade as the measure of work done, very conveniently excluded all mining carried on in this country. The results of this mining industry do not appear in the Trade Returns, and the returns for Nova Scotia, for example, are not included in any blue-book. I do not propose, however, to go over this question in detail so far as figures are concerned. I simply, at this stage, make that statement, and I take that instance of the volume of trade because the hon. member for Brant used it, and I contend that whatever fair test is applied to the business of this country, except the business of the present year, which I shall deal with later on, it will be found that its trade and its work has been progressing by leaps and bounds. Take the test used by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to the prosperity of a country. He said that if we imported largely and paid for the importations, our people are prosperous, that this is a sign of prosperity. We imported, in 1893, 50 per cent more goods than in 1879, and no doubt we paid for them. If that is to be a test of prosperity, we are 50 per cent more prosperous than in 1879. But, as I said before, figures can be manipulated and made to convey an unfair impression to people outside. The hon. gentlemen opposite manipulate figures one way and hon. members on this side of the House do it in the opposite direction.

Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House say that this country is going to destruction, and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House say that everything is rosy. Now, let us take expressions of opinion outside of this House, and in doing that I will choose authorities which should carry some weight with hon. gentlemen opposite. I will take two classes of authorities. In the first place, politicians belonging to their own party of hon. gentlemen opposite, but politicians who are not speaking immediately for political purposes; politicians who are stating fairly and frankly what they believe to be the condition of this country, and I will put their statements alongside the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, leaving the country to judge which is more likely to be correct. I suppose that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are familiar with the Hon. J. W. Longley, a prominent member of the Liberal Administration of Nova Scotia. In the "Fortnightly Review" in the year 1890, the Hon. Mr. Longley had an article in which he said of Canada:

It has a population of at least five millions and is rapidly growing. It has large cities and rising towns, its trade is expanding and its wealth accumulating. It has two of the greatest railway lines in the world. Canada cannot be charged at home or abroad with lack of natural enterprise. Wealth is being rapidly accumulated by the steady progress of trade and industries. Things are moving up wonderfully well at present, and, to sum up, Canada is prosperous, contented and happy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What date does the hon. gentleman say that is?

Mr. DICKEY. In 1890, when the hon. member (Mr. Davies) and his friends were preaching blue ruin as blue as they could paint it. In 1887 Sir Oliver Mowat, then the Hon. Mr. Mowat, also made a deliverance upon the condition of the country. He had no party purposes to serve, he did not want to turn out any Government and get into power himself, and he was speaking simply his genuine opinions on this subject. He said of Canada:

A comparison of the statistics of both countries (Canada and the United States) for the past half century would show that the percentage in every department was greater in Canada than it is on the aggregate in the United States, and as Canada had prospered in the past, so she would prosper in the future.

That was the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat in 1887. In 1891 Sir Oliver Mowat said:

Our farmers as a class, or our mechanics as a class, or our labourers as a class, whatever the reasons may be, are not less comfortable on the whole than the farmers, mechanics and the labourers of the United States appear to be.

Mr. Fielding, Premier of Nova Scotia, speaking in London in 1891, said: that things in Canada were in a satisfactory condition. The hon. the leader of the Opposition himself, having got so far away from the influence of his colleague (Sir Richard Cartwright) as Boston, ventured to open his heart and to say, notwithstanding all that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his colleagues behind him had been saying in this House: that Canada was growing, developing and progressing. Mr. Harcourt, the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario, said, in September, 1892:

Decade after decade witnessed progress and advancement in every direction and in every part of the province of Ontario.

Now, Sir, I think that we have to some extent made a convert of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. When he is in the House I notice that he does not dare to say very much that is optimistic, through fear, I suppose, of his hon. friend beside him. But he was away off in Victoria, B.C., far from the malign influences of that hon. gentleman, and it seemed as if he were answering a statement of his own colleague made in the House some years ago. In the year 1887 the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, in his Budget speech:

Is confederation such a blessing as to be worth the struggle to preserve?

The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) had got so blue that he was almost willing to throw up our nationality. Probably that saying lingered in the mind of the leader of the Opposition, and as if answering it, he said, in Victoria:

The time has come when the country has realized that Canadian citizenship is worth living for, and worth dying for if need be.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear. You do not object to that.

Mr. DICKEY. Not at all. Sir, I have quoted from the opinions of some of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking when they had no aim except to convey their exact opinions as to the real position of matters in Canada. Let us take another class of observers of the condition of the country. Take the financial men. Take the statement of Mr. Hague, General Manager of the Merchants Bank, made last October in London, and published, I think, in the "Daily Chronicle." He says:

As to the progress of the country, take the following facts, which I can vouch for personally. Having lived in England some twenty-five years, I went out to Canada about forty years ago. The whole of the deposits owned by the people in all the banks and savings banks of the country were then less than £3,000,000 sterling. They are now over £50,000,000, and have been steadily increasing. The farmers' deposits—I speak again from personal knowledge—have been steadily increasing during the whole time already referred to. At the same time these very farmers, who, it must be remembered, owned their land, have been developing their land and improving it by new buildings, fences, drains and clearings, year by year steadily up to the present time.

There is a recent opinion from a man who is recognized as a high authority in financial circles. Mr. Speaker, I could multiply that class of opinions, but I shall not do so now. I will give the hon. gentlemen, if they wish, opinions from another class of observers of our country. I will call into the witness box men in the United States who are watching the progress of Canada and taking an interest in it as our experiment in government goes forward. Mr. David A. Wells, who is well known as an economic student and who is certainly not favourable to the fiscal system which Canada has adopted, wrote in the "Forum," I think, in February a year ago. He was speaking of the depression and financial trouble in the United States, and he said :

In the Dominion of Canada, separated territorially from us on the north by an imaginary line, there has been no panic, no unusual demand for money, no stoppage of industries, no restriction of trade, no increased rate of interest, in short, nothing beyond the ordinary course of events, except so far as these events may have been influenced by contiguity to what may be termed a financial cyclone whose pathway of destruction was contiguous but not within its own territory.

There is an opinion from a man who is entirely above any influence with reference to party politics in this country, a man who has made a special study of economic questions, and who is to-day observing closely the progress of economic problems in every country in the world. Mr. Speaker, there is one more class of testimony I want to call attention to, and that is the testimony of a man who spoke on the floor of the United States Congress, and a man who referred to the progress of Canada as evidence of the great benefits of the protective system. I quote from a speech by the Hon. Joseph H. Walker, one of the representatives of Massachusetts, who says :

The product of capital and wages of the factories in existence in 1878 in six years was half as much again ; the product two-thirds more ; the wages half as much again as when the tariff was adopted. In the language of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mills), why does not Canada "take down the bars," "remove the obstructions," or else they will "within a few years be roosting on the tops of their chimney stacks?" The wages of the workmen in Canada have advanced about one-third within that period. The case of Canada proves that it was not possible for her to increase her exports or imports until she had adopted a protective tariff to employ her own people. Canada is richer by every dollar of her manufactures than before she adopted protection. That much more opportunity for work was furnished.

So that, without dealing with figures, which may be manipulated, I have taken the independent opinions of men favouring the politics of hon. gentlemen opposite ; I have taken the opinions of financial men in this country, of economic students in the United States, and of men in the Congress of the United States ; and they all lead to one conclusion, that in past years Canada has been progressing steadily and with great strides. Sir, in private life a pessimist is a trouble and a grief to his friends ; in public life a pessimist is a nuisance and a danger. The men who settled this country years ago and hewed out homes for themselves in the forest, were no pessimists ; they had none of the pessimistic spirit in them. The men who do the business of this country to-day, run its manufacturing establishments, its lumbering and mining industries, are not pessimists ; if they were, they would accomplish nothing in the world. The people of this country, especially the young men, like to have men in charge of their affairs who take a hopeful and confident view of the country's future. They find such men in the leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party, who, whatever their faults, have always looked forward with confidence to the future of Canada. The Conservative party has committed errors ; it will commit errors again ; but I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, that a persistent and buoyant spirit of confidence in Canada's future, such as has always characterized and at present characterizes the Liberal-Conservative party, is a mantle which will cover more sins than that party will ever commit. I say further to hon. gentlemen opposite—though I suppose they will not thank me very much for any advice that I tender them—that unless they reform, not the tariff, but themselves and their views of the country's future, and imbibe some of the optimistic views of the Liberal-Conservative party, they will never occupy the treasury benches. All progress and all prosperity is relative. There is no country in the world that is supremely happy or where everybody is wealthy. The question at issue between the Liberal-Conservative party and the Liberal party is this : Has Canada from 1879 forward progressed steadily and been prosperous ? Hon. gentlemen opposite represent that these have been years of boom, and that Canada has been simply getting the benefit of general good times throughout the world. Now, let us test that assertion. Let us see what the London "Times" and the London "Economist" have to say with regard to the industrial history of England during the last thirteen or fourteen years. The "Times" of December 10, 1883, says :

Slackness began in 1881, and for the past two years the depression has been increasing. Great industries are admittedly in distress.

Mr. Chamberlin, who may be regarded as a prejudiced witness perhaps, being a politician, speaking in Hull in 1883, said :

We have been suffering from a depression in trade unexampled in its intensity and duration.

The "Times" in the summer of 1884, said :

Trade continues depressed. The prospect is cheerless.

The "Economist" on February 21, 1885, said :

Instead of the improvement to which many were inclined to look for, there has been increased depression, and we have undoubtedly been feeling the pinch of hard times more severely than for many years.

On February 13, 1886, the "Economist" said :

Turning to the exports to foreign countries, we find a serious decline, viz., of foreign trade in 1885, £17,027,000, or over 11 per cent.

On April 3, 1886, the "Economist" said :

The depression of trade, which at first affected mainly the capitalist class, is now pressing heavily upon the working population. There is less work for them to do, and they get less for the work done.

On February 19, 1887, the "Economist" said of the trade of 1886 :

The value of our imports during the past twelve months was 5·7 per cent less than in 1875, and in the value of our exports there was a decrease of 0·3 per cent.

On January 9, 1892, the "Economist" said of the trade of 1891 :

To judge from the business circulars and local summaries relating to the state of trade throughout the country during the past year, it would appear to have been of a very chequered character. The most disappointing branch of business in 1891 has clearly been our foreign trade.

On January 9, 1892, the "Economist," speaking of farming in 1891, said :

Whatever the financial result of the past year may be, as far as the farmers are concerned, they will always remember it as one of the most unseasonable, worrying and expensive of years.

On January 14, 1893, the "Economist," speaking of the trade of 1892, said :

On the whole year the value of our imports shows a falling off of about eleven and three-fourths millions sterling, and of this no less than ten and a quarter millions was in the last two months.

I need not refer to the official inquiries that have been taking place in England into the state of business there. Commissions have been appointed by the Government to inquire into the condition of agriculture and into the condition of trade generally. So that during all these years the mother country, with her enormous wealth, has been suffering from financial depression, while Canada during the same period has been enjoying a fair measure of commercial prosperity. It has always struck me, Sir, since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, in listening to debates upon the Budget, that hon. gentlemen opposite, in dealing with the subject of depression in trade, never cite independent authorities. They state their own convictions, and they manipulate figures to suit themselves ; but they never cite a financial or business authority outside. They have never been in the habit of offering to this House independent opinion except during the present year, when they are able to get it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We cite blue-books.

Mr. DICKEY. I quite admit that they cite blue-books, and you can prove anything out of blue-books, just as you can out of the Bible. The hon. member for Bothwell knows very well that the figures contained in our blue-books may be so manipulated as to make anything appear, and as to lead to endless argument, one side refuting, while the other side affirms. But where are the independent authorities that the hon. gentlemen have ever cited in this House. Except with reference to one railway corporation in this country, I do not believe that the hon. gentleman can find any independent authority stating that during these years past, of which I am speaking, the condition of Canada had been otherwise than very prosperous. We have come down to 1890, and in 1890 the greatest financial disturbance of modern times began. It began apparently in Portugal, which became bankrupt. Then the South African mining boom collapsed, causing enormous loss of capital. Then the Argentine Republic went to smash and struck down Baring Bros. and a lot of other banking and financial firms in London. In 1892 the cloud burst in Australia, land values went down to nothing, and fourteen banks out of twenty-six were wound up. In 1893 came the financial collapse in the United States. I ask any hon. gentleman who has studied the question, whether up to the year 1893 the condition of Canada did not compare favourably with that of any country in the world. We have taken a dip, and it is only because we have taken a dip that we can see the high level at which we were travelling before. The hon. gentleman will have no difficulty now in finding quotations to prove the hard times. The moment hard times come, business men feel it, and hon. gentlemen opposite may now find quotations which they had not during the past year. But there is one feature about these hard times which is not sufficiently considered. If the conditions of this country were so bad as regards its administration and its tariff, surely this would have been one of the first countries to be struck by any wave of financial depression. Yet, there is not, I believe, in this House one hon. gentleman who will be bold enough to say that the depression existing in Canada to-day arose within its bounds and did not come from outside.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The same in 1878.

Mr. DICKEY. I am not as familiar with the financial history of 1878 as the hon. member for Bothwell has sad reason to be. But there is no doubt that in Canada, as

Mr. David A. Wells has said, we are feeling the ground swell of the enormous tornado which has swept over the commercial ocean elsewhere. It is absolutely inevitable that we should. No tariff could absolutely protect any country, no effort that human beings could put forth could protect any community from the effects of the world-wide depression, more or less. With our railways, with our extended trade, it is absolutely inevitable that the trade depression should affect more or less every country in the world. It looks extremely probable, judging from business men, and not from politicians who have ends to serve, that we are coming out of this depression. If we are, the success with which the ship of Canada has weathered this financial storm will be one of the most striking testimonies to the excellence of the system under which it is governed that ever has been offered, better even than the progress Canada made during more prosperous years. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) then referred to the tariff and the industrial figures of the census, and he gave us to understand that these figures were entirely unreliable. I do not blame the hon. member for Brant for doing that. I do not blame the hon. member for South Oxford for discrediting the industrial increase under the tariff. They are like the beaver in the story, they had to do it. As long as those figures stand uncontradicted, they furnish an answer of record to all the statements of blue ruin which the hon. gentlemen opposite have made, and an answer so clear that a child could understand it. Having a bad case, if those figures be true, what was their course? It was to get rid of the figures at all cost. Abuse the men who compiled the figures, abuse the system under which they were compiled. That is the only course left open. The hon. gentlemen have been preaching for years that the country is going to the dogs, but the census has taken a photograph which proves that the hon. gentlemen are absolutely wrong. Does any one suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite are so Christian-like as to admit the corn, and say that they were wrong, and that the country was really progressing? Not at all. But they do as a lawyer does who has a bad case. They abuse the plaintiff, they abuse the men who made the figures, they abuse the system. The leader of the Opposition is fond of discovering conspiracies. I do not know whether he thinks there was a conspiracy among the enumerators from Halifax to Vancouver to cook up census returns. We are asked to suppose that the men who went through the North-west were in a conspiracy with somebody at Ottawa to cook the census returns. But whether the hon. gentleman believes this or not, he will never get the country to believe it, no matter how often he may repeat it. The people know that these figures were taken throughout the Dominion by hundreds of men not connected with each other at all, and men of different creeds, nationalities and politics.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DICKEY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there were men of different politics engaged in this work. The leader of the Opposition will never get this country to believe that all these men conspired together to cook up a lot of figures in order to bolster up the policy of the Government. Why did they not begin at the right end? If they were conspirators, why did not they bolster up the population figures? Why not make us believe that we had a larger population in this country than we actually have? The two acts are inconsistent. The enumerators are honest, because they stated the population far lower than the Government would like to have shown it. And when the hon. gentlemen find that in the census, they are bound to take the figures that tell against them; because the one set of figures show that the other set are made by men who were honestly doing their duties as they understood them and under the instructions they received. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look to other sources, he will find corroboration of these figures. Let him look to other books on this subject. Let him take independent figures published in the United States of America. For instance, let him take "Denslow's Economic Philosophy" and books of that kind published in the United States, and he will find that the people over there, through their consuls, through their various commercial agencies here, collect figures that are substantially the same as those given in the census. As to the industrial figures, the country will accept them, not as literally correct, but as substantially correct. Now, Sir, the population is not satisfactory. Nobody disputes that. I do not propose to discuss that subject at length. There was a difference in the method of taking this census as compared with the last. That has been discussed here very many times before. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the policy of the Government is responsible for the unsatisfactory population. Well, Sir, I suppose that we in Canada will have to make up our minds that the enormous mass of population in the United States will have a certain effect, similar to that of any large body upon a smaller body under the law of gravitation. The units of population around the city of London tend to fly into London. The statistics of population throughout the whole world show that population tends towards large centres, and that a large mass of population will always have an attractive force. We must deal with that, we must accept it and work out the problem under it. Nobody knew it then, because these laws have been developed since. But it is

known now that there is a continuous tendency of population from the country to the cities. And the only policy for us now, in the light of experience, if we wished to keep population in this country, was a policy that would build up cities, towns and villages, because we know that, in spite of us, and in spite of economic laws, there is some occult, powerful law dragging people from the country to the city, which law no economic conditions can control. The only plan, then, is to build up prosperous, happy centres of population within the Dominion, to which the people can go for whatever it is they desire when they go to the centres of population. And that has been the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. Any policy that failed to encourage the manufacturing interests of this country during the last decade, would have been hopelessly fatal to the population of this country. No matter how prosperous the Government made the farmer, you have not have resisted the drain that goes on all over the world from the country to the city; and the only way to deal with it was to provide the people cities to live in and work in. There is no originality about the Government policy now. It is the policy of protection to the farm, to the workshop, and to the mine; it is the policy of developing this country by means of communication favouring the extension of trade—railways, canals and steamships, and by the erection of public works wherever they may be justified by trade conditions. It is a policy that hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to like. But it is the policy favoured by the country and endorsed by the people, time and again, against the protest of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a policy which has carried the country three or four times, and the policy that will carry the country again. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) say there had been no change of policy on the part of his party. Does the hon. gentleman remember the phrase "unrestricted reciprocity"? Does the hon. leader of the Opposition retain in his mind any lingering reminiscence of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity? I should like to refresh his memory with some of the brave words which he spoke of unrestricted reciprocity in years that have gone by. In the year 1889, he said:

> I have read the history of unrestricted reciprocity in this way, that every reform has cost the reformers years of labour, and those years of labour I, for one, am prepared to give; and, though the Democrats may be defeated in the States, and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until that cause is successful. I do not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until the cause has triumphed, and you shall never hear a complaint from me.

The hon. gentleman has grown faint-hearted. The hon. gentleman is still in the cold shades of opposition, but he is not supporting unrestricted reciprocity to-day. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

> I tell you the Liberal party will never cease this agitation until they triumph and obtain continental free trade. We are asked sometimes, gentlemen, what is the programme of the Liberal party. This is the programme of the Liberal party—to obtain continental freedom of trade.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Success will certainly crown our efforts at no distant day: fixing our eyes steadily upon the goal, we shall go on steadily until we reach it—unrestricted continental reciprocity.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a new one.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, that was a combination. Sir, I need not do more than call the attention of this House to the utterances of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He told this country and this House that nothing would save the people of Canada except unrestricted reciprocity. He told the farmers of this country how much unrestricted reciprocity would add to the price of their products. He told them that it would increase the price of their horses $30 per horse, and he figured the farmers into millionaires as soon as unrestricted reciprocity should come. Why does the hon. gentleman desert the cause of the farmer to-day? Was his judgment wrong then, or was he deliberately deceiving the farmer? Which horn of the dilemma will he take? Did he know that what he said was not correct? Did the hon. gentleman himself, or the hon. member for South Oxford, or the leader of the Opposition know then that they were talking nonsense to the farmers? Or were they, as I believe, deceived. Why, Sir, read the speeches of the leader of the Opposition now, and he tells the same story. He writes in free trade instead of unrestricted reciprocity; and to-day he is going to stand just as long beside the policy of free trade as he did before beside the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and I dare say not a day longer. The hon. gentleman's pledges upon the trade policy are worth nothing at all. He has told the people of this country, under his responsibility as a public man, that his party has deliberately adopted a policy. He has promised them upon public platforms in various constituencies, as solemnly as a public man can promise, that he would run an election upon it, that he would fight for that policy to the last; and yet the hon. gentleman has betrayed those constituencies, he has given up that policy, he has surrendered the policy upon which he ran his election, and to-day he comes to us with a new policy. There is only one hon. gentleman, perhaps, in the House that really has a lingering affection for that dead infant, and that is the hon. gentleman from South Oxford, who disputed the paternity of the infant, I be-

lieve, with Mr. Goldwin Smith and Mr. Erastus Wiman. But if the hon. gentleman for South Oxford does cherish these feelings in his heart, he keeps his sentiments and convictions as secretly to himself as the leader of the Opposition keeps his convictions of the Manitoba school question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where are yours on that question ?

Mr. DICKEY. I will be prepared to discuss the question with the leader of the Opposition when it arises. I have no doubt that there are many men who followed the leader of the Opposition in years past who knew that his policy was wrong. I have no doubt many of those who sat behind him did not agree with the policy he was advocating. They claim to be a Liberal party, they claim to be an independent party, yet we saw throughout this country independent Liberals leaving the ranks of their party because unrestricted reciprocity was their policy. Was there one independent man on the other side of the House who dared to vote against his leader on that question, whatever his private opinions may have been ? Was there one of them who had the hardihood to come out and say : This unrestricted reciprocity policy of yours is a farce and a fraud, and I will have none of it ? No, Sir, whether they were convinced, or whether they were coerced, not one of them had sufficient independence to help the people of Canada rid themselves of a policy like that. So, Sir, what are we to think of their convictions on the question of free trade ? What are we to say of their convictions on the National Policy ? Their words are of no avail, their pledges are of no avail, their promises amount to nothing. We have no guarantee whatever that any hon. gentleman opposite believes in free trade. Is there an hon. gentleman opposite who is a free trader ?

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. One.

Mr. EDWARDS. Two.

Mr. CHARLTON. Three.

Mr. DICKEY. I suppose if I had asked any of those hon. gentlemen a few years ago if he was an unrestricted reciprocity man, he would have answered, yes. Sir, everybody knows now, it is what the Conservatives were saying on the platform everywhere during the campaign of 1891, that this country was saved from a great danger when the Liberal party was beaten in 1891. Everybody knows we were saved from a great danger, and the Liberals themselves realized it after the crash in the United States, and they changed their policy. The best proof that the country was saved from a danger is the fact that the hon. gentleman and his friends dare not go to the country to-day on the policy which they advocated in 1891. Sir, this is the same policy as unrestricted reciprocity, is it ? Why, Sir, it is not only not the same policy, it is a right-about-face policy. It is not a reciprocity policy, but it is a policy that makes reciprocity impossible. How can you gain reciprocity under free trade ? How many reciprocity treaties has England ? None, except what she has with people who sell her wine, and those things upon which she levies a customs duty. If you have free trade, or if you lower your duties substantially, on what basis are you going to the United States to ask for reciprocity ? The hon. leader of the Opposition has told us one thing about his policy. He has told us that he intends to give us free coal and free iron. There is one thing clear, and that is that he is going to put the knife into Nova Scotia he is going to sacrifice the coal mines and the iron mines of Nova Scotia, there is no doubt about that. He is going to attempt to do that. But I will put it upon another ground. I do not know what his pledges are worth, but he pledged the people of Montreal on a public platform that he would give them free coal. If he keeps his promise, he will give away one of the most valuable levers for reciprocity with United States that we have in Canada, and he will find that he will sacrifice not only the interests of the miners and of the people of Nova Scotia, but he will sacrifice the interests of other men throughout the country who desire reciprocity with the United States. Sir, what is this free trade, or revenue tariff ? I suppose that they are related, somewhat as commercial union used to be related to unrestricted reciprocity ; you can call it what you like. The present resolution is in favour of a revenue tariff. Now, I would like to invite the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the utterance of a gentleman who led that party years ago. In 1880, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, speaking of Sir John Macdonald, said :

> Whenever any one changes his policy with the chameleon-like frequency characteristic of the hon. member, it is time to give up talking about patriotism or anything of that kind.

I do not know whether that can be applied to the hon. gentleman's trade policy. Let me now quote from his free trade speech at Winnipeg :

> We shall give you freer trade, and, although it will be a hard fight, we shall not give in one inch or retrace one step until we shall have reached the goal, and that goal is the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day.

Exactly the same language that was used two or three years ago about unrestricted reciprocity, and that language was not worth the breath that was spent in uttering the words. And what confidence will the people of Canada have in the hon. gentleman's promises when he says that he will

stand by the policy of free trade until he carries it ? Once more, in speaking at the Liberal Convention in Ottawa, the hon. gentleman said :

> Protection is a fraud and a robbery. * * * The policy should be a policy of free trade such as they have in England.

Sir Richard Cartwright said :

> The National Policy is a system for duping and plundering. * * * A thousand millions of dollars has been taken from the people of this country during the last fifteen years by the National Policy. * * * The National Policy is a crime.

Does the hon. gentleman endorse that ?

Mr. GILLMOR. I do.

Mr. DICKEY. The only free trader in the Opposition endorses that statement. The hon. gentleman from South Oxford said that protection was a crime, and a blunder. He said again :

> You can have no true liberty under protection.

I do not presume to be able to define protection and free trade ; but there is a rough way of getting at it, as we understand it in practical life. Protection is placing a duty upon goods which are produced in the country. Free trade, as in England, is placing a duty upon goods which are not produced in the country, and, therefore, there must be more than the duty added to the cost.

Mr. GILLMOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. DICKEY. I am glad to observe that the only free trader in the House agrees with that statement. The protection accorded to manufacturers is objectionable to hon. gentlemen opposite for this reason : They say that not only do you pay the duty, but the article manufactured in the country is put up in price by the amount of the duty, and, therefore, the consumer who buys such an article pays the duty, the consumer pays an additional price for that equivalent.

Mr. GILLMOR. That is it.

Mr. DICKEY. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that is plunder and fraud.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DICKEY. I ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) if such words, when used by him mean anything ? Are hon. gentlemen opposite willing to rob to the extent of 17½ per cent ? Is it a question of percentage ?

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman is willing to steal 17½ per cent, but not 25 per cent.

Mr. GILLMOR. That is not my idea of free trade.

Mr. DICKEY. Then the hon. gentleman, as a free trader, should oppose any duty whatever being imposed on any manufactured article.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, because it is said to be robbery. Is there any principle underlying the statement of the hon. gentleman ? Does the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) mean anything ? Or does the hon. gentleman, in using the terms robbery and fraud, simply use figurative language, mean nothing ? If so, we can feel easier in our minds as to what the hon. gentleman said about the tariff. If the hon. gentleman means what he said, that it is a policy of robbery and fraud, the hon. gentleman will be dishonest if he agrees to 1 per cent of protection on any manufactured article.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. DICKEY. This policy enunciated in the amendment, I suppose, means something. It means free trade, as they have it in England. Let us look at it. The first and cardinal principle of free trade, as they have it in England, is—and I think the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will agree with me—free food.

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. Therefore, the first thing we must do is to wipe out the protection given to our farmers. The hon. gentleman may not be able to carry out his whole scheme, but he will, no doubt, take the step Mr. Cobden took, and remove the duty from meats, wheat, grain, and flour, and those articles which the farmers of this country produce. Will the hon. gentleman take the duty off manufactured articles to meet the protection which he is taking away from the farmers ? Is he prepared to give any assurance on that point ?

Mr. GILLMOR. I shall make a speech after you get through.

Mr. DICKEY. What is the effect of the duty on farm products ? Take the case of pork. In 1890, this Government placed a duty on pork. In that year we imported, roughly speaking, $1,500,000 worth of pork, and exported pork to the value of $640,000. We put a duty on pork. What was the effect ? Within three years we imported pork to the value of only $361,000 instead of $1,500,000, and we exported pork to the value of $2,000,000 against $640,000. So that the farmers of this country got a net gain on account of that duty of nearly $2,500,000 in the year 1893.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the duty enabled the farmers to export pork ?

Mr. DICKEY. Certainly. I am not here to discuss the abstract principles of free

trade and protection ; but the hon. gentleman certainly knows that anything which stimulates the production of an article, until a man gets a large quantity on hand, will enable him to send it abroad.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the National Policy stimulated industries during the years from 1890 to 1893 so as to be able to enable the farmers to export 62,000,000 pounds of pork, what stimulated the export of 85,750,000 pounds from 1874 to 1878 ?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not at all prepared to answer that question. The hon. gentleman need not put that question to me—I know these questions are not such as can be disposed of off-hand, with yea or nay. If the hon. gentleman asks a fair question, I shall give him an answer. There might be a dozen causes for such a state of things. We will take another fact. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that these are Conservative figures which were taken from the blue-books. Let hon. members refer to the returns of the Ontario Government, and they will find that in 1889 the farmers of Ontario alone owned 835,000 hogs, while in 1894 they owned 1,150,000 hogs, or an increase of 300,000 hogs in that time. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has not always been so particular with respect to protection, and as I am replying to the speech made by that hon. gentleman, I thought I would look up his record a little on the question of protection. I do not intend to refer to his old record ; I will not recall to the hon. gentleman the speeches in favour of protection he delivered in 1876. I think we should allow the statute of limitations to apply to them, and not trouble him further. But I will call attention to speeches delivered at a later period by that hon. gentleman, in which he expressed his willingness to be a robber to the extent of 17½ tariff. In 1882, as will be found on page 394 of "Hansard," the hon. gentleman said :

> I am willing * * * to give the manufacturers 17½ per cent protection. * * * I am one of those who believe in building up the manufacturing industries of this country, and, with a view of doing this, they must have some advantage, and that they cannot exist without some such advantage.

That was the doctrine of the hon. gentleman in 1882. He said further, in the same speech :

> I admitted then (in 1876), as I admit now, that my policy would be a defensive one, and that in raising the revenue of this country, if foreign goods were being slaughtered, * * * that I would use the tariff as a means of securing the revenue, and at the same time affording encouragement to the industries natural to this country.

On page 397 the hon. gentleman is reported to have said :

> While I am willing and anxious, and while the party with which I am connected are willing to arrange the tariff so as to give fair protection to manufacturers, they felt, and feel, bound at the same time to deal fairly with them (consuming classes).

So the hon. gentleman, at that time, did not hold the strong views he appears to hold to-day. I have not discussed this question as a matter of abstract theory.

Mr. LAURIER. That is quite evident.

Mr. DICKEY. I believe that political economy is one of the most difficult subjects you can approach. I have considered it simply in the light of plain facts that the ordinary men of the country appreciate. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite know that whenever an industry becomes established in a county or town, any proposal for its removal is a matter of consternation, not only to the inhabitants of the town, but to all the farmers who live in its neighbourhood. Hon. gentlemen are perfectly well aware that a policy which produces factories will give employment and furnish a market for farm produce, that a policy which produces factories develops the country's resources and affords employment, irrespective of any theory or fine-spun talk whatever. The unrestricted reciprocity policy very nearly carried this country. It had some merits. Its advocates told the manufacturers that they would get the benefit of the American markets and be able to build up their establishments, and there was something in it. The policy of unrestricted reciprocity was unknown, and there is great truth in the old adage that the unknown is always magnificent. Free trade is not unknown, a revenue tariff is not unknown. We had a tariff from 1874 to 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Try 1868, you had better.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, I am willing to discuss that matter, too, with the hon. gentleman, but I do not propose to be interrupted just now. The revenue tariff has a record. That record is that it shuts off all hope of reciprocity with the United States of America. A revenue tariff will certainly produce the direst distress—and I am speaking in all earnestness—in the coal mines of Nova Scotia. It will close down factories. It will repeat in Canada the experience of the United States when they tried adopting the principles of free trade upon a very modified scale a few years ago, an experiment which has swept the Democratic party of the United States out of sight altogether. However, if hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied with this policy, I am quite sure that the Liberal-Conservative party are satisfied with it, and I tell them here, as my leader told them this afternoon, that we challenge the verdict of the country upon the issue, free trade or protection. And

when we go to the country, and when the country understands this question, as members on this side of the House shall take care that they do understand it, the Liberal-Conservative party will have no fear of the verdict.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I regret, that having taken up the time of the House at some length yesterday, I should again so soon have to address this Assembly, but I have some remarks to make in connection with the subject before the House, and I suppose it matters very little whether I make them now or a few days later. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Dickey) has dealt more largely with the question of the tariff than with the question of the finances of the country. I shall endeavour during the progress of my remarks to pay some attention to the arguments which he has brought forward, but I shall leave it more in the hands of those who follow me in this debate to discuss this question of tariff policy which he has raised, because it is my intention to devote myself more especially to the question of the condition of the finances of the country as elaborated in the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance. The Budget speech was, as has been pointed out on this side of the House, devoted entirely to a discussion of our finances, leaving out almost entirely any consideration of the question of the National Policy, which in previous years formed the great burden of the Finance Minister's remarks. I must say that I listened to the exposition of our finances made by the hon. Minister with great pleasure, and I have to say that he certainly presented our financial position in its most favourable aspect from his standpoint. However that may be, his arguments, his statements, and his illustrations were, to my mind, most unfair and misleading, and I shall endeavour to show that his comparisons are inaccurate, and that if they are carried out in the same direction they tell entirely against him instead of for him. I shall also endeavour to show that many of the statements he made were most inaccurate and misleading, for in some instances he actually made misstatements as to fact. How he came to do so I do not know, but I shall try and prove everything that I allege. Starting out with that, Mr. Speaker, I beg to call attention to a matter, perhaps small in amount, but indicative of the method which the hon. gentleman adopted in initiating his speech and which he continued through it from beginning to end, endeavouring to twist and turn the figures found in the blue-books to prove theories of his own. I contend, and I will show, that he twisted them and turned them in a way which was unfair, and, as I say, misleading. The hon. Minister found it his unpleasant duty to announce that there had been a very serious falling off in the revenue of the country for the year 1893-94, the principal falling off being in the customs duties. The hon. gentleman stated that in the excise there had been an increase, very, very small indeed, microscopic indeed, of $13,725; and this is a statement which I claim to be erroneous, taking it with the remarks which the hon. gentleman treated us to later on. The Finance Minister had not only the unpleasant duty to perform of calling the attention of the House, and of the country, to the fact that the receipts of the Government had very largely fallen off for 1893-94 as compared with 1892-93, but he also had to admit that along with the falling off of revenue, there had been a very large increase in expenditure, amounting to three-quarters of a million dollars. And it was in explaining, or attempting to explain, how that increase had arisen that the hon. gentleman called attention to a fact, which if he is allowed to take credit for in explaining away his increase of expenditure, must be used in all fairness on the other side of the ledger. I find fault with the hon. gentleman for dealing unfairly with the House and with the country, and for using the information which he had, to show in his favour in the one instance, and in failing to apply that same information and the same argument on the other side of the ledger when it would tell against him. Now, I say that instead of there being an increase in the excise of $13,725 as stated by the hon. gentleman, if we are to adopt the argument which he put forward in explaining the increase of expenditure, the excise really decreased $72,929 as compared with 1892-93. The hon. gentleman pointed out to us that it had been a system of book-keeping in the Finance Department in connection with several matters, chiefly with regard to methylated spirits, to allow the Inland Revenue Department to disburse moneys which they received, for the purchase of raw material, not entering the gross receipts in the Public Accounts, and then charging the expenditure, but simply entering the balances. That was done in 1892-3 with regard to methylated spirits. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report he will see there set down the total amount of the receipts from methylated spirits, with the amount expended by the department deducted, so that the net profits on the undertaking are alone entered in the Public Accounts. The hon. Finance Minister called attention to the change in the practice made in 1893-94 by which all the receipts from methylated spirits were credited in the Public Accounts, and all the disbursements were debited, thus, as he pointed out, increasing the amount of the disbursements by $86,654. Now, if the hon. gentleman does that on one side of the ledger, he must also do it on the other side; if he says that his expenditures were not realy the amount

they appear to be, namely, three-quarters of a million dollars, but that amount less $86,654, on account of the change in bookkeeping between the years 1892-93 and 1893-94, he must in all fairness make the same deductions on the other side of the ledger. Then, the receipts from excise in 1893-94 would have taken their place along with the receipts from customs, and would have shown a decrease of $72,929. It may be thought that this is a small matter, but it is simply an indication of the manner in which the Finance Minister has dealt with the public accounts all through his Budget speech; and I will endeavour, in the progress of my remarks, to call attention to other misleading statements of a similar nature. Several times in the course of his remarks, in endeavouring to account for the appearance of that ugly and ill-visaged customer, a deficit, which came to him in 1893-94 to the tune of $1,210,000, and which he admits is about to come to him in 1894-95 to the tune of $4,500,000, the hon. gentleman found it incumbent upon him to give some reasons why the country was to be at last confronted with that final proof of incapacity in a Government, as alleged by him year after year. One of the reasons given by him for the falling off in the revenue was the increase in duties made last year. Twice in his speech the hon. gentleman made that bald statement; but nowhere did he give any proof whatever of a statement so important for the country to know or understand. Is it true or untrue that the tariff, as amended in 1894, after months of discussion, after great agitation in the country, and after many promises, decreased the burdens of the people? Was that one of the reasons for the falling off in the revenue, as alleged by the hon. gentleman, or was it not? I shall have no trouble in proving most conclusively, from his own statements, that the changes then made in the tariff did not decrease taxation, but on the contrary, resulted in a considerable increase in taxation, so far as the first nine months of the present financial year are concerned.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MARTIN. When the House rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the contention of the Finance Minister that one of the causes of the immense reduction in the revenue from customs during the current fiscal year was the fact that the new tariff of last session had made a reduction of taxation. I stated that I would show from the returns of the Customs Department published in the "Canada Gazette," that that statement was not correct, though it was similar to other statements made by the hon. gentleman for the purpose of putting a rosy hue upon the present condition of affairs. Before dealing directly with that, let me for a moment call the attention of the House to the state of the tariff previous to last session. It will be remembered that in the session of 1893, the Government announced that the time had come for a revision of the National Policy tariff, and that during the recess they intended to thoroughly look into the matter, to visit different parts of Canada in order to find out just how far the tariff needed amendment, and to make such reductions in it as the altered circumstances of the country required. In the recess the Ministers did visit various parts of Canada; in fact, they went all over the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in search of information. The session opened with a declaration in the Speech from the Throne, as follows:—

> While my Ministers do not propose to change the principles on which the existing enactments on this subject are based, the amendments which will be offered for your consideration are designed to simplify the operation of the tariff, and to lessen, as far as can be done, consistently with those principles and with the requirements of the treasury, the imposts which are now in force.

In carrying out this promise, the hon. gentleman did bring down resolutions which, if put into force, would have lessened somewhat the imposts then upon the country. He was not allowed, however, to carry his policy into force. He found that, strong, as the Government were, large as their majority in the House was, there were other forces and other influences which had to be dealt with before it was possible to lessen those imposts, or to make an alteration in the tariff in the direction of reducing taxation. He found that the manufacturing class, who had been bolsterd up by this tariff, and whose existence depended upon its continuance, had something to say. Here let me deal with the report of those gentlemen whose interest it was to continue the old tariff, and to increase it rather than reduce it; and in the end I will endeavour to show whether the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite, made in response to a strong feeling which they found existing in Canada from one end of the country to the other were triumphant, or whether those gentlemen at whose instance this tariff was brought into existence, for whose benefit it has been continued all these long years, and at whose instance amendments and changes of various kinds and descriptions were made, dictated the final tariff. There is, as we all know, a Manufacturers' Association, which has its headquarters at Toronto, and whose business it is to look after the interests of the manufacturers, to see that the National Policy is sustained, and keep the Government in line, and this association held its annual meeting, from the report of which I read the following:—

At the time of the last annual meeting of this Association the Finance Minister and the House of Commons were struggling in the revision of the tariff. There had been a fierce and unreasoning demand for such a revision as would, if carried out, have amounted to a revolution ; and it required the best generalship on the part of Mr. Foster and his protectionist colleagues and supporters to withstand the onsets of the free trade enemy. On March 27, the House, sitting in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Foster introduced his tariff Bill, which instantly became operative. Quite a number of amendments were from time to time made to this Bill, and before its final passage on July 26, it became modified to an extent that gives much satisfaction to the country—certainly to the friends of the Government.

In accordance with the usage of this Association, previous to your last meeting, the Tariff Committee of the Association, in the discharge of their duty, entered upon a close and careful examination of all matters brought before it by members of the Association relating to the tariff. The situation at that time was critical. An excitement, amounting to a furore, had been worked up by the enemies of protection, and some who had previously declared themselves staunch adherents of the National Policy, weakened. It was evident, however, that some changes in the tariff were imperative, and that if they were not inaugurated by the friends of protection, the Government could not survive, and that the enemies of protection would accede to power. It was under these circumstances that the Tariff Committee entered upon their labours, having the counsel and assistance of many of the most experienced members of the Association, the result of which was the embodiment of their views in a communication to the Finance Minister (a copy of which is here before you), which elicited from him a kindly letter, in which he alluded to it as a well prepared brief in which all the matters therein discussed had been done full justice. Perhaps it might be going too far to even surmise the effect these recommendations of your Tariff Committee to the Minister may have had in the final arrangement of the tariff ; but it is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes that were made in the tariff along the lines suggested in the recommendations, and that in many instances the language used in both are substantially identical. This is particularly noticeable as regards the iron schedule, the duties upon textiles, the duties upon drugs, chemicals, alcoholic preparations, &c., as well as upon an extended list of miscellaneous articles, and large and most important additions to the list of non-dutiable articles.

The hon. gentleman told us, when he made his Budget speech last session, that he calculated that the reduction in revenue from his lessening the burden of taxation, would amount to $1,500,000 or $1,600,000. Now, we are in a position, from the reports which we have before us, to apply the test of actual results to the reductions of the Finance Minister ; and we can well see that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association had every reason to congratulate themselves upon the manner in which the Finance Minister had followed the instructions which he found in his brief. It will be seen that instead of reducing the taxation of the country, the hon. gentleman added considerably last session to the burdens of the country. The dutiable goods imported up to the 31st March, 1895, amounted to $42,979,130, and the free goods amounted to $35,467,370, making a total on imports entered for consumption of $78,446,500. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of making an estimate. We can either take the dutiable goods alone and compare the rate of taxation with the previous year. If that is done, there is a very slight decrease for the year 1895. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that that is not fair, that their reductions were not alone in the rate of taxation, but that they have added a long list of dutiable to the list of non-dutiable goods, thereby making a large reduction in taxation. Accepting that method of testing the matter, I take the total amount of imports, $78,446,500. First, take off coin and bullion, because coin and bullion is an importation which varies without any relation whatever to the trade of the country. Some years it assumes large proportions and goes up into $4,000,000 or $5,000,000, and other years it falls to one-half or one-quarter of a million dollars, so that we can make no fair comparison of one year with another, so far as the rate of taxation is concerned, unless you take out coin and bullion from both periods. It so happens that the amount of coin and bullion imported into Canada in the period of the fiscal year ending 31st March was very large, indeed, compared with the previous year, and large indeed, compared with the average in Canada's history. I take that out and I think the House will agree that it is necessary to do so in order to arrive at the real rate of taxation. The amount of coin and bullion imported to the 31st March was $4,452,835. That leaves the actual imports of free goods and dutiable goods at the figure of $73,993,665. The amount of duty collected upon that was 13,278,853, and the rate of taxation, as shown by these figures, was 17·94 per cent. Now, the rate for 1894, also taking out coin and bullion, was 17·76, so that the rate of taxation for 1895, so far as it has gone, and so far as we have any return, taking the free goods and the dutiable goods together in both cases, and excluding coin and bullion, amounts in the one instance to 1[illegible]04 and in the other to 17·76, or ·18 per cent more for the current year 1895 than for the year 1894. Under those circumstances, what becomes of the prediction of the hon. gentleman that the reduction in taxation would amount to $1,500,000 or $1,600,000. I am dealing with the hon. Minister's estimate now, but the figures I have given are the actualities. They show that on the imports up to date, the increased taxation this year amounted to $133,188. If the rate of taxation on the amount of imports—about $74,000,000 up to 31st March—had been the same as prior to the readjustment of the tariff made by the hon. gentleman in 1[illegible]4, the amount of money taken

out of the people of Canada would have been $133,188 less. Under these circumstances, how have hon. gentlemen opposite fulfilled their promises made last session to the House and to the country? How does the hon. gentleman justify the statements that he made more than once in his Budget speech, that among the causes which had contributed to the falling off in revenue during 1895, was the reduction in taxation made by the Government under the tariff of 1894. The hon. gentleman, as I say, smuggled that statement into his remarks. He knew full well that it could not be substantiated by the figures, and he was careful, therefore, to offer no proof whatever, but merely to put it forward as a bald statement. He says: We changed a number of specific into ad valorem duties, we decreased the burdens of the people, we lessened the taxation to the amount of a million and a half of dollars. But when we come to look into the figures showing the actual results up to date—and I believe there is no reason to suppose that there will be any improvement in this respect for the remainder of the year, calculating on the basis of the old tariff, though, of course, the new tariff will increase the taxation and add something to the revenue—we find that, instead of a reduction of taxation there has been an actual increase, as I have shown. Up to the end of 1895, that increase will probably amount to $200,000. I have read to the House the statement of the Manufacturers' Association. It shows that there was a furore in the country, and that if an election had been held and the Government had not promised to give a reduction in taxation, there would have been a change of Administration. The association recognized that public sentiment was against the National Policy. The hon. the Premier of that day came out with a promise to lop off the mouldering branches, and the hon. the Finance Minister proceeded to lop off those mouldering branches. He brought his tariff before the House with long and elaborate explanations showing how he proposed to decrease the revenue in that direction and this direction; how he proposed to abandon largely the pernicious doctrine of specific duties and to adopt the fairer method of ad valorem duties. But the Manufacturers' Association interfered, and interfered in a most practical manner. They sent their deputations here day after day; and, while the members of this House were anxious to proceed with business—Parliament had been called that year, as this year, at a most inopportune time—the hon. Finance Minister was not prepared to proceed with his tariff, because he had to confer with these deputations. And, in the end, the Manufacturers' Association were so successful that their brief, backed by the personal appearance of their delegates, was accepted, and, instead of a reduction of taxation—which they themselves admitted was necessary in order to keep the Government in power—we find that this tariff revision has resulted in an actual increase of taxation. So there is a very great discrepancy indeed, Mr. Speaker, between the hon. gentleman's promise of a reduction of a million and a half in taxation and the actual result of an increase of $133,188 for the current year thus far. I might further point out, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. gentleman's prophecy had come true, if he had really taken off taxes to the amount of $1,500,000, as he professed to do when he introduced his tariff last year, instead of a deficit amounting to $4,500,000, as he himself admitted the deficit to be, it would have amounted to $6,000,000. As it is, the deficit is surely ugly and ill-visaged enough to suit even the hon. Finance Minister. A deficit of $4,500,000 is almost as much as the total of the three deficits under the Mackenzie Government. The country has heard from the hon. gentleman ever since he became Finance Minister loud denunciations of any Government having a deficit. According to him, the Mackenzie Government were incapable, their policy was a false one and one not calculated to advance the interests of Canada, because it resulted on three separate occasions in a deficit. The hon. gentleman in 1894 produced a deficit which, in his Budget speech of this session, he is pleased to call a small deficit. It amounted almost to a million and a quarter of dollars, almost as large as any deficit of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And this year he proposes to bring forward a deficit almost large enough to swallow the three deficits which the Mackenzie Government had in 1876, 1877 and 1878. The hon. gentleman, however, has hit upon a new means of accounting for a deficit. He says: I did have a deficit in 1894, but it was only a small one, about a million and a quarter; but I had also a sinking fund. I wiped out the deficit with a sinking fund, for we put more money in the sinking fund than we lost in the deficit. Surely if that argument is an excuse for the hon. gentleman it should be an excuse for their opponents. While the Mackenzie Government had deficits, they also had sinking funds. Their sinking fund would have paid 57 per cent of their deficits, while the hon. gentleman's sinking fund would have paid 63 per cent of the deficits he has had. So he can claim no particular advantage on that ground. The hon. gentleman, however, thinks that he completely disposes of the position in which he finds himself with regard to deficits, decrease of revenue, falling off of imports—a state of affairs which he himself has described time and time again in this House as showing incapacity on the part of the Government—by saying: I took off the sugar duties, and if I had not done so there would have been this large sum of money—and as to the inaccuracy of his calculation of that amount, I shall have something to say. Now that may be a fair way of looking at the matter, but

if it is a fair one for one side of the House, surely it must be fair for the other. The hon. gentleman made a great many comparisons in his Budget speech by which he has proved to his own satisfaction that the Government is going in the right direction. He compared the present year and the past year with the year 1889. Now, in the year 1889 the hon. gentleman himself was in power. He has shown by these comparisons how very badly the Government was administered in 1889, and how much better they are conducting affairs in 1894 and 1895. Now, Sir, I think that is a very unfair and misleading comparison to make. If the hon. gentleman wishes to contrast the National Policy with a tariff for revenue, let him contrast the years in which a revenue tariff was in force, with years in which the National Policy was in force. As the hon. gentleman has failed to do that, I have prepared some figures in that direction. I put it this way: Suppose the Mackenzie Government had had during the years they were in power, the same duties which the hon. gentleman congratulates himself on having in 1894. The hon. gentleman showed by his comparison that he is a very much better man, indeed, that his Government have a very much better policy, a very much better tariff, in 1894, than they had in 1889. Now, in order to make a comparison, I do not propose to take the bad year of 1889, but I will take his model year of 1894, the year upon which he bases his comparisons, and I ask you to consider for a moment what would have been the result if Mr. Mackenzie's Government had adopted a rate of taxation during their period of office as high as that upon which the hon. gentleman congratulates himself so much in 1894, which rate as appears in the Trade and Navigation Returns, at page 11, was 17·13 per cent. Now, in 1874, the rate of taxation, as shown on the same page of the Trade and Navigation Returns, was 11·32, or 5·81 per cent less than it was in 1894. Now, Sir, if the hon. member for South Oxford had been taxing the people of Canada in 1874 at the same rate that the Minister of Finance taxes the people of Canada in 1894, the surplus which he had in that year of $888,776 would have been converted into a surplus of $8,290,958. Now, that is not applying the rate of taxation in that year with the rate which the Finance Minister had in 1889, his high water mark, but comparing it with the year 1894, the year in relation to which he takes a large amount of time in the Budget speech in glorifying himself and his Government in having brought down the rate of taxation, which I find here to have been the enormous rate of 21·65, as compared with the moderate rate of 17·13, a reduction, as he rightly claims, of over 4 per cent. But I say, taking his model year, taking the year when the hon. gentleman's well-known economical motions, as he calls them, have been productive of some effect, the year after he had performed that great act of patriotism in removing the sugar duties and in refraining from taking all these millions of money out of the people of Canada—I say, compare the rate of that year with the rate of taxation at 17·13, and give the hon. member for South Oxford that same rate of taxation on the imports which he had in 1874, and see what the result will be. I make a comparison of the year of the hon. member for South Oxford with the Minister of Finance's year of 1894, it is a comparison of the time when the Liberal policy as it is to-day, was in force. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had a great deal to say as to what that policy is. What is the policy of the Liberal policy? The policy of the Liberal party is a policy of taxation for revenue. Now, Sir, let us take the same system of comparison and see how the surplus of the hon. member for South Oxford in 1875 will fare. Very few people in the country know that the hon. member for South Oxford ever had a surplus. To judge from the Budget speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, one would think that the hon. member for South Oxford had a succession of ugly and ill-visaged deficits; but in 1874 he had a surplus, he had another surplus in 1875, and I am going to apply the same method of comparison, which I claim is a straightforward one, not a tricky, misleading, and unfair comparison, such as the hon. gentleman made all through his Budget speech, and which I am here to expose. Let us take the rate of taxation in 1894, the model year after the sugar duties had disappeared, which was 17·13. In 1875 the hon. member for South Oxford imposed upon the people of Canada a rate of taxation of 12·83 only, compared with which 1894 had an addition of 4·30 per cent. Let us take the imports as they actually were that year, and let us apply to those imports the rate of taxation which the hon. gentleman had in 1894, and let us put that rate of taxation into the hands of the hon. member for South Oxford, and his modest surplus of $935,644, by that species of comparison, springs into a surplus of $6,079,246. I say that his surplus of less than a million, by that method of comparison, would have been, at that time, a surplus of $6,079,000. The next year, 1876, one of those ugly and ill-visaged customers came to Canada, and the hon. gentleman had a deficit of $1,900,785. By the same system of comparison, putting into his hands for a moment the rate of taxation which the hon. gentleman glorifies himself upon so much in 1894, and that deficit disappears entirely, and is replaced by a surplus of $1,594,870. Again, in 1877 the hon. gentleman, by keeping down the taxation, by refusing at that unfortunate time, in that period of depres-

sion, further to burden the people of Canada with more taxation, had a rate of only 13·44 per cent. That taxation was increased somewhat, but only moderately. Let us again hand him for a moment the taxation which the hon. gentleman plumes himself so much upon in 1894, 17·13 per cent, or a difference of 4·10, and we find that the deficit of 1877, which amounted to $1,460,027, becomes a surplus of $2,488,292. Again, in 1878, when the hon. member for South Oxford, through stress of circumstances over which he had no control, by virtue of the cyclone of depression which had spread over the United States, and which was then being felt in Canada, found it necessary to increase the taxation, he raised the rate to 14·3, or 3·10 less than the hon. gentleman had in 1894. Now, if we apply the same test again to 1878, we find that the deficit of $1,128,146 which existed in that year disappears, and in its place a surplus comes to hand of $1,699,040. Take the whole five years of Mr. Mackenzie's administration, and give the Finance Minister of that day the rate of taxation which we have glorified in the Budget speech now under consideration, and he would have accumulated—I will not say accumulated, but he would have taken out of the people a surplus of $20,152,406, or an average surplus each year during that period of $4,030,481. That is what I call a fair comparison, that is using the records of the country for the purpose of showing the difference between a system of taxation such as that adopted by the hon. member for South Oxford and that adopted by hon. members on this side of the House. I wish to make another comparison, which I claim to be a fair one. The hon. gentleman has claimed great credit for the rate of taxation that existed in 1894. Let us give to him and his predecessors in those years following 1878 up to the present time that rate of taxation instead of the rate they actually imposed on the people, and let us see where we would land, where the surplus would go and what kind of deficits those hon. gentlemen would have had. I am not giving them the rate of taxation which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) imposed in 1878, but I am taking their own model rate of 1894, which is glorified so much, and applying it to each year, commencing with 1879. In that year the actual rate was 16·10, or 1·03 less than in 1894. The deficit for that year was actually $1,937,999. The deficit would have been less by the increased taxation, and would have been $1,110,000. In 1880 the rate of taxation took an enormous spring upwards and became 19·17, or 2·01 more than in 1894. The actual deficit of 1879 was $1,543,227. If the Minister of Finance in 1880 had been as great a man as is the Finance Minister to-day he would have had a deficit instead of $1,543,226, equal to the sum of $3,888,039. In 1881 the hon. gentleman's predecessor had a surplus. It was a large one—the rate of taxation was large also. The rate was 20·19. The surplus was $4,132,743. If the hon. gentleman's rate of taxation had been applied, it would have fallen to $1,329,428. In 1882 the hon. gentleman again had a surplus, the amount being $6,316,352. With the same figuring that surplus would have fallen to $3,905,665. In 1883 we had a large surplus, the largest surplus we ever had, viz., $7,064,492. At the 1894 rate the surplus would have fallen to $4,983,477. In 1884 there was a moderate surplus, the sum being $754,255; but if this method of comparison was applied, instead of having a surplus of something over half a million there would have been a deficit of $879,272. The rate of taxation was 18·64, or 1·51 more. In 1885 the rate of taxation was 18·61. The actual deficit was $2,240,000, which would have been increased to $3,760,167. In 1886 the rate of taxation was 19·50—it was always going up—or 2·37 more, the actual deficit being $5,834,572. This was much larger than the combined deficits of the hon. member for Oxford for three years. It would have become a deficit under the 1894 rate of $8,194,000. In 1887, there was a surplus of $97,313. That would have been changed into the enormous deficit of $4,244,467. In 1888 the rate of taxation reached 21·57. I am taking these figures from the blue-books and not depending on my own calculations; they will be found on page 11 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, table 7, where the rate of taxation is given for each year up to 1894. In 1888 there was a deficit of $810,032, which would have been increased to $5,376,443. In 1889, the rate was 21·65. That was the year which the hon. gentleman most ingeniously and unfairly took as a year with which to make a comparison, a year when the hon. gentleman and his Government had gone to the full extent in wringing taxation out of the people. They were enabled by that system to produce a moderate surplus of $1,865,035 which I say would have been changed, by the 1894 taxation, into a deficit of $3,092,204. Again, in 1890, when the taxation rate was 21 and 21-100ths, the surplus that year of $3,885,894, or nearly $4,000,000 would actually have been changed into a deficit of $714,941. Again, in 1891, when the rate of taxation was 20·06, the surplus of that year which was $2,235,743 would have become a deficit of $1,085,269. In 1892 the rate of taxation was 17·56, the surplus being $155,978, it would have become a deficit of $347,031. In 1893 the rate of taxation was about the same as 1894, namely, 17·38, and the surplus of that year was $1,354,556, which would have been reduced to a surplus of $1,050,294. In 1894—I take the deficit as it was, because we cannot compare that as we have got to the year—in 1894, it was $1,211,332, and in 1895, I do

not add the increase, it was not very large, and I leave it at the actual deficit as it is, of $4,500,000. Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize for inflicting so many figures upon the House. They are, no doubt, very dry, but it is necessary to give them for the purpose of meeting the misleading and unfair comparisons and statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in his Budget speech. Take, then, the total for the seventeen years from 1879 to 1895, inclusive, and we would have a total deficit during these years of $26,627,417, or an average deficit every year of $1,566,318. Let us compare them. Now, we have got the thing on a fair basis. We have got Mackenzie's Administration on the 1894 basis, and we have got the Administration of the hon. gentleman and his predecessors on the same basis. If the Finance Minister chooses one year to have a rate of 21½, and another year to have a rate of 17·13, it is very easy for him to say: Oh, we are saving the people this much. But it is just as fair to put it the other way and say: While you charge them so much in 1894 with your 17·13, you charged them so much more for the other years than you should have charged them. One argument is just as fair as another. But here is a fair comparison. Here we reduce both Administrations to the same terms, and what do we find on this basis? I have to apologize for devoting so much time to a matter which I do not take any stock in at all. I do not take any stock in the assertion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that a deficit or a surplus, either one way or the other, is any test per se of the prosperity or success of the Administration of the day. It may mean many things. It may mean that the Administration have seen fit to enormously increase the burdens of the people. It may mean that the imports are very largely increased. If the imports are largely increased, and the rate of taxation remains as small as it was before, that means prosperity, that means that this money would come into the treasury without any addition to the taxations of the people. But the hon. gentleman does not put that forward, and he never has put it forward in his Budget speeches. He has put forward the bare, bald statement, that because the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in certain years, namely, 1876, 1877, and 1878, without taking any account at all of the greater taxation, actually had a deficit; that, therefore, the Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Administration was a bad financier, and that the policy of the Government was a bad policy. It is hardly necessary for me to take up the time of the House in order to dispose of the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), and to give the comparisons based on the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and show where they lead us. I say that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had had, during all these seventeen years the same rate of taxation which existed in 1894-95, the average deficit of the present Government would have been $1,566,318, and that if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), during his five years of office, had had the same rate of taxation, his average surplus would have been $4,030,481. You will see that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has a "plus" sign against his name by this method of calculation, and that the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has a "minus" sign opposite his name. On that test, which the hon. gentleman himself has put forward in his Budget speech of this session, and in his Budget speeches of every session since he has been Finance Minister, I say that you will find, by adding the two amounts together, that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his Administration were $5,596,799 each year better than the hon. gentleman opposite and his Administration. Let us take it in another way. Mr. Speaker, I am almost afraid to lay before the country the astounding results of the following comparison. Is not this a fair suggestion, Sir? I have been giving to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the rate of taxation for 1894 upon which the Finance Minister glorifies himself so much. Let me turn around and, in all fairness, give to the Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) the rate of taxation which the hon. member for South Oxford had in 1878, and let us see where he would be, then. The rate of taxation in 1878 was 14·3 per cent. Take that for 1879, when the rate was 16·10, and there would have been a deficit of $3,601,070. I hope I have made myself clear. I am giving the amount of money that the Conservative Government would have got in these years, supposing they had not increased the rate of taxation, supposing they had left the taxation where we say it ought to be on a revenue basis; on a basis not for protection, but for revenue, a basis that would extract as small an amount as possible out of the pockets of the people, consistent with the obtaining of a revenue. The rate was then 14·03 per cent, and I am going to apply it to each year. Under that rate, in 1880 the deficit would have been $5,613,285; in 1881, the deficit would have been $1,510,531; in 1882 there would have been a surplus. Hon. gentlemen will remember that there was a large surplus in 1882; but there would have been a moderate one of $413,549. In 1883 there would also have been a surplus—I linger on 1883, because it is the last year in which there would have been a surplus—of $1,166,229. Now, we have a long list following of most ugly and ill-visaged deficits, which the hon. gentleman would have got if he had ad-

hered to the revenue rate of 14·03 per cent; in 1884 a deficit of $4,232,872; in 1885, $6,944,177; in 1886, $11,282,839; in 1887, $7,519,289; in 1888, $8,564,703; in 1889, $6,503,048; in 1890, $4,210,674; in 1891, $4,498,967; in 1892, $3,973,378; in 1893, $2,722,562; in 1894, $4,717,245; in 1885, taking the rate as the same as in 1894, though it was really as I have shown slightly higher, and estimating the imports at $100,000,000, which is somewhat more than they will come to, as I think the hon. gentleman will admit, the deficit at the end of the year would be $7,460,000. Now, what about the totals? Supposing the hon. gentleman had had that rate of taxation during those years, he would have had surpluses in two years amounting together to $1,579,778, and combined deficits amounting in all to $83,354,640, or one-third of the present enormous national debt. Now, I want next to consider the amount of money which the hon. gentleman during these seventeen years has taken out of the people of Canada—because that is really the important question all the time. This dallying with figures, with surpluses and deficits, is a mere trick of the hon. gentleman, to try to show that the Mackenzie Administration was wrong; but the real question which we must always bear in mind in these financial investigations, is: how much do the people pay? Now, how are we to arrive at the answer to that question? In this way. I am going to try to find out how much more money hon. gentlemen opposite have taken out of the people of Canada than the Mackenzie Administration would have taken if their policy of 1878 had been continued. How do we get at that? We take the total deficits as they would have been, and the total surpluses as they were. Now, I have shown that the total deficits, if the same rate of taxation had been continued, would have been $81,774,862. The net surplus which the hon. gentleman has at his credit at the present time is $9,785,139. Add these two sums together, and you have, I claim, the amount of money that this Government have taken directly out of the people of Canada. I am not saying a word about those millions and millions of dollars that have been taken out of the people of Canada which the revenue never got; nor am I dealing with any estimate. I am making a calculation which cannot be wrong, which is backed up by the actual imports. These two amounts together give the enormous total of $91,560,001, an amount of money large enough to pay off one-third of the national debt, and leave about eight millions of dollars in the treasury. Now, I have endeavoured to dispose of some comparisons instituted by the hon. gentleman, and I have made the charge that his comparisons were unfair and his figures misleading. I come now to that portion of his speech in which he glorifies himself first and Canada next upon the credit which Canada had in the money markets of the world. I do not know where he got his figures, but certainly they were most incorrect; misleading is not the word; they were actually wrong, and I propose to prove that they were. The hon. gentleman said that at the time he made his loan in the old country, which he stated was at the rate of 3⅛ per cent, the American Government made a loan at the rate of 3¾ per cent. Now, the real fact, which he omitted to mention, is that the American Government made a loan in a different market—in the American market; and instead of the rate being, as he claimed, 3¾ per cent, the actual rate at which the American Government floated that loan of $50,000,000 was 2·87 or 2⅞ per cent. I do not understand how the hon. gentleman could come into this House and make the statement he did. I must, I suppose, attribute it to ignorance. It would not be parliamentary to say that he deliberately misled the House, and I must out of charity say that he did not know any better. If the hon. gentleman will look at the "Statist," a financial paper published in London, of the 1st of December, 1894, he will find there in plain English that the new American loan was floated at a price which made the rate of interest to the Government 2·87 or 2⅞ per cent. At the present time there appears to be a disposition on the other side of the House to decry everything English or connected with England, and to look for inspiration, and I suppose also for facts, to the United States. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that financial organ, let him look at the New York "Herald" of 27th November, 1894, and he will find there precisely the same statement. Now, if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that, I will give him the particulars of the American loan, and he can calculate the rate for himself. The American loan paid what was, for a nation like the United States, a large rate. It was floated at a rate which was a large rate for them to pay in the present condition of the money market. They ought to get their money at less than two and seven-eights per cent. If they had had the kind of loan to offer which our Finance Minister was able to offer to the English people, they could have got their money a great deal cheaper, but they were pledged to borrow their money at five per cent, under a statute which provides that it shall be repayable in coin. The financial world knows that there is a great agitation on the other side in favour of free silver, and that the danger always exists, under that statute, of the Americans deciding some day, as they can do legally, to pay borrowed money in silver, which is coin. Let me mention another matter. Our loan runs for forty-four years, whereas the American loan runs only for ten years. It is equally well known in financial circles that a loan running for a large number of years is worth consider-

ably more than a short loan. Under those circumstances—being redeemable in coin and only running ten years—the American loan was allotted to a syndicate at 117·77, which produces a rate of interest of 2·87. The American loan was therefore at a great disadvantage. The treasury was being depleted of its gold. It was necessary for the credit of the country to replenish the treasury, and the Government had only statutory authority to issue this kind of bond. This loan was put upon the market and bid for, and the highest bid was made by the syndicate to which it was allotted, on the 27th November, at the figure I have given. On the 29th November—two days later—the syndicate announced that they had sold $5,000,000 out of the $50,000,000 at 119, and that they had raised the price of the balance to 119½, thus clearing out of the transaction a cool million of dollars. This shows how unfair and misleading was the comparison made by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman took another means of glorifying himself and his party, and I mention it, not because of any intrinsic value it may have, not because of any impression it could make on the country, but to show the unfairness of the hon. gentleman, to show the deliberate manner in which, with malice aforethought, knowing the facts, he sought to mislead the House. He referred to failures in Canada to show how successful his Administration was compared with the imbecile Administration of Mr. Mackenzie. In 1890, he said, the failures for the year, according to Dun, Wiman & Co.'s account, represented liabilities of $18,000,000, and in 1894, they were only $17,000,000. But seeing that he was comparing one bad year with another bad year, or one Conservative year with another, which is the same thing, he says I will give a fair comparison and take the average from 1874 to 1878. In 1874 the liabilities were $7,796,000; in 1878 they were $23,908,000—an increase of 210 per cent. Take the average from 1874 to 1878, and you will find it was $22,299.000, and from 1890 to 1894 it was only $16,690,000. I draw attention to this to show how unfair that hon. gentleman was. He knows that the failures of 1874 were $7,696,000, and that in 1875 they had risen enormously to $28,843,000. Why did not he give the cause? The cause is clear. In the early part of 1875 an insolvent law came into force. The hon. gentlemen opposite have introduced an Insolvent Act. Let them put that Insolvent Act into force this session, and I will make next year a comparison between 1894 and 1895 which will knock into the shade the comparison between 1875 and 1874. Will that be any reflection upon the hon. gentleman? No, it will merely show that when an insolvent act is passed, all the insolvents rush into insolvency in order to get a release from their liabilities. The hon. gentleman seizes the evidence of the fact that there was that increase and that falling again in 1880, when the Insolvent Act was repealed, down to $7,988,000. He knowingly and wilfully takes the figures for years when there was no insolvent act, and compares them with Mr. Mackenzie's years when there was an insolvent act, and attempts to make us believe that the contrast is an evidence that under his Administration and policy, Canada had prospered as compared with the period when Mr. Mackenzie was in office. Why, the only fair comparison to make would be between 1880 and 1893, in neither of which years was there an insolvent act. In 1880, the failures were only $7,988,000, while in 1893, the hon. gentleman's policy had brought Canada to such a position that the failures had risen to $15,610,404. That is a fair comparison to make—to take one year with another under the same circumstances. If you cannot make comparisons which are reasonable, fair and right, you admit that the propositions you are attempting to establish by the comparisons you make, are untrue. Now, the hon. gentleman has again brought forward the savings' bank matter, and attempted to prove, by reference to the statistics of these banks, that the policy of the Government has been eminently successful. It has been pointed out before, and I shall not delay the House by showing it again, how the accumulations of savings may be a sign at one time of prosperity, and at another of depression. It is true that if a country is prosperous, and those persons who are not in a position to invest their money in any other way put it in the savings bank, that shows an increase of prosperity. But it is also proved that when the policy of the country has brought about commercial disaster, when people lose confidence in ordinary investments, they put their money into institutions which they think are sound, but where the interest is low, in order to prevent the loss of their money in ordinary speculation. Now, let me take some of the specific figures, and show from these very figures of his that the hon. gentleman's policy is mistaken. I do not put this forward as a proof that the hon. gentleman is wrong; but I am prepared to take the same figures that he uses and show that they lead to a wholly different conclusion from that which he reached. I do not say that I have any faith in this comparison, but it is the kind of comparison that the hon. gentleman himself makes. Take, for instance, the deposits in the chartered banks from the year 1867. I get these figures from the Year-Book. If I were going to make a comparison that I wanted to repose faith in, I do not know that I should adopt these figures with great confidence. But for the purpose I have in view, they may be assumed to be correct; at any rate, they

are figures referred to by the hon. gentleman himself. The deposits in the chartered banks from 1867 to 1873 amounted to $54,397,236 on the average. In the period from 1874 to 1878 the average deposits in the chartered banks—and this was a period of ruin, desolation, incapacity of government and everything that was bad, according to the hon. gentleman—had risen to $73,926,285, an increase over the previous period of over 36 per cent. Now, we come into the time of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the five years from 1879 to 1883, the average deposits in chartered banks amounted to $94,116,645, an increase of only 27 per cent. Take the next period of five years, and you find that the average of deposits was $111,131,142, an increase of 18 per cent. Always getting a little less, you see, showing, according to the hon. gentleman's own argument, that the country was gradually approaching ruin and chaos. But in the last period, from 1889 to 1895, they are actually getting back to the Mackenzie standard of 36 per cent. During that period the average deposits were $152,008,320. And if the hon. gentleman and his predecessors had been able to keep the country up to the high standard of Mr. Mackenzie, the deposits would have been $187,807,917. So there was a loss there, a discrepancy telling against the hon. gentleman and in favour of the Mackenzie Government of $35,799,597. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to decide the question of prosperity, the question of the succees of the hon. gentleman's policy by making comparisons, are not the comparisons I make as fair as those of hon. gentlemen opposite? Now, take the deposits in the savings banks, Government and special. I will take one Conservative period and compare it with another Conservative period. In the first period I shall refer to—that from 1868 to 1873—while the country was under a Conservative Administration, they had the present Liberal policy, a tariff for revenue. In 1868, the deposits in the Government savings banks and special savings banks, like the Montreal District Bank, were $5,057,607. In 1873, under this tariff for revenue, they had risen to $12,933,884, an increase during these five years of 255 per cent. Now, take the figures for the National Policy period, from 1878 down to 1893. In 1878 the deposits were $14,128,185. If they had increased at the rate of 255 per cent every five years, they would have amounted, in 1893, to $234,264,733, as against what they actually were, $54,673,494, a deficiency of $179,591,239 in the sixteen years of the National Policy, under a Conservative Administration, as compared with the five years of the tariff for revenue policy under a Conservative Administration. Now, is not that a fair comparison? Does not that show as much against the hon. gentleman as his figures showed in his favour? The hon. gentleman went on to make some more comparisons. He took the years 1890 to 1894 and compared them with the years 1874 to 1878. The reason he gave for that seemed peculiar. He did not undertake to say it exactly—I cannot find that he made the absolute statement—but he left the inference that the years 1890 to 1894 were years of depression and of hard times like those of 1874 to 1878. He says: Opposition papers say so; Opposition speakers say so. The hon. gentleman spent a long time on this comparison, and he drew the most disastrous conclusions as to the period when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Minister of Finance. But if it is not true that the years 1890 to 1894 were years of depression, then this comparison wholly fails of its object. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford, in his Budget speech during years of depression, regularly admitted that he was in a period of hard times, that Canada was suffering from depression which was world-wide, following with us, as it always does and always will, a period of severe depression in the United States. But the hon. Finance Minister has not been doing that. What he did say in these years from 1890 to 1894, which he said are spoken of by the Opposition as years of depression? In 1890, he said this in the Speech from the Throne:

> I may fairly congratulate you on the continuance of the progress and prosperity of the country.

Prior to that the National Policy had been at work and we had been told of Canada's great prosperity. This year the Governor General congratulates the country upon the continuance of that prosperity. In 1891, the Speech from the Throne contained the following:

> The season in which you are assembled has opened auspiciously for the industries of the people.

In 1892:

> It affords me much gratification to meet you at the commencement of a parliamentary session, and to be able to congratulate you upon the general prosperity of the Dominion.

Was there anything of that kind in the Speeches from the Throne in 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 or 1878? In 1893, another of the years which the hon. gentleman now says are spoken of as years of depression, the Speech from the Throne says:

> It affords me pleasure to congratulate you upon the continued progress which the history of the past year unfolds with regard to Canada. The increase in trade, as illustrated by the exports and imports during the period for which the official returns have been prepared, has been most gratifying, and that increase has continued down to the present time, with promise that the volume of trade during the current year will exceed that of any year in the history of the Dominion.

In 1894 again we read:

Canada's progress continues with every mark of stability and permanence.

The hon. gentleman takes those years in which those remarks were made, and he proceeds to glorify himself and demolish his opponents with a comparison with those other years which were admittedly years of panic and depression. I would like to say here that while the hon. gentleman has always been making the contention that these years were good years, it has not been charged on this side of the House that there was a depression such as existed during the Mackenzie régime. What we charge is that during those years, the effect of the National Policy has been to impoverish the people, not that there was a world-wide depression which had reached Canada, not that times were hard for the reason that they were hard between 1874 and 1878, but that they were hard from our own actions, that population was not increasing, that the trade of the country was languishing from causes within our own control. Our criticisms were comparative. The hon. gentleman used those terms, "comparative and absolute," and our criticisms as to the period between 1890 and 1894 were comparative. We compared the country as it would have been, and might have been, under a proper policy of tariff for revenue, with the country as it actually was under the pernicious National Policy, a policy of robbing the people for the benefit of the few. The hon. gentleman is now face to face with circumstances similar to those which confronted the Mackenzie Government in 1874, and during the whole period they were in office. I shall draw attention, before I get through, to the fact that all this depression which has come from causes beyond our control, the panic in the United States occurred in 1893. The hon. gentleman congratulated the country in 1893, and also in 1894, on the fact that we were not touched by that panic in Canada. Economic students were well aware, and it was pointed out from this side of the House, that the depression in Canada which comes from our close affiliation in trade with the United States, has always affected us in Canada later than it did the people of the United States. The hon. gentleman comes here in 1895 and admits that he is in a period of depression, and he gives the proper reason for it, namely, the fact that there was a panic in 1893 in the republic to the south of us. What the hon. gentleman said was: If you had been wise statesmen in 1874 and 1878 you would not have allowed the depression in the United States in 1873 to visit this country as it did visit us; if you had had the National Policy during that period the depression would have been warded off. Since that time there has been no repetition of a depression until now, and it is for us to examine into the public record and see when the National Policy, which I have shown in still in force in this country, has been applied at this time to ward off from Canada the effects of the panic of 1893, and the gentleman said it would have warded off the effects of the panic of 1873 if it had been brought into existence by the Mackenzie Government at that time. But before I do that, I shall deal briefly with the hon. gentleman's comparison, which he made with such pains and at such length, between these two periods. I think I have made it plain that this is an unfair comparison to commence with, that the two periods are not at all alike in their characteristics. But even supposing they were, I propose to show that his figures are misleading, that his comparison is unfair, and that the conclusions which he draws from his own premises cannot be substantiated. In the first place, the hon. gentleman unfairly takes the period from 1874 to 1879. Now, so far as the Mackenzie Government is concerned, I disclaim any responsibility for the year 1879. According to hon. gentlemen opposite, their sins were enough during the period they were in office. They came into office in November, 1873, and they went out of office in October, 1878, so that the hon. gentleman should have taken the period from 1874 to 1878, instead of the period from 1873 to 1879. I intend, in making corrections in the hon. gentleman's figures, to take the real figures for the Mackenzie Administration, and not include in them the year 1879, during a considerable portion of which the National Policy was in force. The hon. gentleman says that during this period the exports fell $18,000,000. The House will find this very elaborate exposition in the form of a table at page 563 of the hon. gentleman's speech, and a great deal of stress is laid upon it; so that I intend to take a few minutes in trying to show how inaccurate his statement is. In the first place, he makes a statement that the exports fell $18,000,000. Now, I take his own figures, as furnished to us this session in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that the exports in 1873 were $89,789,922; the exports in 1878 were $79,323,667, a total falling off of $10,466,000, as against the figures put into the table by the hon. gentleman of $18,000,000. The hon. gentleman said the exports, during the Mackenzie Administration fell off $18,000,000. I think it is most unfair for the hon. gentleman to make a statement of that kind, almost doubling the figures. Now, that was a period immediately following the panic of 1873 in the United States. There was, we must admit, a falling off of $10,466,000, or an average each year of $2,093,000 during that period. It is not a good showing, but the causes for it have been explained time and again in this House, and the valid excuse put forward was that it was something over which

Canada had no control. How is it to-day, after the panic of 1893? And how was it in 1894, the year during which, according to the hon. gentleman, it was not felt in Canada, at least during a large part of that year? The exports fell off in that year by $1,039,000, or at the rate of 50 per cent as much as they did during the Mackenzie period. But when we come down to the year 1895, when, for the first time, the Minister of Finance is prepared to admit that we are following our neighbours in this crisis, we find that the exports for six months of that year, fell off $5,005,203. While during the whole period of five years under the Mackenzie Administration the total exports, which the hon. gentleman paraded here with so much rejoicing and glee, only fell off ten million dollars, while in a period of six months, under similar circumstances, the hon. gentleman's exports fell off at a rate which at the end of the year would equal the amount for the whole period of five years under the Mackenzie régime. The returns given up to 31st March, make the showing worse than that, the decline instead of being $7,500,000 was close on $8,000,000. So that at the end of the year there will really be a falling off from this cause equal to the sum I have indicated, for which the hon. gentleman is not responsible and for which I do not blame him, but what I do blame him for is the attempt to make the Mackenzie Government responsible under similar circumstances. If it is a high crime and misdemeanour against good policy for the Mackenzie Government to show a falling off of $2,000,000 a year, how much greater must the crime and misdemeanour for hon. gentlemen opposite to have a falling off in one year from the same cause, under the same circumstances, of five times as much, or ten million dollars. I should like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to his statements about exports as reported in his speech, that exports fell eighteen millions, that the imports were eighteen millions, and in the period from 1893-94 the exports rose twenty-eight millions, and the imports rose twenty-eight millions. I take it for granted that this is an error of the printer. As I do not possess the hon. gentleman's figures I am not able to criticise them, but I doubt not if I had them I would find them equally as inaccurate and unfair. I draw attention to this fact, and if I adopted the same method of criticism which the hon. Minister attempted to apply to me when I rose to speak, I would deal at considerable length the enormous discrepancy between the real facts and those presented. The hon. gentleman, however, is not to blame for those figures, and I point out the inaccuracy to him. However, in 1894, when this depression caused by the panic in the United States began to work, the imports for consumption fell off $8,611,047; in 1895, a half year only, it fell off $6,321,667, or if the falling off continued at the same rate for the year, 1895 will show a total falling off of $12,000,000. Now, where is the efficacy of the National Policy? I admit the cause; I say the cause is the depression in the United States reaching Canada, as it always does, a year or two later. Hon. gentlemen opposite have contended year after year, in season and out of season, that it was the duty of the Government to prevent that depression, and that there was one sovereign remedy, which if applied at the proper time and in the proper way when the depression reached us in 1874 would have warded it off. I ask the hon. gentleman opposite why he has to come here and admit that with this National Policy in full force and vigour, the amendments to it having been dropped at the time and the revision having been passed over, the tariff having been increased slightly last session instead of decreased, the hon. gentleman finds it inoperative to-day? The total falling off will reach the enormous sum of $12,000,000 in one year. I am obliged not to criticise his figures, because, as I have already explained, I do not know what the hon. gentleman stated on that point. The hon. gentleman next said that the duties during the period from 1874 to 1878 fell off to the value of $1,400,000. The exact figures are $1,222,037. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say, I am going to deal in round figures; he let himself down easily in that way several times during his speech. Perhaps it is more pleasant to give round figures than the actual amounts, but the Finance Minister when he refers to $1,222,000 as being $1,400,000 in round figures, this presentation of the case, telling against the Opposition, is most unfair and misleading. So the hon. gentleman deliberately gave wrong figures, or he did not know what the correct figures were. If he did not know what the figures were, he should have known and he should have referred to the blue-book. The truth is that the hon. gentleman prepared his tables and delivered his speech largely as a campaign document. It goes forth to the country with the hon. gentleman's frank upon it and with these unfair statements. I correct them here, but my words will not reach the persons whom this speech will reach. We have here one statement after another that is incorrect. We have here, as I have pointed out, an amount of $1,222,037 spoken of by the Finance Minister as $1,400,000. If that is fair criticism and a true exposition of the finances of the country, then I am utterly mistaken. The next statement made by the hon. gentleman is that during the Mackenzie Administration the debt increased $40,000,000. Well, the hon. gentleman knows when he puts forward the statement that almost every dollar of that sum was incurred in carrying our liabilities imposed on the country during that period, reference to which brings a blush of shame to every true Canadian, that period of the Pacific scandal. Is that a true statement for

the hon. gentleman to put in a campaign document? He might as well say that the Mackenzie Administration added $40,000,000 to the public debt—indeed that is really what he says; and yet the hon. gentleman knows that it is absolutely untrue. He knows that as administrators of Canada they were bound by every pledge to carry out the promises into which the preceding government had entered, and that in adding $40,000,000 their predecessors really added it. Yet for the mere purpose of bolstering up himself and his party, the Finance Minister put forward that false misleading statement in a speech which was intended for a campaign document and intended to influence the votes of the electors in the elections which will shortly come on. Next, the hon. gentleman makes a statement on his own side, and says that during his period the taxes have decreased $6,000,000. I cannot find that in the figures. It is a very high sounding round figure, $6,000,000, and I have looked for it. I will exclude coin and bullion, which I think the House will agree with me from the explanation I gave before it is fair to exclude, for you cannot take coin and bullion, because one year it is $5,000,000, and another year it falls to half a million dollars without any apparent relation to the trade of the country. Take out coin and bullion and get the 1894 rate of 17·76, so you will see that between 1889, when the rate was 21·80 and 1894, when the rate was 17·76, there was between those two years a decrease of taxation, of 4·04 per cent. Calculate that upon the amount of the imports, $113,093,983, and you find that the saving of taxation instead of being $6,000,000, is $4,568,997. Is it not taking a good deal of latitude to raise, for the purpose I have set forth, an amount of four and a half million dollars to six millions, or in other words adding 33⅓ per cent. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can justify that. I do not see what right the Finance Minister, holding the responsible position he does, and also the highly honourable position of leader of this House, dares to say, that the taxation was decreased during that period six million dollars, when he knows perfectly well that it was only decreased $4,568,997. I have alluded to the fact that the hon. gentleman had a great deal to say as to the sugar duties. He takes great credit to himself for what he has done with regard to sugar, as a partial apology, I suppose, for the reimposition of the one-half cent per pound, and largely for the purpose of glorifying the Conservative Administration during the time which he has presided over the Finance Department. He says on page 554 of "Hansard," after taking in the glass duties and the anthracite coal duties, and the sugar duties which were taken off, that the saving to the people of Canada was $23,660,902. Now, I will show by the most convincing figures that that statement is enormously wide of the mark. In 1891, the rate was 20·07. The sugar duties were taken off on the 24th June, 1891, so that we commenced the financial year of 1892 when the rate was 20·07. In 1892 the rate, always omitting coin and bullion, was 17·84, or an actual reduction of $2,568,077. In 1893, the actual rate was 18·37, or an actual reduction of $1,957,904. The hon. gentleman says, I took those duties off sugar, anthracite coal, and glass, and I saved that much to the people. Well, one would naturally suppose that that was a clear saving, and I take it on that basis. But I cannot look at it in that way. We have got to look at the actual saving as it was in that year. Whether other duties were increased, or how it was I am not prepared to say, because it cannot be shown from the returns; but you take the actual taxation for each one of those years, as I am doing, and you will wind up with the exact amount which the hon. gentleman saved during the periods 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895. In 1893, it was 18·37, and the saving was $1,957,904. In 1894, it was 17·76 and the saving was $2,519,538. In 1895, it was 17·94 up to date, and the saving, $1,575,865. Add these all together and you get the actual figures. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has got it down to the odd dollar, and he says at page 554 of "Hansard," that during these periods he saved the pepole of Canada taxation to the amount of $23,660,902. The actual amount that he did save, calculated as I have done—the only fair way of calculating it, and I defy the hon. gentleman to pick one single hole in this calculation—was $8,621,384. Now, the hon. gentleman again returned to the subject at the end of his speech as a prelude to his announcement that he put on a half cent a pound on sugar, and he makes the calculation again there. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman can tell us to-day what the sugar duties would have been in 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895, with no other information to guide him, except the total number of pounds imported in each of these years, when we remember the fact that the sugar duty was not a duty of so much a pound. It was a duty varying from $1 to $1.90, according to the polariscopic test of the sugar, and the figures which the hon. gentleman has do not show how much sugar was imported at the $1 rate, or at any amount up to $1.90. I have looked over the returns and I have found that in the different years, 1889-90 and 1891 for example, there was a great variation. Some years a large amount came in at the 75 degrees, and a similar amount at the higher degree, so that from year to year the taxation varied very much indeed, and how could the Finance Minister make the estimate down to the odd two dollars without guessing? But the hon. gentleman did not put it forward as a guess, and he said it was quite the actual thing.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened to the hon. gentleman making very many very extreme statements and some that were, I think, almost unparliamentary. It is quite useless for me to call him to order, because he seems to make these statements as part of his speech. Now, just in reference to that, it strikes my mind that if he will read "Hansard," if "Hansard" is correct, he will find that when I was giving the sugar duties, I gave them as the average of the duties for 1890-91. If I did that, I am quite sure that is a sufficient explanation to the House of the basis upon which I calculated. Any gentleman may quarrel with the calculation, but he has no right to use hard language with reference to me. But it is all a matter of taste.

Mr. MARTIN. I will read the hon. gentleman's exact words. He may have intended to say that, but he did not say it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that I did not say it. The hon. gentleman holds in his hands the unrevised version, which is just as it is taken by the reporter here, and is liable to error. He might as well say that the reporter made the error as that I made it.

Mr. MARTIN. I could not possibly read the revised edition, because it is not out yet. I will comply with the hon. gentleman's request, and read it as I have it here, and he can correct it afterwards. We know the hon. gentleman's way of alluding to clerical errors. He has always a way of getting out of things. It is curious that I have made so many unparliamentary statements, and that this is the first one he has objected to—see how he grabs at it. This is what he did say:

> In 1891, under the new tariff, there were imported fourteen million odd pounds of sugar, the duty on which, taking an average at the old rate——

He does not say the average of 1890-91.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it go at that—the average of the old rate.

Mr. MARTIN:

> —the duty on which, taking the average of the old rate, would have been $227,447; in 1892 the quantity was 327,000,000 pounds, the duty on which would have been $5,200,000; in 1893 the quantity was 252,500,000 pounds, the duty on which would have been $4,000,000; in 1894 the quantity was 303,000,000 pounds, the duty on which would have been $4,821,000; in 1895 the actual import and the estimated receipts on the same basis would have shown, imports, 310,000,000 pounds, the duty on which, at the old rate, would have been $4,919,700.

Now, there was no old rate, absolutely. There was a rate which varied, for we know how much of this 310,000,000 pounds was 75 degrees, according to the polariscope test, how much was 76, how much 77, and so on; and we could carry out the calculation and get it down, as the hon. gentleman did, to odd dollars. But the hon. gentleman has not attempted to make such a calculation; he simply said at the old rate. The duties existed for a long period before 1890-91, and how did he get at the average? There was a chance to get at round figures; but, in order to leave the impression that he was making an accurate statement, he took an estimate and got down to the odd dollars. I am very sorry if I have said anything unparliamentary. I have been very anxious not to do so; but when the hon. gentleman says that the American loan was floated at 3¾ per cent, while it was actually floated at 2⅞ per cent, what am I to say? I say it is an incorrect statement, and if the hon. gentleman did not know that it was incorrect, he ought to have known, for he came here and spoke of it as something that ought to glorify himself and the Government. Or, what am I to do when he converts $1,220,000 into $1,400,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman the least glimmering idea that the reporter, in taking down a mass of figures such as are contained in my statement, might make an error in the figures?

Mr. MARTIN. It is a little curious that the errors are all in the hon. gentleman's favour. I have not found a single one against him. I found one error that was palpable, and I mentioned it; but I take for granted that the reporters have done in his case, what they do in mine and every one else's—that when he was speaking from tables, carefully prepared, they got those from him and copied them into "Hansard," so that "Hansard" is not likely to be incorrect, except in the case which I pointed out, which was due to the slipping down of one line, and was evidently an error of the printer. Let the hon. gentleman give any excuses he likes, when the country understands the hon. gentleman's statements, they will not have the effect he intended them to have; because, when he admits the facts which I have mentioned here, his Budget speech falls to the ground, and these grand periods and glowing sentences based on inaccurate statements, will be considerably discredited. Let me take up another point which the hon. gentleman dealt with, which is just as misleading—a mere juggling with figures. He said the net interest is decreasing. I will read exactly what he did say; and if he is misreported in this instance, as in the others, he can make another Budget speech and correct all his mistakes. He says:

> If you will take the actual interest, you will find that whereas in 1868 we paid 4·51 per cent, in 1894 we paid 2·91 per cent.

Now, I am going to deal with that statement, and I am going to show how very

bad the hon. gentleman is if this statement is worth anything at all, as I do not consider it is, as I say, I take no stock in these propositions. I merely deal with them to show that they do not amount to anything. I say this is a proof of the hon. gentleman's wickedness if he puts them forward as proof of our wickedness on this side. I will put them forward to show that he is entitled to no credit, but that the credit should be all the other way. I wonder if this is a sign of that great financial management upon which the hon. gentleman plumed himself in one of those glowing periods—a magnificent policy—admirable financial management. If we are going to get down to questions of taste, I have not been taught that it is good taste for a man to come here and blow himself up for admirable financial management—to wit, my management. That is what I call bad taste; I do not know what the hon. gentleman calls it.

Mr. LISTER. It is blowing your own bugle.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. The hon. gentleman could not find any one on his side of the House to blow his bugle for him, and so he blew it himself, and I must say he is the best blower on that side of the House. He says the net interest is decreasing. If that is so, how does the Deputy Minister, in his report bear him out? By saying that the interest on the gross debt during 1893-94 increased from 3·26 to 3·31, even under the hon. gentleman's own administration. There must be something seriously wrong there. The net interest, also, increased from 2·88 to 2·91, although the hon. gentleman tells us that there never was a time when money could be got at such a low rate. But I am going to take this net interest business and see where it lands the hon. gentleman. In 1886 the net rate of interest was 4·51; in 1878, at the end of that terrible period, it was reduced to 3·68, or a reduction of ·83 per cent. Now, in 1884, the net rate of interest was 2·76. Ten years later, in 1894, it had risen to 2·91, or an increase in ten years of ·15 per cent. I understand perfectly well how that came about, but the hon. gentleman has put it forward as an evidence of able financial management and great prosperity under his administration. He said:

> If you take the actual interest, we paid 4·51 per cent in 1868, whereas in 1894 we paid 2·91 per cent, showing a large decrease.

The hon. gentleman would have it understood that his administration had been decreasing the net rate of interest. I have shown that the net rate of interest, commencing in 1868 and ending at the close of the Mackenzie period, was decreased 83 per cent, whereas in the ten years from 1884 to 1894 it was not decreased at all, but was increased 15 per cent. These comparisons of the hon. gentleman are worthless. The only fair comparison you can make is between two things of the same kind—one Grit and the other Tory. Take similar circumstances, take the same rate of taxation and then talk about your surplus; or take the same rate of taxation and talk about your deficit. Take the same circumstances and look at the effect of your policy: but to point to a decrease from 1868 to 1894 as an evidence of very strong financial position while omitting to point out that in 1884 the net rate of interest was $\frac{15}{100}$ of 1 per cent less than in 1894, ten years later, is trifling with the intelligence of the House. What does the net rate of interest amount to? It depends on circumstances, such as the amount of money in the savings banks, such as the amount of money to be obtained from different investments, which all have to be considered in any comparison worth making. But the hon. gentleman saw the figures there, they looked in his favour, and he promptly gave them to the House. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a supplementary statement with regard to railway subsidies. I am quite unable to make the figures given by the hon. gentleman correspond with the figures given in the Public Accounts; but, as the hon. gentleman has insinuated his intention to correct some of these mistakes of the reporter, and perhaps this is a mistake of the reporter, I think it is important that we should know from him before we are done with the Budget debate, the exact financial position of Canada. It is important that we should have the correct figures. He says that the railway subsidies under contract and not paid amount to $2,257,059. Now, I find in the Public Accounts, at page xcii, that those railway subsidies amount to $3,485,175. He says also that the railway subsidies not under contract, amount to $2,587,257. Look at the Public Accounts on page xcv, and you will find that the railway subsidies of that kind not under contract, amount to $4,791,400. There is just some possibility, perhaps, of the hon. gentleman's saving himself there, because he says those railway subsidies not under contract, which the Department of Railways enumerated here, are likely to be put under contract. If that be the explanation of the second discrepancy, we ought to have, before we are done with this matter, a detailed statement from the hon. gentleman as to which of those subsidies on that page are, according to the Department of Railways, likely to be put under contract, and which are not.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not seen the discrepancy.

Mr. MARTIN. I must, then, have been very obscure in my remarks. I say that, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, the railway subsidies under contract amount to $2,257,059, and that, according

to the Public Accounts, they amount to $3,485,175. According to the hon. gentleman, again, the railway subsidies not under contract amount to $2,587,257, and according to the Public Accounts, the same railway subsidies amount to $4,791,400. Now, if I have made no mistakes in arithmetic, the hon. gentleman's total amounts to $4,844,316, while the total given by the Public Accounts amount to $8,276,575, or a discrepancy of $3,432,259, and I may say that the $8,000,000 given in the Public Accounts corresponds quite correctly with the statement given in answer to the hon. member for South Oxford by the Minister of Railways this session.

Mr. FOSTER. Therefore, you find a discrepancy ?

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of the Public Accounts ?

Mr. MARTIN. They are for 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of my statement ?

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman's statement is for the present time. Does he mean to say that the others have been paid in the meantime ?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to say that you cannot compare the 30th June, 1895, with a date in May, 1895.

Mr. MARTIN. If that is what the hon. gentleman meant, he did not make that plain at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I be permitted to say that the statement made by the Minister of Railways had reference to the same date at which he made the statement

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the Minister of Railway's statement that the hon. gentleman is criticising, it is mine. My statement was to date.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Railway's statement was to date. The question was asked up to date.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman may have a way out of that, but certainly he has not a way out of the next point I am coming to.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no way into it.

Mr. MARTIN. I have the hon. gentleman's own authority for it in "Hansard." He made this careful statement of the liabilities of Canada with a view to the increased taxation which he proposed to put on in order to meet those liabilities—capital and interest on capital. The hon. gentleman is not in the position which we are on this side. He comes to deliver a Budget speech with a full knowledge of the finances of the country as they are. He comes fully prepared, after having had plenty of time for preparation, and we have the right to suppose that, if the hon. gentleman is the admirable Finance Minister he pretends to be, these statements are correct. What do we find, on his own admissions ? We find that he has not said a word about the Trent Valley Canal or the Hudson Bay Railway, the two and a half million dollars for which has become a liability of the country, so far as an Order in Council can make it. But he admits sums that, in making up that statement, he forgot: The fast Atlantic line means an expenditure of $7,500,000; the Hudson Bay Railway, under the statute of 1891, a liability which he admits should have been included, $1,600,000; Kingston and Smith's Falls Railway, $250,680. So that, after all this preparation, after all this careful inquiry, the calculations of the hon. gentleman for the year 1895-96 are not correctly based. He has to admit, now that he forgot altogether these liabilities, amounting to $9,350,680. If that is the hon. gentleman's idea of an admirable financier, why it is a very different thing from mine. I think it is one of the most essential points that the man who handles the dollars and cents for a financial concern should know what the liabilities of the concern are, what it has got to pay next year and the nature of the obligations it is assuming. But when a financier, supposedly after careful preparation, makes a Budget speech before this House, and then is obliged to come a few days after and tell us that he has made a clean mistake of ten million dollars in his calculations, it makes a strange commentary on the hon. gentleman's modest testimonial of himself. I shall not take up the time of the House for more than a few moments longer. I wish to advert to the hon. gentleman's plunge into economy. It is one of the planks of the Liberal platform that there should be economy in the public expenditure. The hon. gentleman has adopted that, to a certain extent—at least he says so—and I wish to examine for a few moments his proposals in this respect. I wish to point out again how very far—the "Hansard" reporters, I suppose I must say—are astray in their transcript of the hon. gentleman. I think we had better have the "Hansard" Committee take up the subject, because if they cannot report the Budget speech, a good deal of which is written out in the shape of tables, etc., I am afraid there must be something wrong with the "Hansard" staff. I remember last session listening to a speech of the hon. Minister of Railways, in which, speaking of economy, he took up department after department, and, while admitting that economy was a good thing, asked what could be done. The hon. gentleman has shown the Minister of Railways that something in this direction can be done. Having got the admission from the hon. gentleman, it will perhaps be easier for us

to show hereafter that something substantial ought to be done instead of accepting the mere flea-bite which the hon. gentleman has offered in these Estimates. The first thing I have to remark upon is the falling off in the item of immigration. Now, Mr. Speaker, I object to that at once. That is not the kind of economy the Liberal party propose. They do not propose to reduce the expenditure of the country by taking away from the efficiency of the public service, by refusing to make those expenditures from which the people get a benefit, or ought to get a benefit. It is their proposition that millions are squandered in this country uselessly, that the departments are crowded with clerks who have nothing to do, that the Civil Service is manned with those who have been appointed merely for political reasons, and who are incompetent for the position they occupy—or it may be, appointed for charitable reasons, or something of that kind. And we propose to economize by preventing waste and by cutting off useless expenditures. We do not propose to economize by reducing an estimate like that for immigration. I must admit, however, that if the hon. gentleman takes my view of the success of the immigration expenditure, he is quite justified. For I consider this money is practically thrown away. But of course the hon. gentleman does not take that view. He claims that the hon. Minister of the Interior is pursuing that vigorous immigration policy which he started out to develop : and, holding that view, he deliberately cuts off $70,000 from an appropriation of $200,000. I may say that that proposition will not meet the approval of the people of Manitoba and the North-west. What they want is immigrants, and that is not the kind of saving the Liberal party propose. Well, the hon. gentleman touches a branch of the expenditure in which there is every chance for economy—civil government. And what does he do there ? He makes a reduction of $30,000. He takes a little nibble at it. In 1878 my hon. friend from South Oxford spent for civil government $823,396. In 1894, the brilliant financier who leads the House at the present moment spent $1,402,279, an increase of nearly $600,000. And he comes here and says : I have become the apostle of economy ; I propose to cut this expenditure down to $30,000. There is a chance for him if he really wants to economize, if he really wants to save the people's money and himself the onerous duty of placing more taxation on the people. Let him deal with a strong hand with this enormous increase made within the last sixteen years. Then, in legislation, at page 569, we find one of those errors, clear as daylight, which the hon. gentleman will have to lay on the "Hansard" reporters or upon some clerk. He says he is going to reduce that by $22,000. But, judging by the Estimates, it would seem to be a reduction of $80,000. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a reduction at all ; and if the hon. gentleman knows what his new estimates are, he has again misled the House, has again put forward a statement which cannot be substantiated. There is no reduction, for this reason, that in 1894 there were expended on legislation, $202,000 for voters' lists, and that has been struck out altogether so that, on the whole, there is an increase of $120,000 for legislation. Now, I say that legislation is altogether different from immigration. When we used to discuss the question of finances in Manitoba, when I had occasion to deal with finances in opposition, we used to divide the public expenditure into two classes, one we called for the benefit of the people, and the other for running the machine ; and we always claimed that the Government spent too much in running the machine, and too little for the benefit of the people. Now, if you are going to classify these matters, immigration comes into the class for the benefit of the people, and legislation for running the machine. The hon. gentleman cuts off $70,000 for immigration, and he puts $120,000 on to legislation. Then we come to militia. The hon. gentleman makes a cut there of $263,398. Now, I must say that I sympathize with the hon. gentleman in that case. I have long thought there was a chance for economy ; but it seems to me one of the strangest things in the world to have a Militia Department, a Minister of Militia, a General, all the paraphernalia of an army, schools, clothing, officers, colonels, majors, brigadiers, adjutants general, drill sheds, guns, a full-fledged department, everything in the militia, except the soldiers. The hon. gentleman proposed in his estimates to cut out the soldiers. He would have every other requisite for the defence of Canada except the one unimportant item of soldiers. But the Dominion Association knew something about militia if the Government did not. Perhaps there is some excuse for the Minister, as he had not been long in his department. The Government did not know anything about militia, and they did not know that it was necessary, for the purpose of having an effective militia, to have some soldiers. The Dominion Association came down here and pointed out to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Militia, and then they said : Well, we think you are right, we think we had better have some soldiers ; and, the hon. gentleman proposes to violate the solemn pledge which he made on the floor of this House only a few days ago, that under no possible circumstances would there be supplementary estimates in order to get these soldiers, in order to have that trifling addition to the Militia Department, as well as all these other things I have mentioned. The hon. gentleman makes a cut in railways and canals. Now that was very easy to do, because I find that there are $230,695 of

items that were in last year that have disappeared this year. But the decrease is not in salaries by any means. If the hon. gentleman had dismissed a lot of useless men that he has throughout the country on these railways, he would have been doing something good; but he has cut off the expenditure in public works, in canals and railways, which expenditure, if it had been applied properly, would have been for the benefit of the people. Instead of making a change, he actually makes an increase here again of about $50,000, while he claims a decrease of $183,000. The great bulk of the hon. gentleman's savings come from public works, the very last department on which the hon. gentleman ought to economize, on the principle I laid down that economy should be practised in the expenditure for running the machine. The money that goes to the people, that develops the country, that improves navigation, that erects useful public works, that erects public buildings where they are required, is not the kind of expenditure which the Liberals propose to reduce. They propose to expend that money in a great deal better and more proper way than hon. gentlemen opposite, who have proposed to make their reduction in the other direction. The hon. gentleman makes the great bulk of his reduction in this direction, and from the experience we have with the hon. gentleman, I am afraid not much real reduction will be made in this respect. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to strike these items out of his estimates. It is also very easy to go on and promise to do work and commence it, and then bring in the estimates after the elections. That is what the hon. gentlemen have done before. They have been paying no attention to Parliament. Parliament is the very last authority they have considered in the question of expenditure. They knew that all they had to do was to put an item in and have it go through, whether Parliament was sitting or not. They were always prepared to promise a public work here, a public work there, to enter into enormous obligation on the part of the country, knowing full well that all they had to do would be to come to the House and put it in the estimates. I say that is no test whatever. It would be some test if the hon. gentleman had undertaken to cut down the cost of running the machine, had actually got rid of those barnacles, got rid of those incapables. We could see that, but what they have done is to strike out this expenditure for public work, telling the country that they are economizing instead of adding to the public works. The next matter that I see is Mounted Police. Well, I shall leave the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to deal with the question of reduction in the number of the Mounted Police. Now, I find that since the Mackenzie regime the increase in the expenditure of the country has been $14,081,867. That is the increase in 1894 as compared with 1878. Now, it must be admitted there should have been some increase. It must be admitted that if the Liberals had been in power there would have been an increase, but if we allow the Government to increase the expenditure in proportion to the population, we make them a very liberal allowance. But that is not necessary, because the population can be increased by a very considerable percentage more than the expenditure is increased. It is just like a wholesale business. Every wholesaler will tell you that when his total volume of business is small, the ratio of expense to profit is large, but as their total volume of trade increases, they do not have to increase their expenses in anything like the same proportion. The same rule applies to government. As the population increases the expenses of government do not increase in the same proportion. Therefore, I say that if we allow an increase of expenditure in the same proportion as the increase of population, we allow a good deal more than should be allowed. I think that allowing 22 per cent for an increase of the population during that period is a very liberal estimate. From 1878 to 1894, 22 per cent is more than the actual increase, so far as we have any statistics to guide us. Now, $5,170,694 in expenditure would have been a normal increase, whereas the actual increase was $14,081,867, making $8,911,173 per annum by which these gentlemen have increased the expenditure with no possible excuse. Now, I say it is a most moderate proposition for the Liberal party to make —I am not saying this, of course, on behalf of the Liberal party because I have no authority to do so—but I put it forward as one principle of our policy, and I say it is a most moderate proposition to make, that no government, actuated by a desire for real economy, upon coming into power, should make a saving of less than one-half that amount, or, putting it in round figures, four million dollars per annum. I shall be very much disappointed, indeed, if the Liberal Government, which is soon to come into power, does not make a saving of $4,000,000 per annum on the expenditure. The Minister of Railways says that practically there are no controllable items. The uncontrollable items are five in number: Interest on the public debt, charges of management, sinking fund, pensions, subsidies to provinces. All the other expenditures of the Government are controllable, the expenditure for public works, for railways and canals and for other departments. It would be better if the expenditures on certain departments, such as civil government and legislation were reduced, because they can be largely reduced without doing any damage to the public service; but they are all controllable, and among them it is

very easy for a capable and economical government, which we shall soon have in this country, to make a moderate saving of $4,000,000 out of $8,911,173, which hon. gentlemen have unduly incurred. The reason that hon. gentlemen opposite are not ready to grapple with this question is because they are incapable. The country has come to the conclusion that the Government of the day are incapable to meet the problems forced on them in Canada's interest. The hon. gentleman who preceded me dealt with the question of the National Policy, and I shall leave that to be dealt with by the hon. gentleman who will follow me. I have only a word or two to say with respect to the charge he made, and which has been made by others that the policy of the Liberal party had been changed and had become a policy of free trade. I wish to say no to that statement. I say the policy of the Liberal party, so far as the tariff is concerned, is the policy of Canada as it was in the Conservative period from 1868 to 1873, and as it was in the Liberal period from 1874 to 1878. I have said myself to the people of the North-west Territories that the Liberal party have made a pledge that when they came into power every vestige of protection would disappear from the tariff. I meant by that statement that I understood the Liberal leaders meant that where there is an item of taxation, the effect of which is protective only, or so far as it is protective only, that is to exclude exports——

Mr. FOSTER. Prohibitive.

Mr. MARTIN. That such would be done away.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you need not do away with much.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course we would have to raise our revenue, as in previous years. It is not proposed by the Liberal party to change the fiscal system in Canada——

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN—as it was understood to prevail from 1868 to 1878. They do not intend that. They intend to raise a revenue by a tariff for revenue, and where a tariff for revenue has the effect of giving protection to those industries which are suited to Canada, all right. Reference was made by the Minister of Militia to an old speech delivered by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in which he stated it was his policy to encourage industries natural to this country. That is still the policy of the Liberal party.

Mr. FOSTER. Robbers.

Mr. MARTIN. No, it is no robbery, and no plunder for the Government to take from the people that money which is necessary to carry on the affairs of the Government; but it is robbery, it is plunder for hon. gentlemen to put an item in the tariff which brings no money into the treasury, but places large sums in the pockets of millionaires, sugar millionaires, cotton millionaires, whom the hon. gentleman's policy has created.

Mr. LISTER. Who are the Government of the country, in fact.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman referred to the visit made by Mr. Laurier to Winnipeg last fall and the meetings held there, and he declared that Mr. Laurier stated that the policy of the Liberal party was free trade as it was in England. The hon. leader of the Opposition made no such statement. What my hon. friend did was to outline the policy as I have attempted to lay it down, and what he did point out was, that while as regards a fiscal policy the Conservative party look for their inspiration to Washington and to the American Republic to the south of us, the Liberal party look for their inspiration to grand old England.

Mr. DAVIN. I will point out to the hon. gentleman that in the Winnipeg "Free Press" of 5th September last, he will find a verbatim report of the speech, in which Mr. Laurier says that his policy is free trade as they have it in England.

Mr. MARTIN. I heard Mr. Laurier speak. I do not know whether the House will call it a matter of taste or not, but I really think if I had been Finance Minister I would not have alluded to Mr. Laurier's visit to Winnipeg. The Finance Minister, accompanied by the Minister of Agriculture, came to Winnipeg—a Minister of the Crown, and one of its leading Ministers came to the city, which had uninterruptedly sent supporters of his Government to this House since 1879. The hon. gentleman came there with everything in his favour, for the purpose of holding a public meeting to glorify himself and his Administration. He had a torch-light procession, and he held a meeting in a large hall, and I am within the mark when I say that never at any time were there present to listen to the words of wisdom and eloquence of that gentleman more than 300 or 400 people. Mr. Laurier, sitting in the cool shades of Opposition, came to Winnipeg and held a meeting there in the large rink, which is capable of holding 3,000 or 4,000 people. At half-past seven, the meeting having been called for eight o'clock, it was not possible to get a seat, and there were more people when the meeting was ready to commence, hanging on the roof to listen to the words of wisdom that fell from that great statesman, than there were to listen to the Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. What has that to do with what he said ?

Mr. MARTIN. What he said was merely following out what he has been saying to the people of this House and throughout the country for years. The people came to hear Mr. Laurier because they had heard of him, because they knew he was the leader of the great Liberal party. While I charge hon. gentlemen opposite with being incapable to deal with the questions of the day, I have the greatest pride in sitting here, a member of this House and a member of the Liberal party which has at its head a gentleman who is capable in every sense of the word of filling the great office which is waiting for him so soon as hon. gentlemen opposite give the word. It is impossible, since the Hon. Mr. Laurier became the leader of the Opposition in this House to point to one single mistake that he has made as leader. He has the unqualified support of every single man who sits behind him in this House. He is a man, Sir, who during all these years has been able to lead so successfully his party——

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). To defeat.

Mr. MARTIN. No, never to defeat.

Mr. LISTER. You squander the public funds.

Mr. FOSTER. Down in Quebec.

Mr. MARTIN. No, never defeat, but to real success. The man who is capable of leading in such splendid style, his party in opposition, proves himself possessed of those qualities of head and heart which fit him for the position of Premier of this Canada of ours, a position in which the Liberal party, aided by the votes of the independent electors of the country, propose to place him at an early moment, just so soon as hon. gentlemen opposite give the word.

Mr. TAYLOR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not notice the leader of the Opposition here, but I suppose the arrangement that was practically made, that after Friday the debate upon the Budget, as it is called, is to go on from day to day, holds, and that we may expect to go on with this on Monday?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course no notice having been given, it would be possible, I suppose, for hon. gentlemen to object, but we will try to accommodate you.

Mr. FOSTER. No notice was given, because of the conversation we had across the floor. In accordance with that, Mr. Speaker, I move

That the adjourned debate on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means be made the first Order of the Day on Monday next and subsequent days, until concluded, after questions to be put by members.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th May, 1894.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 75) to revise and amend the Act respecting the Maitland and Cobourg Canal Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

BALLOT PAPERS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill is introduced in consequence of the decision of the judge in the Quebec election case. The House will remember that last session a Bill was passed amending the Dominion Elections Act, and providing that a uniform ballot should be introduced and used in all elections. The merit of this uniform ballot consisted in having a white disk on a black ground, in which it was proposed the voter would place his mark, so that there could be no mistake that he would place it opposite the name of the candidate he desired to vote for. It was contended for this new ballot paper that, with ordinary intelligence, it would be impossible for men to go astray at all. The Act provided that the voter should put his mark in that white portion or section opposite that within which the name of the candidate was placed, but some 26 or 27 voters, instead of placing their mark in the disk, placed their mark in the white space or division under the name, and the judge held on the recount that that was a sufficient mark. Hon. gentlemen will see that that decision practically defeats the object of the Bill, which was to prevent the mark being placed in such a way that an outsider would know, on examination of the voters' ticket afterwards, who placed it there. The Bill which I now ask leave to introduce amends the present Act, and provides that the ballot shall have the mark only on the white disk, and not elsewhere, opposite the

name of the candidate for whom the voter seeks to vote.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask whether the Government have official information of Mr. Bond having left Newfoundland to visit Ottawa to confer with the Government on the subject-matter of confederation, and if so, whether the hon. gentleman knows at whose request he is coming ?

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to say that the Government have no official information of the coming of Mr. Bond.

IN COMMITTEE—READINGS.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Sir Donald Smith.)

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Deschênes Bridge Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Tésmiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Camp Harmony Angling Club.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 72) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Calgary and Lethbridge Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

POWDER MAGAZINE, BEACON HILL, VICTORIA, B. C.

Mr. PRIOR asked, Has the Government handed over the powder magazine on Beacon Hill, Victoria, B.C., to the Imperial authorities, or are they still responsible for the delay in removing it ? If still responsible, why have they not removed it before this ?

Mr. DICKEY. The Home Government has not handed over the powder magazine on Beacon Hill, Victoria, B.C., to the Imperial authorities, but is still responsible for keeping powder therein. The removal of powder has not taken place in consequence of the powder magazines in the neighbourhood being in the charge of the Imperial authorities, and of the only magazine in which the accommodation is available, namely, that at the artillery barracks, being considered by those authorities to be dangerous for the storage of such powders.

THE CASE OF MR. T. J. WATTERS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, 1. What were the facts which constituted the offence or offences for which Mr. T. J. Watters, the late Assistant Commissioner of Customs, was prosecuted ? 2. What punishment was awarded Mr. Watters by the magistrate before whom he was tried ? 3. Was the punishment awarded with the concurrence or on the advice or at the suggestion of the Minister of Justice ?

Mr. CURRAN. 1. The facts as alleged by the Crown were as follows :—In the Wabash Railway case, Watters received from the Wabash Railway Company, as Assistant Commissioner of Customs, six drafts amounting in all to the sum of $543 ; which, instead of depositing at once in the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Receiver General to the proper Customs account, he converted to his own use.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman give the date ?

Mr. CURRAN. Not in this case. The dates are given in the following :—In the Blackwood case, Watters had a departmental cheque for $750, dated 2nd August, 1893, made to his own order, on pretense that it was all required to pay the expenses of customs officer Blackwood to England on official business. This cheque Watters deposited to his own credit ; out of this sum he paid Blackwood $500. On Blackwood's return from England he refunded Watters $153.95 out of the $500. Watters kept the $250 from the 2nd August, 1893, and the $153.95 from the 20th of September of the same year until the 21st September, 1894, when on that day, after an interval of about fourteen months, he deposited the $403.95 to the credit of the Receiver General. In the Durafort case, Watters on the 10th August, 1894, received $214.16, money of the Government, which he converted to his own use, and subsequently on the 22nd of August, 1894, he deposited an equivalent amount to the credit of the Receiver General, which deposit was in part made up of cheques which he had received as a departmental officer from the Wabash Railway and Main Central Railway, and which latter cheques should have been deposited to their proper account. The Maine Central Railway case was similar to the Wabash Railway case. Watters received five cheques of $25 each, which he converted to his own use. In the Grand Trunk Railway case, Watters received $80 from the Grand Trunk Railway Company and converted it to his own use. In the Watson case, an advance of $25 was made by the Customs Department to officer J. A. Watson, to meet certain travelling expenses. This amount was subsequently paid over to Watters, who, instead of depositing it to the credit of the Receiver General, converted the same to

his own use. 2. Mr. Watters having made restitution, on a plea of guilty, was sentenced to one year's imprisonment in the county jail, without hard labour. 3. The Minister of Justice, acting on the advice of counsel, intimated, through him, that he considered the ends of justice would be satisfied by the punishment afterwards imposed.

DEPTH OF WATER IN CANALS.

Mr. DENISON (for Mr. Cockburn) asked, In view of the fact that at an expense of $20,000,000 an open channel 160 feet wide at the bottom and at least 18 feet deep is being constructed at Chicago, which when opened will discharge over 10,000 cubic feet of water per second (being about 5 per cent of the amount now flowing through the Niagara River) and which will materially affect the level of our lakes and the depth of water in our canals and harbours; in view, also, of the fact that the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce has just petitioned the Secretary of War to investigate the matter at once, and that cities along the lower lakes are being aroused to a sense of the danger threatening their interests, is it the intention of the Government to take immediate steps to protect the interests of the Dominion?

Mr. HAGGART. I have directed an inquiry to be made as to what probable effect the channel proposed to be constructed at Chicago would have upon the harbours in Canada and on the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, and the navigation of the lakes. I am awaiting a reply before any steps are taken in the matter.

MAILS BY THE DOMINION LINE.

Mr. DENISON (for Mr. Cockburn) asked, Whether the "Labrador," of the Dominion Line, and the "Laurentian," of the Allan Line, both left Liverpool on the same day. The "Labrador" arrived in Quebec on Saturday at 5.40 p.m., while the "Laurentian," which carried the mails, arrived at the same place at 12.30 noon, Monday. The Dominion liner made the trip in 43 hours quicker than the "Laurentian," and to that extent were the mails late in reaching Toronto. Up till recently there was a sub-contract between the Dominion Line Company and the Allan's, by which the "Vancouver" and "Labrador" of the former line took the service both ways, as they were faster than any two other boats of the Allan Line. This sub-contract expired the other day. In view of these facts, and as the original contract was to run out the balance of this season, is it the intention of the Government to insist upon the two faster steamships of the Dominion Line being employed as formerly in carrying the mails, and if such is not their intention, will proper and immediate provision be made of an equally satisfactory character?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The mails were sent by the "Labrador" which sailed from Quebec yesterday. The department is now in correspondence with the Allan Line in reference to this important matter.

IMPORTS OF RAW AND REFINED SUGAR.

Mr. LEGRIS asked, What were the total quantities of raw sugar and refined sugar imported during the years 1893 and 1894 respectively?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The total quantity of raw sugar imported during the fiscal year 1892-93, was 245,781,700 pounds; refined sugar during the same period, 1,610,147 pounds. 2. Raw sugar imported during the fiscal year 1893-94, 303,796,812 pounds; refined sugar imported during the same period, 3,356,526 pounds.

STEAMSHIP CONTRACT WITH PICKFORD & BLACK.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Has the subsidy contract with Messrs. Pickford & Black for the running of the steamers "Duart Castle," "Taymouth Castle," "Alpha" and "Beta" between Halifax, St. John and ports in Cuba, Jamaica and the West Indies been renewed and continued or modified, or has any new contract been made with them or with any other persons for the above services or any of them? If so, when was the renewed or modified contract, or the new contract entered into? Has it been signed? What modifications or changes have been made, and what subsidy does the new or modified contract provide for, and for what length of time does it extend? Were tenders called before the new or modified contract was entered into? If not, why not?

Mr. IVES. The subsidy contract with Messrs. Pickford & Black for the running of the steamers "Duart Castle," "Taymouth Castle," "Alpha" and "Beta" between Halifax, St. John and ports in Cuba, Jamaica and the West Indies has been modified. A new contract has been made with them. A new contract has been entered into with them for a modified service, under date of the 5th of March last. The contract has been signed. The modified contract provides for the services between St. John, Halifax and Demerara, via and touching at different West India Islands, being continued monthly as heretofore. It provides for the continuance as heretofore of the services between Halifax and Jamaica. It does not provide for a continuance of the service between Halifax and Cuba as heretofore existing, but it does provide that the Jamaica service, upon notice being given to the contractors, shall be fortnightly instead

of monthly, with monthly calls at a port or ports in Cuba ; it also provides, upon similar notice being given, for the running of a service between Halifax and a port or ports in Hayti with the option of calling on the homeward voyage at a port or ports in the Island of Cuba, also between Halifax and port or ports in Porto Rico with the option of calling at port or ports in Cuba, or in lieu of this latter service a monthly service between St. John, N.B., via and calling at Halifax to a port or ports in Porto Rico, with the option of calling at a port or ports in Cuba. The subsidy provided for under the new contract is, for the Demarara service, at the rate of $5,000 each for 12 monthly trips during the year, and a further sum of $3,000 for one extra trip each year, if run for the monthly Jamaica service at the rate of $15,000 per annum ; if the Jamaica service is run semi-monthly and the other services added, the rate for all such combined services to be $35,000 per annum. The contract is for five years from the 1st July next. Tenders were not called for before the modified contract was entered into, for the reason that contractors who are familiar with the routes and ports to be touched at and who have their business connections established are more likely to make the enterprise a success and of advantage to Canada than new contractors would be. The contract further provides that the payment of subsidy as stipulated is subject to its being provided by vote of Parliament.

GOVERNMENT PENSIONS.

On the question,

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has the attention of the Government been called to the following article in the Peterborough "Examiner" ? If so, what action do they propose to take in the matter ?

PENSIONERS IN THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION—HEALTHY AND ROBUST MEN PENSIONERS ON THE PUBLIC BOUNTY.

It is a time-honoured policy of the British Government that the defenders of the country and the fighters of the battles of the Empire, who have served long terms, should be rewarded with pensions ; so there was no objection to the Canadian Government giving a pension to those who were injured in body or general health in the campaign in the North-west in 1885, so long as they were suffering from the consequences of those services, but it does seem a waste of the public funds that pension allowances should be continued after the subjects have been restored to vigorous health. In the Public Accounts for 1894 there appears a pension grant of $200.75 a year to Mr. Weir, of Keene, and of $91.25 to Chas. Guy, of Peterborough. It is well known that both of these men have completely recovered, one of them being noted locally for his unusual strength and vigour. There are hundreds who in that campaign served longer and endured more hardships, who had no such recognition of their services. The Government can't afford a few thousands to drill the volunteers whose services may be needed at any time, but they can devote large sums to bonusing volunteers who are in perfectly good health and able to earn their own living. It is such waste of public funds, repeated in a thousand different forms, that account for a deficit of nearly five million dollars, and the Government, instead of cutting off the source of waste, are crippling necessary public services to make up the leak and putting on extra taxes. That $200 a year should be paid to Mr. Weir is simply indefensible. The information is given that he is in normal health, and the only trouble that appears to afflict him is that he has grown chronically tired of waiting for the date of his quarterly instalments to come around. It is time that this and other numerous instances of the abuse of the pension and superannuation system should cease. One or two big leaks from the public chest would be promptly noticed, and could be promptly stopped, but the money oozing out in thousands of places, most insidiously, but not the less effectively, drains the public coffers and necessitates periodical trips to England for loans to replenish them. Mr. Foster's last loan of ten millions has already melted away and dropped into the grave of gigantic deficits. The individuals above referred to should in decency notify the Government that they have long ago recovered, and not wait for investigation, which will only result in their further humiliation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I submit to the House that this is a question which, under our rules, cannot properly be put. Rule 29 is as follows :—

Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs ; and to other members relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such members may be concerned: but in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same.

May lays down, as follows, the rule with regard to questions :—

The purpose of a question is to obtain information, and not to supply it to the House. A question may not contain statements of facts, unless they be necessary to make the question intelligible, and can be authenticated, nor should a question contain arguments, inferences, imputations, epithets, nor ironical expressions.

In the form in which this question appears on the Notice Paper, it seems to me not in accordance with the rules of Parliament, and, therefore, I think it should not be put.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the question.

OBSTRUCTION IN YAMASKA RIVER.

Mr. BRUNEAU (for Mr. Migneault) (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have caused to be removed that portion of the dam which was carried away in the spring of 1892, and which obstructed the channel of the Yamaska River, near its mouth ? If so, by whom, and how much was paid for the work ?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The obstruction referred to was removed in the course of October last by Mr. Moise Robidoux, who had the assistance of six men. Two of these were paid by the department, at a cost of six dollars to the Government.

PROPOSED MONUMENT AT LOUISBURG.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked, Whether the Government have granted to a certain society in the state of Massachusetts, permission to erect a monument at Louisburg, intended to commemorate the taking of that fortress from the French, in 1745, by Colonel Pepperell ?

Mr. DICKEY. No such permission has been given.

SPEECH OF THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Whether the Minister of Public Works is correctly reported in the Montreal "Herald" of the 8th inst., in the speech which he made on the occasion of the visit of the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec to the Monument Nationale, as having said: "It was here that they (the French Canadians) had once been conquered, but could boast that they had reconquered their country since the Queen was represented in the province by a French Canadian. As to himself, he could say that he had shown lately in the Federal Cabinet that the French Canadians were not only respected but that they could even command"? 2. If so, to what did the Minister of Public Works refer, in saying that "he had lately shown in the Federal Cabinet that the French Canadians were not only respected, but could even command"?

Mr. OUIMET. With due respect to the rules of the House, I question the right of the hon. gentleman to put such a question, which relates to no public business before this House; but, as my refusal to answer it might be given a wrong interpretation, I beg to give a short resumé in my own language of what I said on the occasion referred to: (Translation.) Referring to Canadians of French extraction and language in this country, and to the presence of one of our own nationality as Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, I must have said that there was good reason to congratulate ourselves upon the fact that after all we were still at home, and that we had reconquered our country; that we had cause to be proud to find that our nationality could command the respect of other nationalities in Quebec as well as in Ottawa.

Mr. LAURIER. There must be a good action for libel against the "Herald."

EMPLOYMENT OF HENRY SMITH, OF CHATHAM.

Mr. ALLAN asked, Whether Henry Smith, of Chatham, Ontario, is now in the employment of the Government, or has he been employed by them during the past year? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Henry Smith is not now in the employment of the Government, nor has he been employed by it during the past year.

POST OFFICE EXPENDITURE.

Mr. MARTIN (for Mr. Lister) asked, What has been the total Post Office expenditure for the nine months ending 31st March, 1895?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The total expenditure of the Post Office Department to the 31st March, 1895, from parliamentary appropriations, amounts to $2,719,775.17. The Post Office expenditure returns for the quarter ending 31st March, 1895, are not yet complete. It may be explained that the salaries of postmasters, not being in the Civil Service establishment, are paid out of the revenue collected at their offices, and are not voted by Parliament.

THE SAN JOSE SCALE PEST.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Whether the Government is aware of the existence, in the state of New York, and elsewhere in the United States, of a dangerous pest known as the San José scale, which infests the apple and other fruit trees, and which may be introduced into this country with the nursery stock now in course of importation? If so, what action does the Government propose to take?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Department of Agriculture are aware of the existence of the San José scale pest in certain of the United States, and they are considering what steps may be necessary, effectually to prevent its coming into Canada; but I may say that the best entomological opinion in the United States, as expressed, is that this pest is likely to be confined to the portion of the continent below the boundary between the United States and Canada. However, the department are alive to the necessity of protecting our fruit trees from it.

PROSECUTION OF EMMANUEL ST. LOUIS.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Has a prosecution been commenced against Emmanuel St. Louis, in connection with the frauds perpetrated in the construction of the work known as the "Curran Bridge"? 2 (a).

If so, before whom and for what offence ? (b). When was the information laid or the prosecution commenced ? (c). Has the prosecution been disposed of, and if not, why not ? (d). What are the dates on which the charge was heard or investigated ?

Mr. CURRAN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to say : 1. A prosecution has been commenced against Emmanuel St. Louis in connection with the frauds perpetrated in the construction of the work known as the Curran Bridge? 2. The prosecution was taken before M. C. Desnoyers, Esq., Judge of the Sessions of the Peace, for the city of Montreal, under the ordinary provisions with respect to preliminary investigations before magistrates, contained in part 44 Seq. of the Criminal Code. The offences charged against Emmanuel St. Louis are those of having obtained divers sums of money amounting in all to $144,874 by false pretenses with intent to defraud, and for having unlawfully destroyed his books, papers and writings, to wit, his time-books, cheques, bank-books, cash-books, journals, ledgers and balance sheets whilst Her Majesty the Queen was his creditor, with intent to defraud Her Majesty the Queen. (b). The information was laid on October 22nd, 1894. (c). The case is still pending before His Honour Mr. Justice Desnoyers, who is to render a decision on Monday, the 13th instant, at 9.30 a.m., as to whether there is sufficient evidence to call upon the accused to make the voluntary statement referred to in article 591 of the Criminal Code. The reason why the prosecution has not yet been disposed of, is owing to the very voluminous nature of the evidence taken, comprising 1,569 pages of type-written matter, and the examination of a very large number of voluminous exhibits. (d). The first witnesses were examined in this case on the 9th November last ; when the case was adjourned until the 16th and subsequently to the 19th November. Witnesses were examined on the 19th, 21st, 26th and 28th November ; the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 18th, 19th and 21st of December ; the 9th, 10th, 11th, 14th, 16th, 21st, 22nd, 24th, 25th, 28th, 29th, 30th and 31st of January, 1895. On the 1st February an argument took place with respect to the admissability of certain evidence, the judgement on which was only given on the 8th February, when the case was adjourned to the 15th February to enable the Crown to obtain certain documents which had gone astray. On the 15th February these documents were filed and the case for the Crown declared closed, and the defence applied for an adjournment of ten days, which was granted. On the 26th February the defence applied for a further delay, owing to the absence of Mr. McMaster, Q.C., and Mr. Geoffrion, Q.C., which was also granted. On the 5th March the defence contended that the voluntary statement required by article 591 of the Criminal Code could only be called for if the magistrate decided there was sufficient evidence to commit the accused, and consequently a delay of ten days was granted to allow the preparation of factums. On the 15th March, the Crown produced its factum, but Judge Desnoyers was absent owing to illness, and the case was adjourned until the 19th March. On the 19th March Judge Desnoyers was still absent through illness, but appeared later in the day and the defence got delay until the 21st March to file their factums. On the 21st March the factums were filed, and, on the application of the accused, a delay was granted until the 25th to enable each party to reply to the other's factum. On the 25th March the Crown filed its factum, but the defence again applied for further delay, which was granted. Since that time the judge has been studying the case, and on the 7th May, instant, he recalled two witnesses, J. Villeneuve and J. A. Michaud. All the applications for adjournments since the 15th February have been strenuously opposed by the Crown, and the cause of the delays at the commencement of the trial was that it took considerable time to gather together the different documents necessary to proceed with the case, and more particularly that certain pay-lists which had been forwarded from Ottawa, to Mr. Hall, the Crown Attorney, were, through an error of the Express Company, delivered to Judge Hall at Sherbrooke.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Whether the Government regard the Order in Council with respect to the grant to the Hudson Bay Railway Company as creating any contractual relationship between the Government and the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company ? 2. Is the Government aware that the company is in ostentatious reliance upon the Order in Council, proceeding with the work of construction and entering into contract for the same ? 3. If the Government does not deem the Order in Council authority upon which the company have a right to rely in the prosecution of the work of construction, is the Government taking any means to intimate to the company that that is their view ? 4. What is meant by the letter of the Minister of Railways to the company, of the 27th April, saying that the Government would not "recognize" the new contractors to whom the company have let or are letting the work ? (a). Is it that the Government passed the Order in Council on the understanding that the company will keep faith with the original contractors ?—or (b). That the Government has no concern or interest in whom the company may contract with ?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman refers to the Order in Council other than

the one under which in 1890-91 the Government entered into the contract with the Hudson Bay Railway, as there is no such company but the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company, I have to answer no. As to the second question, no. As to the third question, the Government has had no communication with the company since the Order in Council, other than the letter of the 27th April last. As to the fourth question, the letter explains itself.

CULLERS' OFFICE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What revenue has been received from the Cullers Office at Montreal and Quebec, respectively, during the last five years ? What has been the cost of maintaining these offices during the same period, including all charges for staff and cullers, &c. ? Has the lumber trade asked for the proposed changes in the system of inspection ? What are the proposed changes ? What will be the duties of the chief inspector under the proposed change, and what salary will he receive ? Will it be necessary to maintain an office for the chief inspector, and will he be required to inspect any timber or deals ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In answer to the first question, the following revenue has been received :—

	Montreal.	Quebec.
1889-90	$ 631 63	$17,497 85
1890-91	300 50	16,432 64
1891-92	149 82	14,160 15
1892-93	175 99	10,661 33
1893-94	116 47	11,756 57
	$3,374 41	$70,508 54

2. The cost of maintenance has been as follows :—

1889-90	$2,336 57	$27,234 22
1890-91	2,269 34	25,334 27
1891-92	1,335 55	23,293 85
1892-93	1,949 82	24,187 29
1893-94	1,624 79	22,579 61
	$9,516 07	$122,639 24

The printing and stationery expenses, which are not divided, have all been charged to Quebec. 3. Those interested in the square timber trade in Quebec, hearing that it was intended to abolish the Cullers' Office, urged the Government to make some provision whereby the machinery established by the Cullers' Act would not be wholly destroyed. After several discussions, Mr. Commissioner Miall suggested the remodelling of the Act upon the principle of the General Inspection Act, i.e. the Act under which the inspection of staples (wheat, flour, fish, &c.) is carried out. This involves the principles of optional inspection and the payment of the whole expenses of inspection by the particular trade interested therein. Other portions of the trade contend that these objects may be attained by the reduction in the staff, and possibly a small increase in the cullers' fee, without any radical change in the existing law. The Government is now considering the views of either of these parties, but has not yet fully determined which course to adopt. If the latter view prevails the supervisor will continue at the present salary, but his staff both in the office and outside will be reduced, and his expenditure for the maintenance of his office will be materially reduced, so that the whole outlay will not exceed the revenue derived therefrom (except as regards the annuities to retired cullers).

REVISING OFFICERS—LAPRAIRIE.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Monet) asked, Why has the Government appointed two revising officers to make the electoral lists for the county of Laprairie ? Were the two revising officers for this county appointed on the same date, and if not, on what date were they respectively appointed since the union of the two counties, Laprairie and Napierville ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The counties of Laprairie and Napierville having been united, a new constituency was formed the same as Richmond and Wolfe and Drummond and Arthabaska. They were appointed on the same day.

LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. MONET asked, At whose request was Charles Bédard, notary, of St. Rémi, appointed jointly with Mr. Roberge, of Napierville ? Were the electoral lists of one part of the county of Laprairie and Napierville (those made by Charles Bédard) printed at the Government Printing Bureau, or at the office of "La Minerve," of Montreal, in 1894 ? How much has the Government paid to the newspaper "La Minerve," of Montreal, for printing the electoral lists of the county of Napierville from 1886 to this date ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. With reference to the first part of the question, as all the papers in regard to the appointment of this gentleman as revising officer are to be moved for by Mr. Monet, it would perhaps be better to have the whole correspondence in that connection before answering. As to the next question, the lists referred to were printed in the Government Printing Bureau, and, I am informed, no sums have been paid to "La Minerve" since the revision of 1886.

CHAMBLY AND VERCHERES—REVISING OFFICER.

Mr. MONET asked, Have two revising officers been appointed for the counties of Chambly and Verchères, and for St. Jean

and Iberville since the union of the counties in 1892 ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

NORTH CAPE, P.E.I.—WHISTLING BUOY.

Mr. PERRY asked. Has the fog-whistle at the North Cape, P.E.I., been replaced ? If so, who had the contract ? Were tenders asked for, and what was the cost of replacing it ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There has never been what is usually termed a fog-whistle at North Cape, P.E.I. An automatic whistling buoy was moored off the main reef at Cape North, about two miles from the lighthouse, in nine fathoms of water, in July last. The buoy broke from its moorings in November last and drifted ashore, where it was secured by a Government officer and placed beyond the reach of sea and ice. Instructions were given to have it replaced by the Dominion steamer "Stanley," when placing the other automatic whistling buoys on the Prince Edward Island coast this spring. No contract was given for replacing the buoy. This work is usually done by Dominion steamers and not by contract. No tenders were invited for replacing, and the cost will be included in the expenditure for maintenance of automatic buoys on the coast of Prince Edward Island.

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has a petition from the inhabitants of Miminegash, P.E.I., and vicinity been received by the Department of Public Works, asking for a further extension of said breakwater, with the view to improving the navigation in said harbour ?

Mr. OUIMET. A petition was received on the 3rd January, 1893, through Mr. Richard Hunt, from the stage-holders of Miminegash asking that the new works being executed at that place be extended about 100 feet further in. Upon this petition, the chief engineer reported that the extension petitioned for would, no doubt improve the harbour of Miminegash ; but the chief engineer did not consider that the work was necessary at the time and stated that it was more important to place the existing works in a good state of repair. For that purpose the sum of $500 was voted by Parliament at its session of 1894, and expended on the most urgent repairs to said works.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries notified the wharfinger at Tignish breakwater to make a return to the department of the amount of dues collected at said harbour during the year 1894 ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes. The agent of the department at Charlottetown has also been directed to inquire into this matter, and report fully to the department.

MAILS FROM ASHCROFT TO CARIBOO, B. C.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, What has been the amount of the mail subsidy paid to the British Columbia Express Company for carrying the mails from Ashcroft to Cariboo for the following periods :—1. From the time of confederation till the Canadian Pacific Railway was opened ? 2. From the time the Canadian Pacific Railway left the mails at Ashcroft to the present time ? 3. The amount of the subsidy they receive at the present time ? 4. The extra amount they are paid for carrying the mails into Lillooet at the present time, also from the time this service was started ? 5. Has a tender for this service ever been asked for from the public generally ? How are the mail contracts for carrying the mails into West and East Kootenay awarded, and what amount is paid for the service ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The figures for the first period are as follows :—1873, $23,784.67 ; 1874-78 (inclusive), $22,000.00 ; 1879, $27,000.00 ; 1880, $13,333.34 ; 1881-83 (inclusive), $20,000.00 ; 1884, $23,666.66 ; 1885, $24,450.00. For the second period, from the time the Canadian Pacific Railway left the mails at Ashcroft to the present time the figures are :—1886, $26,549.00 ; 1879-90 (inclusive), $24,000.00 ; 1891, $23,541.66 ; 1892, $23,500.00 ; 1893, $23,958.34 ; 1894, $24,000.00. The amount of the subsidy received at present is $24,000 per annum. The additional weekly service to Lillooet was started on the 1st July, 1892, at the rate of $250 per annum. The amounts paid have been embodied in the foregoing statement of annual payments. The answer to the fifth part of the question is, no. This information cannot be given unless the points between which mails are carried are specified.

PIG IRON IMPORTS.

Mr. LAURIER asked, At what price was pig-iron coming from the state of Alabama and the United States generally entered at the Custom-house of Toronto during the months of February and March last ?

Mr. WALLACE. No pig-iron was imported from the state of Alabama into the port of Toronto during the months of February and March last. The average invoice price of pig-iron imported from the United States during those months was $10.75 per long ton.

J. A. CHARLEBOIS' CLAIM.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the claim of J. A. Charlebois for balance of account for the construction of the Langevin Block been settled? If so, when, and on what conditions?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

WRECK OF THE "SAN PEDRO."

Mr. PRIOR asked, Is it the intention of the Government to cause the removal of the wreck of the "San Pedro" from Brotchie's Ledge, near Victoria Harbour, without further delay, and to erect a beacon at said point?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The owners of the wreck "San Pedro" are being communicated with, with a view to its removal and the immediate erection of a beacon at Victoria Harbour.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MASSON. Mr. Speaker, as is usual on all occasions of the Budget debate, the subjects that are dragged into the debate are many and varied. A good portion of the time is taken up in discussing subjects such as the relative bulk of trade in various periods, the balance of trade during these same periods, and rules affecting the fiscal policy. Perhaps never in this House have the issues raised by the speech of the Minister of Finance and the resolutions in amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) been more definitely confined to the fiscal policy of the Government. The line never was more clearly drawn between the two parties than it is drawn by the amendment proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the operative part of the amendment being that it is expedient that the existing tariff should be modified so that it may be made a tariff for revenue only, in contra-distinction to the policy of the Government, which, from 1879 up to the present time has been a protective policy, that is, one adjusted and arranged from time to time so as better to protect and promote the various industries of the country. In speaking of that protective policy, I have noticed that several members of this House have referred to it as purely a policy for protecting the manufacturers of the country. Such was not the case in the inception of the policy, such has not been the case during the existence of that policy in this country, such is not the policy as it is now supported by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. That policy extends to all industries actually carried on in this country, and to no industrial class have the advantages of protection been so far extended as to the agricultural class, the class which hon. gentlemen opposite, in their speeches, would lead the public to infer were entirely outside the range of that policy. It is only necessary to refer to the specific duty levied on nearly all the products of the farm to see that that class has received an ample and secure protection. It is only necessary to refer to the class of articles which agriculturists consume, to see that, so far as it can be done, and consistently with protecting other industries, the duties on those articles have been reduced to a minimum. Now, Sir, it is a matter of congratulation to notice that not only is the subject confined to the direct issue between free trade and protection, but that what the hon. gentlemen opposite embody in their present resolution, is common to all the schemes and resolutions they have presented to the House from 1879 down to the present time. There is one element that pervades all their schemes; it is to be found in commercial union, it is to be found in unrestricted reciprocity, it is to be found in the policy of free trade as we have it in England, it is to be found in the policy of absolute free trade, and that is, an absolute, a positive, an ever-present attack upon protection. We find in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite in various parts of the country, as well as in this House, that, wherever they present a scheme, the chief attack is aimed against the protection that the tariff affords; not to the general rate as being too high, not to the amount of money collected as being too great, but to the fact that, in adjusting the tariff, the Government are able not only to raise their revenue, but also to give a measure of protection to a number of industries. That protection is what they attack most vigorously, that protection is what their resolutions are all aimed at, it is a principle common to them all. This is the principle running through the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), whose remarks I shall more particularly deal with on the present occasion. He says that it is the policy of the Liberal party to remove all items in the tariff that afford protection, or, to use the language of the leader of the Opposition, several years ago, in one of his campaign speeches, "to abolish every vestige of protection." Of course, in connection with that scheme, some other policy must be put forth, and hon. gentlemen are not slow to set forth what it is. They would remove all the obstructions to trade, all the duties on articles of food and clothing and all others considered necessaries of life, in order, to use their own pet phrase, to make this a cheap country to live in. They would remove all these duties, and, in doing so, they would naturally begin by re-

moving the duties on all farm products. Nearly all the products of the farm are necessary for food, are necessaries of life. They would remove the duty from grains, from meats, and other articles on which a duty was put at first, and has lately been increased; they would do this for the purpose of improving the position of the farmers. Now, as we claimed in the outset, and as we claim to-day, the effect of these duties has been relatively to enhance the prices of farm produce as compared with those prices in other markets of the world. The policy, therefore, which hon. gentlemen opposite are advocating would bear more grievously upon the agricultural classes. It would remove protection from the staple products of farmers, out of which they expect to get their cash; nor would it better their position in any way that I can see, to reduce the duties on manufactured goods. This policy is a policy not only for the manufacturers, but also for the farmers, and it is a policy framed to increase the prosperity of those engaged in all classes of industry. It is bounded by no hard and fast rules of tariff, but, as was stated at the time of its introduction, and as has been stated from time to time as changes have been made in it, it is elastic, and part of the policy is that it shall be adjusted as the exigencies of the country, and the requirements of trade demand. As to the wisdom of readjustment, it is clear that each change, whether it be slight or great, is a fair subject for discussion, and, during last session, we had that subject entered into in detail, to a far greater extent, perhaps, than it is necessary on this occasion to do. We have had, however, by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) a direct attack made upon the Minister of Finance, and upon the changes made last year, and the changes proposed this year, the assumption being that the Minister of Finance misstated his case, when he said that the changes in the tariff involved a reduction in taxation, that it was removing burdens from the people, and lowering the average of taxation. The hon. member for Winnipeg put himself forward as an authority in making the statement that the changes in the tariff, instead of decreasing the burdens on the people, increased those burdens. There are many ways in which this subject has to be looked at before a true and accurate understanding can be arrived at. The hon. gentleman chose to view it from the standpoint of the percentage of taxation on the total importations. He deducted from the total importations the coin and bullion. To that I take no exception. He deducted, I say, the coin and bullion from the total importations of free and dutiable goods, and he compared the twelve months of 1893-94 with nine months of 1894-95. It must have been obvious to hon. gentlemen that it was hardly fair, and by no means convincing, to compare nine months with twelve months, because no one could have gone over the figures without noticing that, during different quarters of the year the imports, both of free and dutiable goods changed very materially, and that three quarters of the year could not afford any fair comparison as to the trade done during twelve months. Had the hon. gentleman wished to deal fairly with the House and the country, he could easily have obtained the returns for the last twelve months, and have compared them quarter by quarter. As the hon. gentleman did not choose to do that, I propose giving to the House the result, quarter by quarter, of the last twelve months, as compared with the previous twelve months. This does not exactly coincide with the financial year, but it will furnish a much more fair comparison than that which the hon. gentleman advanced. If the hon. gentleman had taken the corresponding quarter, that ending 30th June, 1893, and compared it with the quarter ending 30th June, 1894, he would have found that for the former quarter the value of dutiable goods imported was $17,625,059, that of free goods imported, $15,917,618, making a total of $33,540,677, on which duties collected were, $5,263,529. This gives for the dutiable goods a ratio of taxation of 29·86, and on the total, 15·66. For the corresponding quarter of 1894 we find the importations of dutiable goods to be of the value of $14,127,187; of free goods, $12,596,057; making a total of $26,723,244, on which the duty collected was $4,077,034, giving a percentage of taxation on dutiable goods of 28·86, and on the total imports of 15·25. For the following quarter, ending 30th September, 1893, the value of the dutiable goods was $19,089,223; free goods, $15,172,502; giving a total of $34,261,725, on which a total duty was collected of $5,738,545, being a percentage on the dutiable goods of 30·06, and on the total imports of 16·75. For the corresponding quarter of 1894, the value of the dutiable goods was $15,388,701; of the free goods, $15,391,246, making a total of $30,679,947, the total duties collected being $4,608,250, being a percentage on the dutiable goods of 29·94, and on the total imports of 15·02. For the quarter ending 31st December, 1893, the importations of dutiable goods were at the value of $13,765,495; of free goods, $12,875,842, making a total of $26,632,337. The duties collected were $4,460,018, making a percentage upon the dutiable goods of 32·42 per cent, and on the total importation, of 16·74 per cent. For the corresponding quarter of this year the dutiable goods amounted to $12,741,695; the free goods, $10,833,805 and the total to $23,557,500; the duties collected, $4,092,096, making the duty on dutiable goods, 32·12 per cent, and upon the total importations, 17·35 per cent. For the quarter ending 31st March, 1894, the duti-

able goods amounted to $12,741,695 ; the free goods amounted to $9,502,631 ; total importations, $25,303,641 ; the duty collected, $5,004,300 ; making the duty on the dutiable goods, 32·30 per cent, and on the total importations, 20·17 per cent. For the corresponding quarter of this year, we have the dutiable goods amounting to $14,932,425 ; the free goods, to $8,941,680 ; total importations, $23,874,105 ; the duties collected amounted to $4,577,818, making the percentage on dutiable goods, 30·65, and on the total importations, 19·17 per cent.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT showing the value of goods entered for consumption for the years beginning on 1st April, 1893, and 1st April, 1894, and ending on the 31st March, 1894 and 1895, respectively.

	1893-94. ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION.				Equivalent ad val. rate.
	Dutiable.	Free.	Total.	Duty collected.	
	$	$	$	$	
Quarter ending 30th June	17,625,059	15,917,618	33,540,677	5,263,529	29·86 15·66
Quarter ending 30th September	19,089,223	15,172,502	34,261,725	5,738,545	30·06 16·75
Quarter ending 31st December	13,765,495	12,875,842	26,632,337	4,460,018	32·42 16·74
Quarter ending 31st March	15,801,010	9,502,631	25,303,641	5,104,300	32·30 20·17
Total for year ending 31st March	66,269,787	53,468,593	119,738,380	20,566,392	31·03 17·17
	1894-95.				
Quarter ending 30th June	14,127,187	12,596,057	26,723,244	4,077,034	28·86 15·25
Quarter ending 30th September	15,388,701	15,391,246	30,679,947	4,608,250	29·94 15·02
Quarter ending 31st December	12,741.695	10,833,805	23,575,500	4,092,096	32·12 17·35
Quarter ending 31st March	14,932,425	8,941,680	23,874,105	4,577,818	30·65 19·17
Total for year ending 31st March	57,190,008	47,762,788	104,852.796	17,355,198	30·34 16·55

Now, I give these figures, calculated by the quarters, for the purpose of showing how varied are the importations in the different quarters. In some quarters of the year the free goods exceed the dutiable goods, and in others, the dutiable goods largely exceed the free goods, and so on. It is absolutely unfair to compare the nine months of the year with the twelve months. The hon. gentleman says that by that comparison the duty has been increased, because the ratio in one would be 17·94, as against 17·76, or an increase of ·18 per cent. Well, if the hon. gentleman had taken the nine months of one year, and compared with the nine months of the other, he would have found that the ratio was turned around the other way, and that, instead of having to place 17·94 as against 17·76, we would have had 18·45 as against 17·94, making the difference the other way much more material. I do not wish to occupy much of the time of the House in dealing with figures. I know that figures are tedious, and I have only give them thus far for the purpose of showing the fallacy of the premises set forth by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin). It can never be taken as an authority that the percentage on importation has anything to do with the amount of taxation that is placed upon the people, for it must always be borne in mind that all duties are not taxation. It is quite clear and must be admitted by everybody that where the duty has the effect of protecting an industry, so that that industry flourishes

within a country; that in almost every case, wherever the industry may be said to be flourishing, instead of increasing the price of the article to the consumer, it decreases it. It may be taken as acknowledged that it is only where the protection in some respects fails to protect that it increases the price, or it may be even where it is doing good work as a protection, that owing to the weakness of the industry that is being protected that it fails to reduce the price. But, wherever an industry is so protected as to flourish and prosper, competition springs up between the various industries of the same class in the country, and competition immediately starts between the industries within the country, and the imports of the products of other industries from without. Therefore, competition is developed either in the one way or the other, or frequently in both ways, and competition is so developed that it decreases the price of the product. I hold in my hand a letter from the vice-president of one of the Portland cement companies that have been formed within the last few years. It is only a few years since every barrel of our Portland cement was imported from England, Germany, or France. It is only within the last five years that any attempt has been made to manufacture it in Canada. Experiments have been going on for many years, but these experiments only proved successful within a comparatively recent period. One of the earliest companies to start in this business, and one which, perhaps, has sunk more money than any other, in developing this industry and making experiments with regard to perfecting their product, is situated in my riding, and is called "The Owen Sound Portland Cement Company." I hold in my hand a letter from the vice-president of that company, who, I may inform you, Mr. Speaker, is a warm supporter, a life-long supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, a free trader for many years. I think that what he says as to the effect of protection upon the industry that he is particularly connected with, is worth reading to this House. The letter is not sent here for any purpose it would serve in debate. It is written, asking for concessions as regards duties imposed upon the material that enters in their manufacturing, and, incidentally, the following expression is used :—

I would also mention just here, that the protection that this industry has received in the past has been the means of lowering the price of cement to the purchaser in this country, and were that protection to be removed, there is not the slightest doubt but that our factories would be closed, and the few importers that are in the business would again run up the price.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) to be, that the competition reduces the price right down to as low as it would be as if it were imported from abroad? Does he say that competition has that effect?

Mr. MASSON. Competition, in many cases, has more than that effect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then why does the hon. gentleman keep the tariff on, after that?

Mr. MASSON. The question of the hon. gentleman is so easy to answer, and has been answered so many times in this House that it is almost unnecessary to repeat the answer, but, to please him, I will answer it again. The letter that I have quoted from answers his question. If protection were removed, these industries would be wiped out by the stronger industries abroad. There would be no trouble in a short time flooding and glutting the market with foreign product to such an extent that these struggling industries would be entirely choked out.

Mr. FORBES. Infants.

Mr. MASSON. Yes, the infant would be choked and strangled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But they have already choked themselves down to below what they could buy abroad at.

Mr. MASSON. Not at all. Not only in the case where the competition has reduced the price below what it was before, but, in many of these other cases, where the price is not below what it might be before, the removal of the elements of protection would undoubtedly have the effect of closing the doors of these factories, of throwing large numbers of these men out of employment, and of largely reducing the home market for the consumption of our farmers' products. Mr. Speaker, were it necessary to say anything further as to the unfairness of comparing a portion of a year with the whole year, or even one year with another, as showing where the burden of taxation rests, and on whose shoulders it rests; I might go into figures showing the large number of importations that, in the last two years, have varied very materially. However, I have selected only a few where the difference in the importation during the last two years, between the present and the previous years, amounts to 50 per cent for the first nine months of the year 1893-94, we find that $2,033,197 worth of silk was imported, and that for the corresponding months of the present year only $1,757,938 worth was imported. The importation of spirits in the nine months of 1893-94 amounted to $817,243, while in the corresponding months of this year they amounted to $599,983. In this and many other items there has been a great decrease in the importation; however, in others there has been an increase. In clothing, the importation in the former period amounted to $595,346 as against $715,550 in

the last nine months. In cloths, such as worsteds, woollens, coatings and such like, the increase has also been large, the amount in the nine months of 1893-94 being $1,435,880, while in the corresponding nine months of this year it has been $2,130,807. I have many other statements of the importations during these years, but I will not weary the House by reciting them. There is another view, showing that an increase or diminution of taxation does not always increase or decrease importations. We find, in comparing year with year, that after an increase of taxation there is frequently a larger importation, while at other times after a decrease we have a smaller importation. So that, in order to find out on whose shoulders the burden of taxation rests, or on what particular article it is collected, it is necessary to go over the items in detail. That certainly would be a laborious task, and the recital of the figures to this House, though perhaps interesting, would be very hard to follow. Such an application of the present tariff to the importations of the previous year would show that, instead of the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg being correct, that it meant an increase, there has really been a decrease of between half a million and three-quarters of a million dollars. It may be said that this does not correspond entirely with the promise of the Finance Minister when he stated that he anticipated a decrease of a million and a quarter. But it must be borne in mind that he was basing his expectation, not upon the importation of the previous year, but upon the importation of the coming year. But, Sir, it was not in connection with the comparison of the figures that the hon. gentleman made his most serious charge. His charge was that the Minister of Finance had misstated the facts to the House, that he had made mistakes in reference to these; and he broadly insinuated—I think that expression is none too strong—that the Minister of Finance had done so wittingly and wilfully. The first charge which the hon. gentleman makes in that respect he calls a little matter; he says, it is but a small one; but he makes it for the purpose of showing that the Minister of Finance was not perfectly fair. He refers to the statement made by the Minister of Finance in reference to a slight increase in the excise, and he says that if the hon. Minister had stated the matter fairly, he would have shown a decrease instead of an increase. Now, the hon. gentleman had before him in the unrevised "Hansard" a full statement of what the hon. Minister of Finance said. He had before him the table given by the Minister of Finance, showing that the duty collected was less than in the previous year. In columns side by side were various items —spirits, malt, cigars, cigarettes, tobacco and snuff—with statements of the quantities for each year, and the amount of duty collected, showing the increase or decrease in the amount of duty, as the case might be; and the hon. Finance Minister, after giving the table, explained it as follows:—

> The duty accrued, as will be seen, has declined somewhat, but sufficient has been received from methylated spirits to counteract this, and to give us, besides, the small increase before-mentioned of $13,725. The diminution of $50,840 on malt was due, of course, to the decrease in the duty on malt. Altogether, the excise shows a slight gain of $13,725, a gain arising from the profits upon the sale of methylated spirits, a branch of industry which is carried on under the supervision of the Excise Department.

Now, it is quite clear that when the hon. member for Winnipeg stated that the hon. Finance Minister had led the House to believe that there was an increase in the revenue derived from excise, he held back something, for he did not tell the House fairly and plainly that while there was a decrease in the duty collected, it was to the transactions in methylated spirits that the profit was due. Could anything have been fuller or franker than the hon. Minister's statement? But having made the allegation that the hon. Minister had concealed something, the hon. member, declaring himself to be absolutely fair, stated later on in his speech that the hon. Minister had referred to one side, and one side only of the ledger. I think that in that respect, the hon. member for Winnipeg must have been following some roughly-culled notes taken at the time, and had not referred to the "Hansard" report of that part of the hon. Minister's speech. It seems to me impossible that the hon. gentleman, reading that plain and detailed statement, showing a decrease in the one part and an increase in the other, could conclude that there was anything held back. After alleging neglect and insinuating something worse on the part of the Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Winnipeg treats us to a series of calculations based on an imaginary state of affairs. He goes on to show that supposing Mr. Mackenzie had imposed a duty of 17·13 per cent instead of a duty of 11·23, he would have had, instead of a deficit, a surplus of six million dollars and over. Does the hon. gentleman wish the House to believe that any one can, by raising the average of duty over the whole importation, increase or diminish at will the amount of the duty? Surely the hon. gentleman has made a greater study of political economy than to suppose any such thing. What would be the effect of taking the duties we charge now and placing them upon the importations during the regime of Mr. Mackenzie? Would the hon. gentleman, according to his system of tariff for revenue only, tax at the one average rate all the varied articles that we imported, or would he allow some of the articles to come in free and tax others higher? In what way would he adjust the increase in the average from 11·32 to 17·13 in order to get this larger

revenue? We will take some of the items that came in free, and the free admission of which was not a benefit but a detriment to the country. Take wheat and wheat flour amounting to $8,000,000 imported annually during that regime, and which came in direct competition with the products of our farmers. We filled our mills with these imported products long before our Canadian farmers had their wheat marketed or even threshed. So that the wheat which came in was not for the advantage of the people of Canada, but was a detriment. Would he place his 17·13 per cent upon that; and if he did, would it bring him any revenue? Why, there was only a specific duty equivalent to eight or ten per cent imposed, under the National Policy, on the value at the prices then ruling, and what was the effect? Instead of importing the wheat and wheat flour to the extent of eight or nine million dollars, we imported less than one million dollars worth. So that the hon. gentleman must well know that the placing of duties on certain articles would prevent their importation, and therefore he has no reason to say that on the imports during Mr. Mackenzie's regime he would have an increase of revenue as a matter of mathematical calculation, in proportion to the increased percentage on the total imports. The other products that came in, came in the same way—either free or nearly free. Take the other farm products such as pork, beef, and cattle, all these articles came in free, not for the benefit, but to the detriment of the country. Would the importation of these have continued if the duty of 17 per cent had been imposed? Not at all. Every one knows that the duty hardly amounts to that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman take the ground that the importation of breadstuffs and grain sent through our canals in transit from the western states to the European markets, and furnishing our canals with the business they were constructed to secure—does he suppose that trade was a detriment to the country?

Mr. MASSON. The hon. member for Winnipeg did not refer to the grain that passed through in transit. The grain imported for export passed through in bond. He was more practical, and took the figures of the importations entered for home consumption. I am dealing with that question.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend is aware that prior to the adoption of the National Policy grain was nominally entered for consumption. It did not pass through in bond, but came in and went through the country or remained in the country, as the case might be, for consumption. But the importations had the effect on the market of an importation for transit.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman will not say exactly that it was importation for transit. He must know that all our mills in Ontario of any size and with any pretensions to a wholesale trade received nearly all their supplies during the navigation season, from the United States. Our mills and storehouses were all filled with American grains before the Ontario farmers had theirs threshed.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it a disadvantage for the country to permit our mills to grind American wheat for export? If we had a surplus to export, did not that furnish our coopers and shippers and others with business?

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman had a record at one time as a strong protectionist, and occasionally argues in that line yet. Whenever anything touches his own interests, he is just as strong a protectionist as I am. I am quite willing to be catechised by the hon. gentleman. I do say it is a great advantage to have our mills supplied with wheat, if we had not the wheat in our own country to supply them. I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Trade and Navigation Returns for these years, and he will find that we exported bushel for bushel every year what we imported. So that we were under no necessity to receive American grain and crowd our own out and thus force our farmers to seek an export market while the home market was ready for them here. The result of our imports and exports of wheat showed that we were just producing about enough for our home consumption, and the placing of a tariff upon wheat for the protection of our farmers had the effect of keeping out the American product and causing our own to be consumed in Canada. If the hon. gentleman wishes to follow up that question thoroughly and see whether the farmers were in any way benefited by that or not, I would ask him to refer to the reports of various American markets and English markets in order to see our relative position to these markets before and after the imposition of the duty. He will find that while we had good prices for our wheat and other articles during the years of reciprocity, that we were not getting any thing like the English prices. We were 20 cents below the New York prices. But what took place within three years after the introduction of the National Policy? Instead of being 20 cents below New York, we rose to within 5 cents of New York, and of late years we have frequently been higher than New York. For the last five years our prices have been on a par with those of New York. But, Sir, that subject has been followed out in detail in this House, and, but for the question of the hon. gentleman, I would not have referred to it. I was proceeding to remark that the importation of pork, fresh meat and cattle figured very largely at that time, and these importations were to the detriment and not to the advantage

of the Canadian farmer. The absence of protection may have left this a cheaper country to live in. And to those living upon an assured income, and caring not for prosperity outside but only for what they could get with their small income, or large income as the case may be, this may have appeared an advantage. But to the person interested in the prosperity of the country, whether in trade, or in manufactures or in any other way, the improvement of the condition of the farming classes, which is directly promoted by the imposition of duties upon farm products, is most important. It is not by numbers alone that the buying power of the people is to be estimated. It is true that men, women and children must be fed and clothed and that number, therefore, is an element in consuming power. But the consuming power is regulated by the producing power, and, as you increase the prosperity of a class, whether agricultural, manufacturing or any other, you increase the purchasing power of that class, and much more than by increasing its numbers do you increase its utility to the commerce of the country. It is not through the number of customers a man has that his store flourishes so much as from the aggregate amount of their purchases. And if our farming classes are hard up, if their means are scanty, they are not of nearly the value to the commercial body that they would be if smaller in numbers and better provided with capital. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman through his various comparisons. I contend that it is impossible to make any comparison which would show what effect one tariff would have, calculating upon the importations under another tariff; for we know that a rearrangement of the tariff may decrease some imports, while it would have no effect in decreasing those in other lines. An article which cannot be produced in the country and which has become a necessary, or a luxury so akin to a necessary that it is used by a large proportion of the inhabitants of the country, is a fair subject for taxation, according to the hon. gentleman opposite. Any duty put upon such an article will respond to the theory advanced by the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), of an increase and a proportionate increase of revenue. But in the case of articles that can be produced in this country, that are even to a small degree produced in the country, the imposition of a duty may have the effect of largely reducing or almost prohibiting the importation. Therefore, as I said, it is only by a close comparison of imports item by item that it is possible to say what the effect of a tariff would be in producing revenue. I need not go into details on that matter, for the hon. gentleman himself told us that he took no stock in these things. He said there were many things to be considered in judging the prosperity of the country. As to large imports being an index of prosperity, these things are always governed from year to year, by supply and demand. For an instance, I will refer you to the item of sugar. The hon. gentleman gave the total importations at 310,000,000 of pounds. I find, on reference to the figures, that the amount was actually 307,000,000 pounds; either of these figures shows an immensely increased importation over the previous year, when the importation had been small. Why was it so? Had importers been delaying their importations with a view to the expected revision of the sugar duties? Whatever the reason was, it would require a person well versed in the trade to answer positively. But the fact remains, that the importation of sugar for the last year was abnormally high. Will the same importation continue his year? We would naturally expect it to be less, for an abnormally large importation one year would naturally lead to a reduced importation in the following year, the same conditions existing. But the hon. gentleman, although he says that he takes no stock in these things, although he says there are a great many things to consider, proceeds to apply his own deductions in three different ways. But having adopted three different ways of applying his tests, using figures which he has worked out, apparently with great care, he finds that they lead to three entirely different conclusions. But that does not stagger the hon. gentleman. They show a contradiction, it is true; they show that one test does not correspond with the other. But the hon. gentleman gets over all that difficulty by adding the three sums together and he says: There you have, I claim, the amount of money that this Government has taken directly from the people. Take the first item he gives, when he attempts to show what would have been received by the Mackenzie Government if the tariff enforced by the present Government had been in operation under the Mackenzie Administration. As I have said, he cannot possibly calculate on receiving that money, and if he did, he would have no right to add it to any other sum. Nor can he claim that under the Mackenzie tariff our importations would have been the same as they have been. We have removed the duty on some things, and their importation has increased immensely. For instance, the importations of tea have increased from 13,000,000 pounds to over 19,000,000 pounds free, besides a small quantity that pays duty; but the total importation under the Mackenzie regime, from year to year, was in the neighbourhood of 13,000,000 pounds. The total importation last year was some 23,000,000 pounds, of which nearly 20,000,000 pounds were direct importations and free. This article, along with many others show that he has no right to assume that if the Mackenzie tariff had remained in force the importations would have been identically the same. No person can for a moment contend they would have been so; they would have been entirely different; and, therefore, it is absurd, it is misleading, it is nonsensical, to apply the

importations under one tariff as a test of what the importations would have been under an entirely different tariff. But, after applying the Mackenzie tariff to the importations that have taken place since its removal, he runs up a long string of figures representing money that he claims has been taken from the pockets of the people. Then he takes the expenditure under the Mackenzie Administration, and increases that, and by a system of figuring, he swells that up also to an immense sum. In any one of those tests taken singly, we might suppose the hon. gentleman was in earnest, but no person can believe that the hon. gentleman is in earnest when he says, We will add them all together, and the amount will be the sum that the Minister of Finance has extracted from the pockets of the people. But the hon. gentleman made another attack upon the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance made some statements in reference to failures in the country. In speaking as to the prosperity of the country, he had used the test of the number of insolvencies that occurred during 1874 and 1875. The hon. member for Winnipeg waxes warm when he says that that was a most unfair comparison. Why did the hon. gentleman compare 1874 with 1875? Why, he says, in 1874 there was no Insolvency Act. An Insolvency Act was passed in 1875, and immediately hundreds of debtors in difficulty took advantage of it, and the amount of failures swelled from 7 millions to 28 million dollars. But, says the hon. member for Winnipeg, the Minister of Finance was making an unfair comparison, a comparison that he knew to be unfair; he was wilfully trying to mislead the House. The hon. gentleman dropped his attempt at insinuations, and came out with the broad allegation that the Minister of Finance had, in this respect, deliberately attempted to mislead the House. Now, as to the effects of the Insolvency Act, the hon. gentleman was only fanned into this wrath by his ignorance. That is the only excuse I can give him. I do not think the hon. gentleman would have waxed wrathy over that if he had known the fact, but being ignorant of the fact, he may be excused for getting wrathy. In 1864, an Insolvency Act was passed by Old Canada. That Act remained in force, with some few amendments, until 1869, when a material amendment was made. Prior to 1869, assignments were all voluntary; there was no such a thing under that Act as a compulsory liquidation. But, in 1869, compulsory liquidation was added to voluntary liquidation, and from 1869 to 1875, both measures were upon the statute-book. There were various amendments, but none of any importance. In 1874, the Act would have expired but for the passing of another Act, which extended its operations to the 1st January, 1875, and from that time until the close of the ensuing Parliament. In 1875, in the early part of the following Parliament, as the hon. gentleman stated, an Insolvency Act was passed, to come into force on the 1st September, 1875. That can hardly be said to be in the early part of the year. But the hon. gentleman was right in one respect. There was a certain portion of it which came into effect, for the Act wiped out all the old officers that had been appointed by the Conservative Government, and therefore their heads deserved to be cut off. Provision was made to wipe out all the liquidators and assignees that had existed under the Act of 1869. That portion of the Act came into force right away along with art procedure. Now, there was no change between these two years as between an insolvency law and no insolvency law. The Act of 1875 practically made no change in the working of the previous Act, except that it wiped out the voluntary assignment part of it. But with considerable experience in that matter, I can say that I never knew a debtor yet who found any difficulty in getting a friendly creditor to put him into liquidation when he wanted to go. So that, practically, the insolvent law of 1875 made no change in the conditions that existed previously. The hon. gentleman then proceeds to quote from a number of Speeches from the Throne to show that while surpluses existed under the present regime, the country was prosperous. Well, I am glad the hon. gentleman has been convinced that the country was prosperous, and that the country is prosperous still, notwithstanding all the sermons we have heard on blue ruin, the exodus, and other such subjects, year after year. I am glad the hon. gentleman is able to see that until, at least, the last two years, the country has been prosperous. But I would ask the hon. gentleman, before he leaves this subject, before it gets cold, to refer to some Speeches, from the Throne in the province of Quebec, in the province of Ontario, and in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for the last two years. It is only as concerns the last two years that there seems to be some doubt in the hon. gentleman's mind as to the prosperity of the country. If he will consult the Speeches from the Throne I have alluded to, I think he will find that of Ontario, for instance, uses language very similar to the language used in the Speech from the Throne at Ottawa, namely, that notwithstanding the depression that has swept over other countries, this country has remained prosperous, that we have had no financial crisis, and that the people, on the whole, are prosperous and happy. He will find in each of these speeches language that will, perhaps, convince him that in the two years concerning which he seems to have some doubt, there has still been an element of prosperity in this country that distinguishes it from other countries near us. The hon. gentleman said the depression struck the country in 1873, that it swept over the United States and then came here, and that the same

course is being followed now. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House and the country that when the depression of 1873 struck the United States we felt it instantaneously ; that while a crisis remained with them only six months, we had the depression for four or five years.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the depression did not continue in the United States ?

Mr. MASSON. It was a crisis there, and, of course, depression followed. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House or the country that the depression which commenced in 1892 in the United States reached its height in 1893, and that it was not until the present year, or within twelve months of the present time, that, notwithstanding the depression of the United States, there has been anything such as could be called a crisis in this country. In fact there has not been what may be called a financial crisis in Canada. Our trade must necessarily suffer from the proximity of a large country like the United States being in a state of depression. It is not, however, in the United States only that the depression reigns, but it prevails in other countries with which we have to deal, and consequently our foreign trade must greatly suffer, and depression in our foreign trade is naturally followed by depression in our interprovincial and home trade. These results it would be unreasonable for us so to suppose we can escape, but we can check. But where are the bank failures and failures of financial institutions in Canada, while such institutions by hundreds have been wrecked in the neighbouring republic ? The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) next dwelt on some abstract question as to the right of increasing the expenditure of a country, and the hon. gentleman laid it down as a Liberal doctrine that it was perfectly proper to increase the expenditure in proportion to the increased population. But the hon. gentleman laid it down as a high crime and misdemeanour to increase public expenditure at a greater ratio than the increase in population. Now, how would that rule work if applied to the hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario ? Has the population of Ontario increased in anything like the ratio of its increase of expenditure ? The hon. gentleman is convicting his own friends of high crime and misdemeanour, because they are entirely ignoring the question of population and revenue, and increasing expenditure year by year notwithstanding a decreasing revenue. How would that rule apply to the province of Nova Scotia ? The hon. gentleman must know that the population of that province has not materially increased and that there is no comparison between the ratio of increase in population and that of expenditure. That provincial government has also ignored the question, not only of increased population, but increased income. Their increase of expenditure bears no proportion to increase of population or to increase of revenue. I will not weary the House by referring to other provinces under the control of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I can safely say that in each and all of them the same results will be found, and that under the rule laid down by the hon. member for Winnipeg they have increased their expenditures far beyond legitimate bounds and have been guilty of high crime and misdemeanour by increasing the expenditure far beyond the proportionate increase of population. I will not mention the province of Quebec and the late Reform Government, because I observe that the mention of the name of the late Reform leader seems to be offensive to some hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman referred to savings banks. After having told the House that the deposits in savings banks afforded no criterion as regards a country's prosperity, the hon. gentleman went on to show that the country is not prospering as it did during the Mackenzie regime ; indeed he said the ratio of deposits had not increased since that time. It is a well-known fact in a small town or village there may be during prosperous years an increase of 1,500, which would be a very large percentage, and although it might remain prosperous for many years, that percentage would not be again reached. So that with small beginnings the percentage may run high, and as population enlarges the ratio of increase must diminish. That is the only answer I have to offer to the hon. gentleman's argument, that although the savings banks have gone on from year to year increasing their deposits, and a large increase has taken place, the ratio is not so great now as in former years, and does not, according to the hon. gentleman, afford the same evidence of prosperity. But the hon. gentleman, after entering into these details and arguments, came back to what, I suppose, is the main point of his speech, as it is the main point of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and as it may be expected to form the main point of every speech delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite, that is an attack on the National Policy, in the course of which, in plain words, the hon. gentleman said the effect of the National Policy has been to impoverish the people. What evidence does the hon. gentleman furnish of the people being impoverished ? Is it to be found in the increase in railways, in the number of miles travelled in the freight and passengers carried ? If those tests are to be applied, they show conclusively that the people have not become impoverished. Do increased deposits in the savings banks from year to year afford a test ? Then the result of the test does not correspond with

the hon. gentleman's statement, for the deposits show that the country is not impoverished. Does the fact that a large increase has taken place in the value of buildings, stock and implements on the farms show that our farmers are impoverished ? A great hue and cry has been raised on account of the depression in real estate in Ontario and the shrinkage in values that have taken place ; but grave as the shrinkage has been, it has been due to causes which are well known and must be recognized. The hon. gentleman said there was a time in Ontario when, if a farmer wished to sell his farm, there was abundant competition and many buyers, and the hon. member for South Oxford said that that time was past, that there were no longer any buyers. Why ? Because when farmers who have two or three sons wish to establish them on farms, they do no longer purchase expensive farms in Ontario, but in nine out of every ten cases send their sons to the North-west where farms may be purchased at low prices, and where $1,000 will go further in settling a young man than $5,000 in Ontario. Notwithstanding all the depression in real estate we have, according to the returns for Ontario, which have been accurately prepared by assessors and checked over, evidence that the reduction in value in real estate is more than compensated by the increase of the value of buildings, farm stock and implements. So far as I have been able to see and judge for myself in that respect, I believe that in most, if not in all, the other provinces, the same results would be found if we had the statistics to show it. But, says the hon. gentleman, it is not only in the depression of the value of real estate but in the falling off of trade that the Finance Minister has, by his silence on the question of the National Policy to admit that the National Policy has been a failure, because the foreign trade of this country has decreased. If that is an argument for the failure of a protective policy, what will the hon. gentleman say about the falling off of trade in England. Is that conclusive evidence that "free trade as we have it in England" is a failure ? If the falling off of trade in Canada is a proof that the protective policy is bad, then surely the falling off of trade in England would tell equally strongly against their free trade policy. Now, as a matter of fact, the trade in Canada has not fallen off in proportion as the trade in England has decreased. In the mother country, their trade has declined by millions of pounds, whereas, in ours we can reckon it by a few hundreds of thousands of dollars. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) says that he must have a tariff for revenue only, and I suppose he will also support the statement made by some of his leaders that he is in favour of "free trade as they have it in England." In his closing remarks, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) stated that the Finance Minister was in error in making his calculation upon the sums received as duty from sugar imported into this country last year. Well, as the Finance Minister has the details, the qualities of sugars imported, and all these matters at his disposal, there would be no difficulty for him in making an absolutely correct estimate. But the hon. gentleman objects to any estimate, and he objects to anything that is not figured out in detail. But yet in the comparison that he (Mr. Martin) made, he not only took one particular article, but he took the whole importation, and, without any classification, or without any averages to guide him, he sought to draw his deductions and present them to the House. Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize for taking up more of the time of the House than I expected to, but before resuming my seat, I wish to refer to some of the comparisons that have been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and I trust that I may do so with more justice and more fairness than those which were made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in speaking of the increase of trade in the country, selected the year 1874, and compared it with the year 1894, and he stated that our total trade in the former year was $217,000,000 odd, and in the latter year, $240,000,000 odd, which, he said, showed a total increase for twenty years of only $23,000,000. Now, I do not at all object to the comparison made, but I wish to call attention to the fact that when the hon. gentleman selected the year 1874, when the Liberals came into power, and compared it with last year, that he took merely an arbitrary period, and arranged for himself an arbitrary comparison. There is no particular reason that I can give why he should have selected the year 1874, unless it is that in that particular year, trade was higher than it was in subsequent years of the Mackenzie Administration. Why did not the hon. gentleman take the year 1878, or the year 1879, whichever year he will admit is the last that the Liberal Government is responsible for ? If he takes the year 1879 and compares it with the year 1894, he will find that, instead of the increase being only twenty-three and a half millions in twenty years, it was $87,544,204 in fifteen years. I call attention to this, Mr. Speaker, not for the purpose of finding fault with the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) taking the year 1874, but simply to remind the House that it was a very arbitrary comparison, and that there was no particular reason why that year should be taken. During the years that the Mackenzie Administration was in power the trade gradually decreased, until, in 1878, it had decreased to $172,405,454. In the year ending 30th June, 1879, and for which the tariff that was in force when hon.

gentlemen opposite were in power, is mainly responsible, our total trade had decreased to $153,455,685. If we want to make a comparison between the effect that one tariff policy has upon the trade of the country, as compared with the effect that our present tariff has upon trade, we are perfectly justified in taking the year 1894 when the trade was $240,999,889, and comparing it with the total trade for the year 1879. If we make this comparison, we find that in fifteen years there has been an increase in our total trade of $87,544,204, a very great difference, indeed, compared with the increase put forward by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am inclined to think that, in comparing the result of the two tariffs, no better test can be given than has been shown in the power of Canada to resist the period of depression which has visited countries abroad. The hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) referred at length to that question, and he wished to show that depression followed in the one case as in the other; but I ask the House to consider how, under the present tariff, this country withstood the recent financial depression? If there are any other reasons which tended to strengthen the country against this wave of depression, I think it would be well for hon. gentlemen opposite to mention them. I have no doubt that if they can find any reasons which will detract from the efficacy of the National Policy and the protective tariff they will be very glad, indeed, to discover them and let us hear about them. Personally, I consider that an investigation into the matter will prove that it is the tariff policy of this Government that has protected and preserved our industries, the agricultural industry included, and has maintained for us our home markets. By that means, and by that means only, were we enabled to withstand that tornado of financial disaster which has swept over the country to the south of us. But for the protection that our financial policy gave us, our farm products, cheap as they have been, would have been far cheaper, and the slackness of trade in our woollen, and other industries, marked though it has been, would have resulted in bringing those industries almost to a standstill, but for the protection afforded. That protection has been so equitably and wisely adjusted, that in almost every case we can say that while it is high enough to protect it does not increase the price to the consumer, and in nearly every case where the industry has been a few years established it has very much decreased the price to the consumer. By stimulating the industries of the country, it has brought about internal competition, and the second stage in the development of the protective system has already been reached in many of our manufactures; so that instead of competing with the importer, our manufacturers are now competing one with another until they are actually reducing the prices of goods below the prices at which they could be obtained abroad. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution, and in opposing the amendment thereto.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Masson) who has just taken his seat. I was aware when he got up that he was a protectionist; I am more than convinced, after he has sat down, that he is an ultra protectionist. He sought to prove at the beginning of his speech that protection was very largely in the interest of the farming community. It is evident from the statements he made that he is not a farmer himself—that he does not make his money on the farm, but behind the desk. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if he were a farmer under the National Policy he would not state that the National Policy had ever put a dollar into his pocket. It is one thing to have protection on the statute-book of the country; it is another thing to have protection that will benefit the farmer financially. It is impossible, in my opinion, to protect the farmer in any article that he has to sell in foreign countries in open competition with similar articles from every other part of the world; because it is a well-known principle in political economy that the price of the exported article in the markets of the world determines the price of that article in the country from which it comes. I do not think any member of this House, if he reads the political economy of any great author, will come to any other conclusion. If we have a surplus of wheat and send it to the English market, the price we obtain there for it will fix the price for every bushel of wheat sold to the Canadian people for home consumption, and all the protection now on our statute-book would not increase the price to the Canadian farmer one-tenth of a cent per bushel. And what is true of wheat is true of every other article produced by the farmer of Canada and exported to foreign countries; and I do not think there is a single individual on the other side of the House who will rise here and say distinctly that such is not the fact. If protection would afford a higher price in this country for wheat, why, instead of having 15 cents a bushel on it, do we not put the duty to 50 cents or 60 cents a bushel, so as to give the farmer more for his wheat than he is getting at the present time? If, on the other hand, protection does not increase the price to the farmer, why do you mock him by telling him that he receives benefit from the National Policy, while his protection is only on the statute-book, and not in the reality? The hon. gentleman said also that protection actually decreased rather than increased the price of articles manufactured in this country. Did you ever in your life hear such a doctrine stated be-

fore ? Why is it that the manufacturers of this country are so strongly in favour of protection if they do not know that they are going to receive a benefit from it in increased prices ? The hon. gentleman read a letter from the president of a company who manufacture what they call Portland cement in the town from which he comes, namely, Owen Sound. That gentleman is said to have been a Liberal at one time, and I supposed he changed his opinion because he found that there was more money for him in the National Policy than there would be in the absence of protective duties on Portland cement. That gentleman sends a letter to the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) asking for some changes in the duties on articles used in the manufacture of Portland cement. Now, if those articles are not increased in price by the duties, to the man who is manufacturing Portland cement, why is he asking the Government to reduce the duties upon them, so that he can use them as raw materials ? If that is true with regard to the raw materials, why is it not equally true in regard to the finished article ?

Mr. MASSON. What he asked for was a rebate on certain machinery, on the ground that it was similar to mining machinery.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wonder, Mr. Speaker, at the hon. gentleman in making such a statement. He would protect one article and not the other. Does not the machinery stand in the same position as the article the gentleman is manufacturing ? And if the removal of the duty on the machinery would reduce its price, would not a reduction in the duty on Portland cement also reduce its price ? According to the hon. gentleman, this protective tariff in regard to certain articles has a certain effect, and in regard to certain other articles the direct opposite effect. I would like to know from the hon. member why the Government gives a rebate on the raw materials that enter into the manufacture of certain articles in this country, such as agricultural implements, so that those articles can be sold to outside countries more cheaply than they can be sold in Canada, if the application of the duty does not increase the price ? The hon. gentleman also said that the keen competition between the manufacturers in Canada so reduced prices that they actually sold their productions at a lower price than they could if the duty was not on at all. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman, is not coal oil manufactured in this country ? And when the duty was reduced on coal oil, what was the result ? The result was a reduction in the Canadian market of several cents per gallon ; and if the duty did not raise the price, the removal of the duty would not reduce it

Mr. MASSON. When was the price reduced ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). One year ago. And the price fell from 18 to 12 cents of second-class Canadian coal oil.

Mr. MASSON. The reduction of price took place before the duty was removed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No, sir. Did the hon. gentleman know that binding-twine was manufactured at several points in the country, and that when the duty was reduced from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent the price fell one cent per pound. If the duty had not enhanced the price, how is it the price came down when the duty was removed ? Does the hon. gentleman know that salt was higher a few years ago, and that the Government believed that the imposition of the duty had increased the price to the Canadian farmers ? The Government cut the duty in two, and what was the result ? The price came down in the Canadian market. But the hon. gentleman maintains that the duty has an influence only in cheapening the prices in the Canadian market of Canadian manufactures. If that be so, it would be in the interests of the country to increase the duties as much as possible and put as much money in the public treasury as possible. The Finance Minister, a few years ago, in his place in this House, told us he was going to remove $3,500,000 of duties or burdens from the shoulders of the Canadian people. By one stroke of the pen, he said, I am going to do it. I am going, he said, to remove the duties upon sugar. Now, if this burden of $3,500,000 had not been upon the shoulders of the Canadian people, the Finance Minister could not have removed it by one stroke of the pen.

Mr. MASSON. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that the duty on raw sugar was protective ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am speaking of refined sugar which was mostly refined in Canada. At that time the duty was eight-tenths of a cent per pound, and when that was reduced to 65 one-hundredths of a cent per pound the refined sugar in the Canadian market fell correspondingly. Here was an article manufactured or refined in this country, and yet when the duty was reduced to the extent of fifteen-hundredths of a cent per pound, the price fell in the Canadian market, thus disproving the argument of my hon. friend. Now, the burden was on the Canadian people for many years. The total amount exacted was a good many millions by the protective duty on refined sugar. And yet, Mr. Speaker, in the face of those facts, there are gentlemen here who will get up at this late hour and at this late period of the nineteenth century, and in the broad daylight, make fallacious statements such as those we have lis-

tened to. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the protective duty increases the price to the farmers, how can it at the same time reduce the price to the manufacturers? It must be a very peculiar policy which increases the price of a product to one class and reduces the price of the product to another. The hon. gentleman could not have considered previously what he was going to say, and therefore made the contradictory statements he did. Then, the hon. gentleman said that by the policy of the Liberals, under the Mackenzie Administration, our farmers were ruined by American competition. He said that a great quantity of American wheat came in to compete with Canadian wheat and reduced the price to Canadian producers. Now, the hon. gentleman must know, if he studied the history of that period, that the American wheat brought into Canada was not brought in for Canadian consumption, because we had wheat enough of our own, and exported large quantities besides. It was imported, in the first place, to mix with our wheat. We had not Manitoba wheat then, and had to get our hard wheat from the United States, which, mixed with Canadian wheat, made a better flour, and enabled us to realize a better price in the English market. Then, in the second place, Canadian dealers found it profitable to buy wheat in the Western States and ship it across our country to the English market. This was of great advantage to the carrying trade of Canada, to our steamers and railway companies and the thousands of people employed in transporting this wheat from the west to the east. These people are now, as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) admits, out of employment, because that wheat which was formerly transported across Canada by Canadian steamers and other means of transportation, employing Canadian labour, is now shipped through American ports, and all the labour employed in that business belongs to the American Union. So that instead of the exclusion of American wheat being an advantage, it is a decided disadvantage to Canada. In 1878, while we imported only 1,500,000 bushels of wheat from the United States, we exported 4,000,000 bushels, showing that the import was not for home consumption. Then, we have been told in this debate that the National Policy was stimulating the production of pork products, and that we were now exporting a great deal more than at any former period. We have been told that, while in 1889 we exported about 4,000,000 pounds of pork, ham sides and lard, in 1894 we exported 20,000,000 pounds of those articles, and therefore these hon. gentlemen drew the conclusion that the National Policy had been of great benefit to this industry. But what is the real reason for this increase? Will the hon. gentleman, who has conscientions convictions and political morality, stand up and say that the protective duty imposed in 1889 is the cause? Do not hon. gentlemen know that our farmers have gone into hog-raising because they find it more profitable to feed their grains to their hogs than to sell it in the open markets? They went more into live stock simply because of the low price of other articles. They can make a better profit by raising live stock in the form of hogs than by selling their grain by the bushel. To show the fallacy of the argument that the National Policy is the cause of increase of export of pork, let me give you another fact taken from a former period of Canadian history. From 1874 to 1878 we exported 85,750,000 pounds of pork, hams, bacon and lard. From 1889 to 1894, under the influence of our National Policy, we exported only 52,200,000 pounds. Now, if the National Policy is to be credited with this large export from 1889 to 1894, by a parity of reason we must credit the revenue tariff with the still larger exports from 1874 to 1878. But, Mr. Speaker, neither the National Policy nor the revenue tariff had anything to do with it. But hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to bolster up the National Policy, that they will grasp at straws and make arguments of which a very slight examination shows their fallacy.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In rising to continue my remarks, I beg leave to refer further to the arguments used this afternoon. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to speak of the Liberal party as the party of many policies. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have heard such remarks; and the gentlemen who make them are as conscious that they are in error as they are that they are living. We are referred to as the party who, in past years, have favoured the policy of commercial union, and hardly a speaker upon the other side of the House but speaks of the Liberal party as believing in that policy. Now, I have challenged hon. members before to quote one single statement wherein the Liberal party has ever favoured commercial union, as properly understood. We are opposed to the principle involved in that policy; we have repeatedly told the Liberal-Conservative party that we never endorsed that policy, and still, day after day, in the House and on the public platform, they continue to repeat what they ought to know to be untrue. We are also said to have changed our opinions in relation to reciprocity with the United States. I deny that there is any change in the Liberal party with regard to that subject. We are as much in favour of reciprocity, based upon

equitable principles, as we ever were. At the same time, I do not think that the sentiment on this subject in the United States is as favourable as it was some years ago. But if the Government in power now, and in power at that time had been as conscientious in their efforts to obtain reciprocity as they sought to have the people believe, we should have obtained reciprocity, greatly to the benefit of the people of this country. Gentlemen opposite are aware that, during the last general elections, they had to announce themselves, in the eastern provinces especially, as strongly favourable to reciprocity, or they would never have received the votes they did. The fences and walls throughout the country were placarded with these words: "Vote for the Liberal-Conservative party and reciprocity." For this reason, it comes with very bad grace from gentlemen opposite to say that we have changed our opinions. These gentlemen have changed their opinions, but the Liberal party is of the same opinion as before. There is another point. I suppose, as usual, these loyal men will say that the Liberal party are decrying their country because we point out the effects of the present fiscal policy, upon the interests of the country. In doing so, we do not decry the country, but we show that a different policy would have a different effect, and one much more beneficial to the people. We are told by some of these gentlemen that the country is prosperous—prosperous from the Atlantic to the Pacific, not a word of discontent in any part of the country. But others on that side of the House tell us that there is a depression in trade; in fact, a declaration was put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General in the Speech he made from the Throne at the opening of Parliament, to the effect that there is a depression in the country. And we are here for the purpose of pointing out that that depression arises largely from the policy adopted and continued by those in power. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told upon the public platform that the policy adopted and carried out by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, when at the head of the Liberal party, so exposed the markets of this country to competition from the United States that our farmers and manufacturers had no chance to get on. Now, if we look at the facts and figures given us in official documents, we find that this statement is only made for political purposes, and contains no truth whatever. I have before me a statement which will show the truth of what I say. In 1877 we imported from foreign countries only $1 worth of furniture for every $13 worth manufactured in Canada. We imported only $1 worth of carriages for $52 worth we manufactured in Canada. In clothing, we imported $1 worth for $57 worth manufactured here; in spikes, nails, tacks, and other manufactures of that kind, $1 worth imported to $10 worth manufactured here; in boots and shoes—which were particularly mentioned by public speakers and hon. members as an item in which the American competition was particularly severe—we imported $1 worth for $69 worth manufactured here; in saddlery and harness, $1 imported to $73 manufactured; in other goods of all kinds, $1 to $26; in woollen goods, $1 to $17; in machinery of all kinds, $1 to $27; agricultural implements, $1 to $14. And out of eighteen leading articles, representing a total of $73,263,000 manufactured in Canada, we only imported $3,624,000 worth, or, in the relation of about $1 to $20. Now, during the existence of the National Policy, from 1879 to 1883, we imported 42 per cent of foreign goods to come in competition with Canadian manufactures. From 1883 to 1888 we imported 45 per cent; from 1888 to 1893, we imported 46½ per cent. So you see there were more foreign goods brought in to compete with Canadian manufactures under the National Policy than under the revenue tariff policy which existed under Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. These figures show that this argument is used for political purposes, to frighten the manufacturers and others into supporting the National Policy. I notice the hon. Minister of Railways is busily talking, but, as I wish to refer to something that he said, I hope that he will give me his attention, and that, if I am wrong, or if I misrepresent him, he will put me right. He made a statement during his tour westward with regard to the leader of the Opposition, to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. The report I intend to read was taken from the "Empire" newspaper, which sent a special reporter to report the speeches of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentleman made reference, a few days ago to the same question, but he did not then charge the hon. leader of the Opposition as he charged him in the country, behind his back, where there was no opportunity given the leader to answer him, nor was any other person given the opportunity. Speaking of the Interprovincial conference which proposed an increase in the subsidies of the provinces, the other day, he used these words:

> We remember that there was an interprovincial conference at Quebec some time ago, and I will just analyse some of the demands of that conference. The leader of the Opposition is bound in a sense by that conference, because one of my hon. friends the other day read a letter from Mr. Mercier, then the leader of the Quebec Government, in which he stated, if I am not mistaken—at least the statement has never been denied in this House—that if the leader of the Opposition got into power, he would carry out the pledge made by Mr. Mercier during the election, and give increased subsidies to the provinces. The result of fulfilling that promise will be to increase the subsidies to the different provinces to the extent of $1,721,476.

Then he goes on :

Now, if this is the policy of the leader of the Opposition, or of the Liberal party, we want to know it, and this is the time for them to speak.

Now, when he was out west, speaking to the electorate of Canada, he was not doubtful as to what that policy was. He stated distinctly to the audience whom he was addressing, that Mr. Laurier, in this House, had stated that if he came into power he would agree to increase the subsidies to the provinces to the amount of two million dollars. Now, lest I misrepresent him, I will read the report of the "Empire" on the subject :

I asked Mr. Laurier about this in the House of Commons, and his answer to me, in the presence of Parliament, was that he would carry out those resolutions. Now, what would be the result ? The result would be that the expenditure would be increased by two million dollars.

Of course, his friends cheered.

But none of Mr. Laurier's friends have been saying that this is not his policy. As I have shown you, undoubtedly it is his policy.

Why did not the hon. gentleman have sufficient moral courage to repeat the words that he used on a public platform in the west, before the hon. leader of the Opposition in this House, and give him an opportunity to contradict or acknowledge the statement ?

Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman hear me say that ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I did.

Mr. HAGGART. I never said it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Well, if you say that this report is not correct, of course, that is your affair. I have this advantage of you to-night, that this report was made in your own paper by one of your friends, and I heard you say it myself. So you see there are two against one.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I never asked Mr. Laurier the question, and he never answered it, and I never said so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I knew he never asked Mr. Laurier at the time, but there was no opportunity, on my part, to answer it then. But he did make the statement, and I heard it, and this is the report in the "Empire" of the next day. But if he did say it—and he did so—he should have the manliness to repeat it here so that the leader of the Opposition could have an opportunity of contradicting those false statements made on public platforms before the electorate. There was another statement made at that meeting, and I want to give an opportunity to the parties making it to contradict or acknowledge it. There were two parties who made the statement to which I refer, one party made it upon a public platform that evening, another party made it in this House during the debate on the Address. I notice that the hon. gentleman who made it in this House is present to-night, and, as I understand he is to follow me, I wish him to give his authority for the statement which he has made in reference to a leading member of our party. It was stated by the present Secretary of State on that same evening that in 1887 the Hon. Edward Blake was in perfect unison with the protective system, that he sent a circular to the manufacturers of Canada telling them that if he was elected at the coming elections, he would not interfere with the protective system. Now, I think it is right and just, in the interests of the Hon. Edward Blake, and in the interest of the Liberal party, that some evidence should be given that such was the case. I have before me Mr. Blake's own words in reference to the National Policy, and the expression he made use of will go far to contradict anything of that kind, because he was not so inconsistent as to say to one party that he would support the National Policy, while he condemned it so vigorously before the other. The Hon. Edward Blake did say in 1887 that on account of the corruption and extraordinary extravagance of the present Government, there were liabilities lying upon the people of this country that demand a high tariff, and that it would be impossible for him or for the party coming into power, to cut that tariff down as low as he would like to see it, and, therefore, the incidental protection would be, of necessity, pretty high. But, to say that he was in favour of a protective policy is a slander upon him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want you to hear what the Hon. Edward Blake's opinion of the National Policy was :

Its real tendency has been towards disintergration and annexation.

No matter how much you may disagree with the Hon. Edward Blake, you cannot charge him with being opposed to the interests of his own country, with a desire to break up confederation, a work in which he was himself engaged in bringing about, and to unite this country with the great republic to the south of us. But the Hon. Edward Blake said more about the National Policy :

It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-west empty still.

That a man, speaking in this way with regard to the National Policy, would write to the manufacturers of this country and tell them that if his party came into power, he would be willing to support the very principles which he thus condemned, is utterly preposterous. But he goes on to give us his opinion of the National Policy :

It has left us with an enormous debt, an extravagant expenditure, an expensive tariff, with re

stricted markets, with a trade diverted from its natural into less profitable channels.

And still further, he goes on to characterize this National Policy, which, it is said, he supported :

Worse, far worse ; it has left us with a lower standard of public virtue ; it has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised.

Sir, does that sound like a man who would support the National Policy, who would send a circular to the manufacturers of this country, telling them that they need not fear him, that if he came into power he would not interfere with the protective system. Now, I hope that the hon. gentleman who reiterated this charge will make it good, or have the manliness to withdraw it. Here is what the Secretary of State said upon that occasion :

The leader of the Liberal party at that time was the Hon. Edward Blake, and you will remember in the campaign of 1887 that Mr. Blake's public announcements were, that he would, if elected to power, not disturb the defensive fiscal policy which Canada adopted in 1878.

Then he says further on :

Well, Sir, not only was that the case, but Mr. Blake, as you remember, was sending a private circular—and I have no doubt there are some manufacturers here who will bear me out in this statement—to every manufacturer in Canada, advising him that he need not be afraid of the Liberal party, for they would not disturb his protection.

Now, Sir, that appeal was made to the manufacturers in that large audience that evening, most of them were Conservatives, but not one of them said he had got the circular ; and I have not yet found out a single manufacturer in the country who ever got that circular, and I do not believe it was ever issued. Now, I hope the hon. member for Ottawa will say that he was in error, and that the Secretary of State will withdraw his charges against Hon. Edward Blake.

Sir JAMES GRANT. As the hon. gentleman has mentioned my name in connection with this matter, suffice it to say that it was pretty well known and generally circulated throughout the Dominion, what the policy of the Hon. Edward Blake was on the subject of protection. It was well known that he had studied the question of the fiscal policy of this country, and he thoroughly understood that the only way for a political party in this country to hold power was by the exercise of the principle of moderate protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JAMES GRANT. And in that way, Sir, he informed the manufacturers of this country——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Order. This is no explanation at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Hon. Edward Blake was a man who always expressed the opinions he entertained. He travelled through the country in 1887 and delivered nearly 100 addresses, touching every phase of the political questions in Canada, and I have read all those speeches and I challenge any hon. member opposite to point to a line or a paragraph in the entire 100 speeches that will corroberate by a scintilla of evidence the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant). The only way we can judge a public man is by his public utterances, and I have given the House Mr. Blake's opinion, contained in the celebrated public letter written by him, in which he characterized the National Policy as I have described. There is too much misrepresentation and jealousy exhibited on the public platform ; there is a want of conscience in public speakers which we must all deplore, and misrepresentations are given of the views held by public men and efforts are made to fasten on them the enunciation of policies which they never advocated. This is done by men in both political parties, while both sides should exercise care in representing the views of public men as expressed in their public utterances. I was about to fortify myself in regard to a position I took previous to six o'clock, with respect to the effect of the National Policy as increasing prices of farm products. The hon. member who addressed the House this afternoon said that the National Policy protected the farmers, and, therefore, if it protected the farmers, it must give increased prices to articles produced on the farm. Here is what one of the quartette, as I may properly call them, who went West last December in the Government car, said on the public platform. Senator Ferguson told the farmers :

I want to show you that no Government can keep your prices up. Under the law of supply and demand, the world is producing more wheat to-day than the people can consume, and, therefore, the prices must go down.

Now, that is Liberal doctrine ; that is what we contended in 1878 when the present Liberal-Conservative party wished to impose the National Policy on the people, and when the then Government declared that such a policy would keep up the prices. We were then told by the present Minister of Railways and Canals that the National Policy would increase the prices of their products to the farming community. Let me fortify myself with a greater authority even than the one I have quoted, and I think one that the hon. gentleman will not deny is a greater authority than himself. This authority said :

The price of an article at home must be determined by its price in foreign or unprotected markets, and therefore, even if protective duties are prescribed upon the Statute-book at home, their effect must remain absolutely null, so far as that particular article is concerned.

Again he said:

It is beyond human wit and power to give the grower of wheat or cotton in the United States the tenth part of a cent per bushel or bale beyond what the price in the market of export will allow him.

I said that this authority was even a greater one than Senator Ferguson; this is the testimony of no less authority than the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, the greatest statesman living to-day. His view is that whether there is a protective duty placed on the Statute-book or not, such legislation cannot give increased prices in a foreign market. I desire to refer a little while longer to the speech of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to bring into disrepute a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with regard to agricultural lands in this country. It appears that the hon. member for South Oxford stated that in his opinion the value of farm lands in Ontario had fallen by nearly $200,000,000, and the Minister of Railways and Canals sought to show that he was wholly wrong, and that instead of the value having diminished it had increased by $95,000,000. To enable him to make up the amount, he added the value of live stock and implements to the value of the land, so as to make up his total amount. Who ever heard of adding the value of live stock to the value of the land, and then call it all land value? So important does this statement appear to be that nearly all the Conservative papers which I have had the opportunity of perusing have published this statement, to show that the hon. member for South Oxford was wrong in the statement and loose in the figures he used. I desire to show the House that the hon. member for South Oxford was nearly correct and that the Minister of Railways was wholly and entirely wrong. Speaking in regard to the hon. member for South Oxford, the Minister of Railways said:

Farming property in the province of Ontario had decreased in value to the extent of $200,000,000. But, Mr. Speaker, what do you say to a statement of that kind, when I tell you that there has been no decline whatever in that respect. On the contrary, Sir, there has been a gain of $95,000,000 in ten years.

So there is a difference of $295,000,000 between those hon. gentlemen. Let us examine this question carefuly. I will give the House a detailed statement, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to show that it is incorrect. In 1882 the land in the province of Ontario was of the value of $632,343,000; there were at that time 202,000 farms, and each farm on the average was worth $3,130. In 1893 the farm lands of the province were worth $602,665,000, there were 243,000 farms, of an average value of $2,480, or a reduction of $650 on each farm. If you multiply 243,000 by $650 you will have a depreciation in the value of the land of $158,000,000. It must, however, be borne in mind that the hon. gentleman never took into consideration the increased number of farms between those years. We know that in Algoma and in the Rainy River district that a large portion of uncleared land has been brought under settlement, and no calculation whatever was made by the Minister for the increase, but he simply took the value (and to attain his object added the value of live stock to farm values of 1893) of farms in 1882 and 1893 and made the comparison. If you add to $158,000,000 the money expended for the clearing of waste lands, which is an unknown amount, that expended for drainage works established by the various municipalities for the improvement of the land, for under-draining, which in the west particularly has been carried out to a very large extent, all of which improvements cost an enormous sum of money, the depreciation in value will not prove very far short of $200,000,000, the sum mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford. You see Sir, instead of being $95,000,000 better off to-day, they are nearly $200,000,000 worse off than they were in 1882. I ask the hon. gentleman who will reply to me to take these figures and go to the reports of the Bureau of Industry of 1882, and to the report of the Bureau of Industry of 1893, and he can convince himself that the figures that I present to the House and to the country are perfectly correct, and that the estimate made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is far away from the real facts. I want now, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks in regard to some comparisons instituted by the Minister of Finance, and I want his attention. He gives a table in his speech setting forth several comparisons. I must admit that it was a very ingenious speech, and I must admit, too, that if it went through the hands of parties who were not willing to examine all the figures, they would have a plausible effect, and I suppose, he being a plausible man, wished his speech to be plausible in the country; but I want to point out to him that some of his comparisons were unfair and misleading. You may say that the figures were fairly correct; but in the way he placed one statement against another, it would mislead many persons who would read the statement. He said that the customs tax during the Mackenzie Administration only fell $1,400,000, but he was $226,000 out in his figures, but that is not the point of attack, that discrepancy may have been a slip. Now, let me give you the figures. The customs tax in 1874 was $14,422,000, while the customs tax in 1878 was $12,796,000, or a reduction of $1,626,000, or 14 per cent decrease during the five years of Liberal Administration. Now, the Finance Minister compares that reduction to a reduction from a much larger income from customs taxes. You must know the sums from which the reductions are made in order to form a proper conception of the comparative degree of reduction. Now, the Conservative party commenced with a customs tax, as I said, of $12,796,000, and they

ended in 1883 by a customs tax of $23,172,000, or an increase during these four years of $10,376,000, or 81 per cent. It is from this increased tax that the Minister of Finace made his comparison with the taxation of last year. From 1878 to 1894 there was a net increase of 51½ per cent; that is, from $12,796,000 of customs taxes to $19,380,000. So you see that the increase was so very great under the Conservative Government that the decrease was comparatively small in comparison with the decrease which took place under the Mackenzie Government. Therefore, when you look upon this table given by the Finance Minister and see taxes reduced $1,400,000 from 1874-79, and customs taxes reduced four and a half millions of dollars from 1889-94, the inference would naturally be that the Administration of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was not so economical as the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then again, the Finance Minister made another very unfair comparison. He says that from 1874 to 1879 the debt increased $40,000,000, and from 1889 to 1894, $8,500,000. Any person reading that without knowing the facts concerning the conditions of the both series of years, would come to the conclusion that the Finance Minister gloried in his economy and wished to reflect upon the Mackenzie Administration for spending so much money. It is well known to the Finance Minister and to other gentlemen on the other side of the House, that a large proportion of the money spent during the five years when Mr. Mackenzie was at the head of the Liberal party, was expended because of the responsibilities thrown upon him by the preceding Government. I want you to listen, Mr. Speaker, to a few words which I will quote from Sir Leonard Tilley's Budget speech of 1873, in which he says:

> We are further entering upon new and increased engagements involving very large sums of money. We are entering upon works—we have already done so—which will require a large increase of our debt. We have $30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have $10,000,000 to spend on the Intercolonial Railway, and the canal system that has been accepted by the Government, will involve an expenditure of at least $20,000,000. These are serious matters, inasmuch as they add $60,000,000 to our existing debt.

Now, these were the burdens left as a legacy to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie when he came into power, and both parties were then agreed as to the necessity of spending money upon these great works. There was no difference of policy with regard to them, but the work had to be undertaken by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, and the funds provided for the execution of these works by him. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that Mr. Mackenzie increased the debt $40,000,000, but he did not tell the people of this country, as he should have, that there were $3,690,000 of the forty millions voted in 1872, previous to the advent to power of the Liberal Government. The Minister of Finance also forgot to tell the country, and to tell this Parliament, that $5,277,000 was voted in 1873, previous to the Liberal Government, and for which Hon. Alexander Mackenzie had to make provision when he came in. Now, on these very works which Sir Leonard Tilley had referred to, and which had been accepted by the Government and decided upon by both political parties from the 1st of July, 1874, to the 1st July, 1879, Mr. Mackenzie spent on the canals, $16,232,000; on the Canadian Pacific Railway, $11,362,000, and he spent on the Intercolonial $10,103,000, or making a total upon these three public works of $37,797,000, which was nearly the entire increase of debt which is attributed to him. Mr. Mackenzie did not undertake a single new work with the exception of the St. Peter's Canal, which cost him two or three hundred thousand dollars. He simply carried out the obligations and engagements that were entered into before the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie came into power. Our canals, on the whole, cost $62,500,000, and before confederation $20,500,000 were spent by the provinces and by the Imperial Government. Since confederation, $42,000,000 have been spent, and out of this sum $16,332,000 were spent by the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie or considerably over one-third of the entire amount of money that has been expended on them during the last twenty-seven years. Yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite would draw a contrast between five years in which there was very little expenditure of any magnitude whatever on public works, and the five years that these works were undertaken by the consent of the two parties in Parliament, and they would accuse the Mackenzie Government of the improvident expenditures of these moneys. Now, Sir, it is said that certain responsibilities were placed upon the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie. What did the Minister of Railways and Canals say in his speech a few days ago? He asked us: What did the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie do? And he told us that he cancelled every contract that was given him under Sir John Macdonald's regime, and then that he changed the policy and gave the contract to his own friends, and not to the lowest tenderers? Is that true?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Sir, that is not true. I have the testimony here which will settle that question, from a return which was brought down in answer to a requisition made by the Hon. Edward Blake a few years ago. Let me read what the hon. Minister said a few days ago that I may not misrepresent him:

> The policy of the Government of Sir John Macdonald might have been reversed; but the hon. gentleman approved of that policy. It is true,

contracts were let on some of the works, but the moment the hon. gentleman and his friends came into power, they cancelled every contract. Afterwards they changed their policy and re-let the contracts again, and I would like to have the pleasure of showing to the hon. gentleman in what manner they re-let them. Did they let them to the lowest tenderer? No; they picked out their particular friends, and to them they awarded the contracts.

That is the deliberate statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. He is an old member; he was in the House at the time, and he should have known the facts. Now, I am going to show, by a reference to the actual facts, that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie did not give the contracts to his friends, unless his friends were the lowest tenderers. Mr. Mackenzie did change the Government's policy, in this respect, that from the time he came into power, all tenderers had to deposit with the Government a certain sum of money in proportion to the amount of their tender, and if the contract was awarded to them, and they were not in a position to execute it, they forfeited the deposit. That system did not prevail in the time of Sir John Macdonald's Government previous to that of Mr. Mackenzie; and while I believe the law makes the same provision to-day, it is violated every year. Now, let me give a statement of the contracts let by both Governments for several years:

UNDER CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT.

Year.	No of Contracts let.	No. given to lowest Tenderers.	Total Value of Contracts.	Value given to lowest Tenderers.	Percentage to lowest Tenderers.
			$	$	p. c.
1870...	52	20	9,135,439	2,455,325	26
1871...	75	17	4,027,207	1,765,656	43
1872...	77	27	1,695,313	846,540	50
1873...	76	23	5,969,802	1,978,351	33
1870-73	280	87	20,827,752	7,045,872	35

UNDER LIBERAL GOVERNMENT.

1874...	90	70	5,500,335	2,987,047	54
1875...	73	69	9,269,766	9,097,265	98
1876...	30	25	4,665,562	4,297,550	92
1874-76	193	164	19,435,663	16,381,862	84

Now, Sir, this is from an official document, and these facts and figures are in the hands of any body who takes the trouble to ascertain them; yet, in the face of this statement, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will say that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie gave contracts to his own friends, and not to the lowest tenderers, thus reflecting on a dead statesman, whose name, for integrity and political uprightness, stands above reproach in the esteem of the people of this country. This shows that the assertion of the hon. Minister was made for the purpose of misleading the public ear rather than to present the real facts of the case. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways appeared with the quartette in the west, and therefore his statements must be taken as official in their character; at any rate, they were taken by his friends to be well thought out and to present the actual facts of the case. Now, when we read what he said in the west, it is astonishing what "rot" is uttered on public platforms for the purpose of leading people astray. For fear that I may misrepresent what the hon. gentleman said, I will read an extract from his speech, in the "Empire":

Mr. Laurier has been stating that he will reduce the expenditure $2,500,000. How will he do it?

Then the Minister of Railways went on to say:

The uncontrollable expenditure of the Dominion is between $35,000,000 and $36,000,000.

Whoever heard such a statement as that from a responsible member of the Cabinet? Did he really suppose that we were all ignorant up there? Did he suppose that we did not know the uncontrollable expenditure was not equal to that or more than half of it? The Finance Minister has answered all this. He said the other day that the real controllable expenditure of the Government was $17,000,000. And yet we had another responsible member of the Government stating to a public audience that the uncontrollable expenditure was between $35,000,000 and $36,000,000. The Finance Minister said the other night that there was another item which you might largely call uncontrollable. That was the collection of revenue which amounted to $9,500,000. Add that to the $17,000,000, and the uncontrollable expenditure was about $27,000,000. But there are still $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 discrepancy between the two heads of departments, who are now in such close consultation opposite, trying, no doubt, to reconcile their contradictions. Then the Minister of Railways went on to give the items of uncontrollable expenditure, and those who understand the figures cannot help laughing when they hear the items he mentions. He first mentioned a few items that were uncontrollable. He said:

The uncontrollable expenditure of the Dominion is between $35,000,000 and $36,000,000. Now, what is that made up of? First of all, there is the interest on public debt, nearly $11,000,000. That no Government can decrease. Next, there is a sinking fund of over $2,000,000, which is not really an expenditure, but money set aside for

the redemption of Dominion securities whenever they become due. Next, there is the subsidies for the provinces, amounting to $4,000,000. Will the hon. gentleman reduce this ?

And then he goes on to say what I have already referred to with reference to Mr. Laurier. He then passes to consider some other articles. Among these, he mentioned the penitentiaries, the North-west Mounted Police, Immigration, Indians, and nearly all the expenditure in the Public Accounts, and then he concludes by calling them all uncontrollable. Now, the Finance Minister says they are not uncontrollable. The Minister of Railways said the collection of revenue is uncontrollable, but the Finance Minister replies : You are wrong, for I am going to control them to the extent of $50,000. The Minister of Railways says that civil government is uncontrollable, but the Minister of Finance answers : No, you know nothing about it, for I am going to control it to the extent of $30,000. Then the Minister of Railways and Canals says the expenses of Indians are uncontrollable, but the Finance Minister corrects him, for he says I am going to control it to the extent of $85,000. The Minister of Railways finds the item of penitentiaries uncontrollable, but the Minister of Finance is going to control it to the extent of $36,000. Again, the Minister of Railways finds legislation uncontrollable, but the Minister of Finance retorts : No, I will control it to the extent of $22,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MACDONALD. I heard you say it, and it appears that the reporter you had travelling with you at all you meetings heard it.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought it was a speech in the House you were referring to, but I never said it either in the country or the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That is a serious reflection upon the "Empire" and its reporter, and upon myself, because I was there and heard you.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has repeated that before. Perhaps this time I may make a correction. He alleges that I stated that I had asked the leader of the Opposition with reference to the interprovincial resolutions and that I had received an answer from him. On the contrary, I said that I never did. What I said in the country was this, that I had heard the question put in the House and had heard the leader of the Opposition make the statement that he was in favour of the interprovincial resolutions. It amounts to the same thing, but I never said that it was I who asked the question, and I have heard the fact stated in his presence.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). When a criminal is on trial, all the suspicious circumstances tell against him. I cannot understand how an hon. gentleman will go to the country and speak in the presence of people who can hear every word he says and then go back on his own utterances. At Wingham, he made the statement which I have given, and which I heard him make, and which appeared in the "Empire" the following day. At Wiarton, the evening before, some forty or sixty miles distant, he made the statement, and it was so reported. It is too much for the hon. gentleman, after having repeated this statement publicly, and after I had heard him make the statement on the public platform, to come to this House, where he knows we can meet him, and ask us to accept his denial. I cannot accept it at his hands.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the reporter of the "Empire" had not also heard this statement and published it, I would be willing to accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but when the "Empire" published what I know the hon. gentleman said, I cannot withdraw my statement, without casting a reflection upon myself.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the hon. gentleman to order. He has attributed a certain statement to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. My hon. colleague has denied, in his place, that he ever made such a statement, and the hon. gentleman refuses to take his denial.

Mr. SPEAKER. That question was raised last year, and my ruling then was that I was not called upon to require a member to withdraw a statement he may have made respecting something which occurred outside the House. I presume that the hon. the Minister of Railways knows what he said upon the occasion referred to, and I think, as I stated upon the former occasion, that he must know better than the hon. member does, and it would be well for the hon. gentleman to accept his statement. But I cannot require him to withdraw the allegation he made.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, how is it possible for me to accept the denial of a statement which I heard deliberately made, especially when that impression upon my mind is corroborated by the report in a newspaper friendly to the hon. gentleman. If I were to accept his denial, then I would be reflecting upon my own veracity. Therefore I cannot withdraw my statement. Now, the hon. Minister of Finance contends that he can reduce the uncontrollable expenditure mentioned by his colleague, to the extent of $2,387,648. I wonder if the hon. Minister thought that the following expendi-

tures were uncontrollable :—Did he think for a moment that the expenditure of $230,000 squandered on the Montreal bridges was uncontrollable ? Did he suppose for a moment that the $476,000 spent on the Tay canal was uncontrollable ? The excuse that he gave for the expenditure on the Tay canal was that the Liberal members did not oppose it. So hon. gentlemen will see that if they do not oppose these extravagances, they are held accountable, notwithstanding that they are on this side of the House. Did the hon. gentleman really suppose that the amount, something less than a million dollars, spent in the Trent valley canal is uncontrollable ? That is a work which is not fairly to be called a work in the interests of the Dominion, but is wholly and entirely a local work and as such should have been relegated to the province or to the municipalities. It was to have been relegated to the province some years ago. But when Sir John Macdonald came in after the defeat of the Mackenzie Government, he agreed to make it a national work and to spend national money upon it. And from that time over $800,000 has been spent on this local work ; and, Mr. Speaker, there is not an hon. member here to-day who will say that it can ever become a truly national work. There can only be six feet of water in the canal, so that even if it were sought to be used by ships coming down from the northern lakes they would have to unload and reload. Mr. Shanly, one of the most eminent engineers in Canada stated in his place on the floor of this House that this could never be anything but a local work. Under these circumstances I think that such large amounts of money ought not to be spent in order to carry favour with the constituencies lying along the route of this canal. Does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, think that the three-quarters of a million of dollars that Larkin, Connolly and Company were permitted to steal out of the treasury of this country was part of the uncontrollable expenditure of this country, considering that it was shown on sworn evidence that there must have been an arrangement between these rascals outside and—I will not say rascals—on the inside ? It is evident that there was incapacity and want of that supervision over the public departments that was necessary in the interest of the country. Did the hon. gentleman for one moment believe that the $350,000 spent in the Langevin block over and above the original contract was an uncontrollable expenditure ?

Mr. LISTER. And not settled yet.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And not settled yet, as my hon. friend remarks. Does not the hon. Minister know that there was extravagance in connection with that building that cannot be attoned for ? Does he not know that the agreement entered into by Charlebois was of a nature different from any other ever made by the department ? Does he not know that there was a clause enabling Charlebois as the contractor to charge 25 per cent to every sub-contractor before allowing him to go on the work in order to carry out his contract ; that they refused to pay ; that they were sent back to remodel their tenders and that they simply added 25 per cent to every sub-contract, which money went into the pockets of Charlebois at the expense of the people of this country ? Does the hon. gentleman believe that the $1,200,000 spent under the Franchise Act in revising the voters' lists was uncontrollable ? For seventeen long years we had the local lists and not a single fault was found with the system. But in order to burden the people of the country and the candidates in the various counties with the necessity of expending large sums in the preparation of the voters' lists, they brought in this law which has caused an expenditure of $1,200,000, and only two elections held under it thus far. Is that uncontrollable expenditure ? Can a single hon. member on the treasury benches justify the position they have taken with regard to the expenditure of so large a sum ? Was the $270,000 wasted on the Sheik's Island dam uncontrollable ? If the Government had looked to these matters they might have controlled this expenditure. Was the $69,000 spent on the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic uncontrollable ? No higher object was aimed at in that, I venture to say than for that of shirking a direct vote upon the principle of prohibition. Sixty-nine thousand dollars of the good money of this country was spent to obtain the evidence of men who know no more about the question than do seven-eighths of the people here. We have presented to us five or six volumes that no person in this world—or in the world to come—will ever read. That evidence might have been in the heads of those who gave it and it would have been as accessible as it is now in these five or six blue-books that are handed to us. Now, Sir, I have dealt at some length with the financial condition of the country, and I want to say a little about the National Policy. In my opinion it has been a failure, it has been a fraud and an iniquity perpetrated upon the people of this country—that is upon a certain class of the people, upon nine-tenths of them. The National Policy was inaugurated for a purpose. The late Sir John Macdonald, speaking in 1878 in the amphitheatre on James Street, Toronto, made use of these words :

If you desire this country to prosper ; if you desire this country to rise out of the slough of despond into which it has sunk ; if you desire to see manufactures rise ; if you desire to see labour employed ; if you desire to see the emigration of your young men stopped ; if you desire to bring those who have emigrated back to this country ; if you desire to see the value of land rise——

——Note that gentlemen :

—if you desire prosperity—you will support the National Policy, and say we must have Canada for the Canadians.

The first object was to increase the immigration. It was stated by the Conservatives on public platforms from one end of this country to the other that if we had the National Policy large industries would be established which would give employment to hundreds and thousands of men and that people in foreign countries would come and settle amongst us and add to the prosperity of the country. Has this been the effect ? We expended $3,000,000 from 1881 to 1891, and brought into this country 886,000 people who expressed their intention of remaining in Canada. If you take the natural increase in the population of this country as being the same as in the United States during the last decade—and that was not very high ; only 14 per cent—you will find that there was an increase in that way of 605,000. Take the natural increase and the immigration together and we have a total of 1,491,000, who should have been in the country at the end of the decade. But only 504,000 of an increase was found ; so that you have 987,000 who have not been accounted for. The census takers went up and down this country, and in many cases, no doubt, saw two faces where there was only one. Put all these together and we have only 504,000, or over 100,000 less than the natural increase during the ten years, without taking into consideration the 886,000 brought in by the expenditure of three millions of money. Is that a satisfactory condition in regard to population ? Sir John A. Macdonald, and many others, stated on public platforms that the National Policy would secure a large increase of population. Now, we increased 638,000 from 1871 to 1881, or, in other words, we gave employment in this country to 638,000 more than we were employing in 1881. From 1881 to 1891 we gave employment to 504,000, that is, the labour market had 504,000 more population in Canada who were working among us than we had in 1881. It is evident that, under the regime of a revenue tariff our population increased to a greater extent than under the "benign influence," as the manufacturers call it, of the National Policy. But, Mr. Speaker, the National Policy discriminates against the poor man in favour of the rich man, a bad principle. Let me show you in what respects. As I said, the present tariff discriminates against the poor man, takes from one class and gives to another. That comes about by this iniquitous system of specific taxes, a system that cannot be justified under any circumstances. Now, here are a few examples showing the tariff upon the dearest and cheapest articles of the same class :

	Dearest.		Cheapest.	
Collars	42	p.c.	58	p.c.
Cuffs	50	"	75	"
Blankets	33	"	37½	"
Tweeds	30	"	65	"
Overcoatings	28	"	55	"
Books	1	"	100	"
Ready-made cloth'g	33	"	42	"
Socks and stockings	36	"	51	"
Rice	12½	"	25	"
Raisins	8	"	20	"
Carpets	30	"	40	"
Window shades....	35	"	50	"
Baking powder....	10	"	20	"

This discrimination is caused by the pernicious system of specific duties. Now, Sir, we heard it stated the other day that if a 25 per cent protective duty was robbery, 15 per cent of incidental protection was also robbery. But that does not follow. Here is the distinction given by one of the ablest statesmen of the day :

To impose an extra price upon one class for the benefit of another class, without compensation, is robbery, and robbery not rendered more respectable because the state is the culprit.

Who is the author of that statement ? The Hon. Mr. Gladstone, the ablest statesman now living. And it is in that light that we say protection is robbery, because it takes from one class more than it can return, and, therefore, it is robbery to the extent of the difference. But, Sir, the National Policy does more than that, it enables the manufacturer to make too much wealth—if the census report is to be taken as true—at the expense of other classes, especially of the farmers. Now, I want to show you the extraordinary profits made by the manufacturers of the province of Ontario—always providing that the census can be relied upon. The capital invested by manufacturers in Ontario is $176,604,000 ; the value of the products is $240,100,000 ; wages paid, $49,208,000 ; raw material used, $128,201,000. Now, we will put on 10 per cent for wear and tear, $17,604,000, making a total of $195,013,000. Deduct this from the value of the products, and we have a balance in favour of the manufacturers of $45,087,000, or 25 per cent of net profit, or $272.30 to the manufacturer on every hand employed. Is not that a large profit ? Now, let me tell you that the manufacturers of this country are very thankful for the profits they are getting. Let me read a few extracts from a report of the secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, made a few months ago. I want to read to you the opinion this association entertains of the National Policy, and what fine, honeyed words they apply to it :

Under the benign auspices of the National Policy the entire manufacturing industries of Canada had virtually become possessed of the home market, and required outlets into other markets for their surplus products.

And how did they become possessed of the Canadian market? By barring out the competition that was threatened from the outside, and putting up their prices, reducing their output, thus controlling the Canadian market. Let me read you a little further their reasons for gratitude:

It is gratifying to know that under the newly organized Government the interests of Canadian manufacturers will receive the best consideration.

"The best consideration." Other interests are to receive a secondary consideration. The best consideration is to be given to the manufacturers of Canada, and whatever consideration is left is to be given to the farmers and the other industrial classes. They have reason to feel gratified. Let me read a little more:

It has always been the policy of the Conservative Government to encourage the manufacture of iron in Canada, and in addition to the inducements offered in previous legislation, the new tariff makes considerable and important extensions of such encouragement.

I notice that was not always the policy of the Conservative party, because I have understood from one of those foremost among their ranks a few years ago, that they were just about to take up free trade when the thought struck Sir John A. Macdonald that probably a protective policy would carry them to power faster than a free trade cry. So it has not always been their policy, but it is to-day. Now, look again at the influence the association wields:

The Association has just reason for congratulating itself upon the influence it possesses——

I suppose this means Red Parlour influence.

--in assisting to mould public opinion in the matter of affording tariff protection to our manufacturing industries, and in shaping the laws of the country in conformity thereto.

Sir, they have exercised their influence to such an extent that they formed a brief for the Minister of Finance, and he followed it out, not only in selecting the articles upon which to put a duty, and from which to take off a duty, but he adopted the exact words proposed by the association to the Government of this country, showing what an influence they have. Now, what do they call for?:

United and harmonious as they have always been, it is of the utmost importance that as members of this Association our manufacturers should continue together and work together for the perpetuation of the great cause they have in view, that of protection.

I was almost going to read as the end of this sentence, "the great cause they had in view, the general interests of the country." That is not what they said, it was the interest of protection. This afternoon, we heard an hon. gentleman state that protection reduced the price of articles made in this country, but these manufacturers, meeting together and preparing a brief for the Minister of Finance, do so, not for the purpose of reducing the price of articles manufactured in this country, but to increase the price. Now, I desire hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to the conditions of their support, for it is an important matter. Here are the conditions on which the manufacturers will support the Government. They said:

In Sir Mackenzie Bowell we have a man at the head of our national affairs who is a sturdy and devoted adherent to our existing system, and who, having the courage of his convictions, will hold his way steadily in the course he long since helped to mark out, and as an association, and as individuals, no doubt your best and most earnest support will be given to the Government as long as the Government adhere to the principle of tariff protection to Canadian manufacturing industries.

And no longer. That is all the association thinks of the Government; they will give the Government support so long as they will give them protection and no longer; so long as the Government are putting money in their pockets and will protect them in their investments, they will continue to support the Government, and give them contributions on the eve of elections, as they have done before. But what about the farmers? I have been presenting one side of the shield, and I desire now to present the side of the farmers. Do the farmers pass resolutions on the line of protection? What is the meaning of the petitions presented every day to this House? What is the meaning of the petition of the Grange Organization that is now before the House? These petitions ask not that there should be more protection, but that there should be less protection, showing clearly that the farmers are not convinced that protection benefits them. I have promised to give the farmer's side of the question, and I will proceed to discuss it on the same basis as I have discussed it from the manufacturer's standpoint. The farmers' capital is $861,500,000. That includes their land, houses and machinery. What is their income, what is the value of their output, their crops of every description? In 1892, it was $110,000,000. The total value of live stock disposed of, sold or used at home was $32,500,000. The value of live stock in 1892 over the value of 1891, the increase during the year, was $8,718,000; of cheese, butter, eggs, wool and fruits of all kinds, $30,000,000, making a total of $181,443,000 as the total income of the farmers during that year. What was the cost of production? The cost of all seeds was $12.000,000; feed for stock, $16,000,000; wages at $253 per year for 486,000 farmers and labourers employed in agriculture, $123,000,000; and now instead of allowing 10 per cent on capital, as I did for manufacturers, I will only allow 5 per cent, giving $43,000,000, making a total of $194,000,000 as the cost of production.

Allowing current prices and wages, the year resulted in a loss to the farmers of $12,157,000. Instead of having 25 per cent net gain, as the manufacturers had, the farmers had a loss—that is, taking the same wages as are paid to labouring men—of no less than $12,157,000 on the transactions of that year. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to deny these figures. They are taken from the official documents. And these men who have lost over $12,000,000 on the year's transactions are asked to contribute in the form of duties to pay the manufacturers who have received 25 per cent not on their capital. Is that not actual robbery, is that not taking money from one class and giving it to another, and in this way is not the National Policy a fraud discriminating against one class and in favour of another class of the people of this country? I will bring another charge against the National Policy. It wastes capital that might be invested in various industries which might give employment to a large number of people. Let me illustrate. Supposing a capitalist was sufficiently rich to distribute all the imported steel and iron manufactures imported, a certain amount of capital would be required for the purpose. The iron and steel manufactures imported amounted to about $10,000,000. If there was no duty on it, the entire product would be purchased for $10,000,000, and its distribution through the different sections of the country would require about $2,000,000 working capital, or a total of $12,000,000 would accomplish the distribution of all the iron and steel manufactures required in the country. How is it now? It takes $10,000,000 to purchase the goods in the first place, $3,000,000 are required to pay the duty, and $2,000,000 working capital as before, for distribution, or $15,000,000 to accomplish the same result. The distribution of the article is the same, the number of hands employed is exactly the same, the number of stores required is the same under the one system as under the other; and although we cannot arrive at free trade, the proportion of duties we knock off will give us that proportion of free capital to invest in other industries. There could be hundreds and thousands of men employed profitably in other industries. Hon. members may multiply that single instance by every department of trade, and they will find that the saving of capital would be enormous, sufficient to give employment to tens of thousands of men and not minimize or in the least interfere in the distribution of these articles or hands employed. Here is what Mr. Gladstone said in regard to the waste of capital:

> In my view, I may say for my country that protection, however dignified by the source from which it proceeds, is essentially an invitation to waste, promulgated by the authority of law.

The National Policy increases the price of home made articles, and thus large sums are taken from the consumers and passed into the hands of manufacturers and middle men. I will give the House an illustration. I will take a few articles, commencing with cotton. We manufactured last year cotton to the value of $9,000,000, as was estimated by hon. gentlemen opposite, although hon. members on this side of the House give a somewhat higher estimate. That cotton is increased in price by reason of the duty to the extent of say, 25 per cent, or $2,250,000, which amount the consumers have to pay on the home manufactured article by reason of the duty. In 1894, we imported cotton to the value of $4,007,000, on which a duty was paid of $1,140,000. Now, we take the profit of the importer and retailer, say 40 per cent, divided between the two, which amounts to $446,000. Add these together, the increase of price on the home made article, the duty paid on the imports and the wholesale and retail profit on the duty, and the result will be $3,836,000, of which only $1,140,000 goes into the revenue of the country. The balance of $2,696,000 comes out of the consumers and goes into the pockets of the middle-men and the manufacturers. Take coal oil. There were imported in 1894, 3,546,000 gallons valued at $420,575, duty paid, $466,164, importers profits, at say, 20 per cent, $93,233, retailers profits at say, 30 per cent—and I am putting these percentages smaller than the persons dealing on coal make—$167,819, making a total of duty and profits paid by the consumer of $727,216; and of that only $466,164 is revenue and goes into the treasury of the country. Now, let us take the home manufactured coal oil. In 1894 it amounted to 11,000,000 gallons. The increase of price by reason of the duty was say, 4 cents a gallon. You see I have come down 2 cents below the actual duty, for it is admitted by the producers that they use 4 cents of the duty as protection to the Canadian manufactured article. The 4 cents increase of price by reason of duty on the 11,000,000 gallons would amount to $440,000, and the retailers' profits—the importer is not in it this time—would amount to $132,000, so that the grand total of extra costs by reason of the duty amounts to $1,299,216, or in round numbers $1,300,000 per annum. Let us take the industry of boot and shoes. There were imported in 1894, $247,500 worth, on which a duty was paid of $61,876, and the retailers and importers profits say, 35 per cent, amounted to $21,657, leaving a total on imports caused by duty of $83,533. The boots and shoes manufactured in Canada in 1894 amount in round numbers to $18,000,000. The increase of price by reason of the duty was say, 20 per cent, amounting to $3,600,000. The duty on boots and shoes is 25 per cent, but I only put 20 per cent as the increased price on these articles manufactured at home, and that would amount to $3,600,000. The retailers

profits was say, 25 per cent, which would be on boots and shoes $900,000, or a grand total on boots and shoes of $4,583,533, or in ten years, $45,800,000, which is taken out of the consumers of boots and shoes in this country in order to sustain the protective policy of the Government. That would pay the entire cost of Government for one year and leave a surplus of nearly $10,000,000. Take pig iron. There was imported of pig iron in 1894, 46,106 tons, and the duty paid on that was $179,000. The importers' and retailers' profits at 40 per cent amounted to $71,600. The cost of imported pig iron was $11.54 a ton. There was manufactured pig iron in Canada in 1894, to the extent of 56,000 tons, and the bounty paid on it amounted to $112,000. The increase of cost of the home manufactured pig iron by reason of the duty was at least $3 a ton, and it therefore amounted to $178,000. The retailers' profit on this increase was say 25 per cent and amounted to $44,500. So the total increase to the consumers by duty, bounty and profit, amounted to $585,100, and for every ton of pig iron produced it cost the consumer $10.44 protection. It was stated by the Controller of Customs this afternoon that the average price of imported pig iron was $10 and some cents per ton, and here we pay in order to protect the iron that we do not own when it is protected $10.44 per ton. That is over 100 per cent. Now, let us take the iron and steel goods imported into Canada in 1894. They amounted in value to $8,844,000, and the duty paid was $2,457,000. The importers' and retailers' profits, at, say, 40 per cent, amounted to $982,800, so that the total on imports of these articles was $3,439,800. I can safely say, Mr. Speaker, that we pay at least two and a half million dollars of increased price on Canadian manufactures of iron and steel at the lowest calculation, which when put with the other sum makes a grand total of $5,939,800 that comes out of the pockets of the consumers of protected iron and steel goods in Canada, or in round numbers, $6,000,000 a year, which in ten years would amount to $60,000,000, a sum which would build the Canadian Pacific Railway. It would build our canal system, and would leave $20,000,000 to spare. It would pay the interest on our public debt for over six years. Let me sum up and give you the amount on those few articles taken from the people of Canada in ten years by reason of bounties, duties, and profits on duties by importers and retailers to protect the following industries :—

1. Cotton	$ 38,360,000
2. Pig iron	5,851,000
3. Manf. iron and steel	59,398,000
4 Boots and shoes	45,800,000
5. Coal oil	12,992,000
Grand total	$162,401,000

Mr. Speaker, how much of that immense sum of $162,401,000 goes into the revenue? Just $43,000,000, and the other $119,401,000 comes out of the pockets of the Canadian people without adding one single dollar to the revenue, but goes into the pockets of manufacturers, middle-men, importers and reatilers in the form of profits and increased prices. This enormous sum is taken under the plea of protection. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that this is the result of protection and by whatever percentage we can reduce it, it will by so much lessen the burdens of the people, burdens under which they have suffered for fifteen years of this iniquitous policy, inaugurated, continued and proposed to be continued by the Government now in power. I have a few other things to say, but I will now draw my remarks to a close. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have given facts enough to the Conservative party to think over for a while. I think I have convinced them, at least in their hearts, that the policy they are wishing to impose upon the country for another five years should be abandoned. I am of the same opinion as regards the National Policy that a socialist in Russia was with regard to the late Czar. An interviewer called upon one of the leading socialists in Russia shortly after the late Czar was dead ; and the interviewer said to the socialist : "Well, the late Emperor has done many good things for the country ?" "Yes," replied the socialist ; "I think he has done some good things for the country, and some bad things for the country, but the best thing the late Czar ever did for this Empire was when he died." So it is with the National Policy. The best thing the National Policy could ever do for this country is to die, and let me tell hon. gentlemen on the other side : it is now in a moribund condition, it is in the last stages and throes of death, and if you only went to the country a few months ago the National Policy would be dead now.

Sir JAMES GRANT. Mr. Speaker, at this advanced hour of the evening, and particularly after the extended discussion that has taken place on the fiscal policy of this country, I feel that it would be almost an injustice to the House if I were to detain hon. gentlemen too long at this late hour. I approach this subject with a considerable degree of diffidence. It has been so ably discussed in every detail that I think it is quite unnecessary for me to dwell at any great length on the fiscal policy of the Government. We have had in this Chamber expressions of opinion from two intellectual financial athletes—the one the leader of the Government on this side, who, I must say, delivered one of the ablest financial expositions that it has been my pleasure to listen to during the last quarter of a century that I have been connected with the political life of Canada ; and the other, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), a gentleman who for a number of years was connected with the Department of Finance. In order to become somewhat

posted in the details of the observations of the hon. gentleman, I have taken occasion to look over the various financial statements made by him to this country, extending over a period of a quarter of a century; and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that after reading those various speeches, while recognizing that the hon. gentleman possessed more than ordinary literary abnity and acuteness of observation, and high-toned ability in many directions, still, in all, I failed to find out it was possible for him to put before the country those remarkable statements that he has done, on almost every occasion when he has undertaken the serious responsibility of responding to the financial statement made on this side of the Chamber. The depression in trade that hon. gentleman attributed to the National Policy. The National Policy, with the opposite party, seems to be a 'bête noire.' Is it not, however, a well recognized fact in this country that from the very inauguration of that policy we have had, on the whole, not deficits, but something to the credit of the country, except during the last twelve months, when, owing to the extraordinary depression which has prevailed, not only in Canada, but in every other portion of the world, there has been some little falling off in revenue. This is attributable, not to the Conservative party, but to the fact that there has been a general fall in prices. However, our revenue has been almost sufficient to meet the requirements of the country, with a little addition. The tariff which was presented to this country at the inauguration of the National Policy was such as was destined to meet the needs of the country, as it has done; but within the last year or two there has been a great discussion upon this whole question of the tariff—so much so that our public men on both sides of the House set themselves to work to see what could be done. The Opposition alleged that the Government were not doing what was necessary for the wants and requirements of our people. However, last year our two Controllers went over the country and consulted with leading farmers and manufacturers, and brought down to this Chamber such a tariff as was destined to meet the requirements of the country; and were it not for the remarkable depression that came upon us suddenly and unexpectedly, that tariff would have given us, not a deficit, but something to the credit of the country. To-day, when I picked up the "Shareholder and Insurance Gazette," what did I find? That according to the "Chronicle," the Bank of England hold £37,429,282 in gold, against £31,838,207 last year; the Bank of France, £82,640,665 gold and £49,305,578 silver, against £69,734,000 and £50,900,000; the Bank of Germany, £38,-138,253 gold and £15,577,597 silver, against £31,362,120 and £12,809,880; and the Bank of Austro-Hungary, £18,606,000 gold and £13,612,000 silver, against £10,348,000 and £16,360,000. Now, what do these figures point to? They point to the fact that the remarkable depression of the past year has not been confined to Canada, but is found in England, France, Germany, and, in fact, in all monetary centres in the world. There seems to be a general want of confidence in trade and commerce—and why? Because this stagnation is general in its character. Otherwise, you would have that money, which is now housed up in these banking institutions, going into circulation; but the reason it has not been put into circulation is that they were afraid to invest it. But to-day we find a great change taking place. During the last few weeks, as the hon. Finance Minister pointed out in his Budget speech, a rise has taken place in the price of wheat, timber, iron and those other products, the prices of which are a perfect index to the trade and commerce of the country; and I am sure that we are now just at the commencement of an improvement in trade, and that before another year passes over, we shall find a great advance in every portion of this country. The hon. member for South Oxford in his address stated that for the first time in sixteen years the hon. Minister of Finance had said nothing about the National Policy. Why should it be necessary for us to say anything about the Nationl Policy? Is it not an acknowledged fact what this National Policy has done for Canada? We are not the class of individuals who are always praising ourselves or boasting of what we have accomplished. We know that in this country the National Policy has done more for Canada than any other policy. Why? Because it met the requirements of our people, because it built up our industries, because it brought people into the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that our people are going out of Canada. Before I get through I hope to prove the contrary. The hon. member for South Oxford said that the National Policy was a blight and a curse upon this country. Such, Mr. Speaker, is not the case. From 1878 to 1895 it has the most remarkable record that has ever been inaugurated. When the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald spoke in this House, the sound of his voice reverberated, not only through this Chamber, but broadcast through this country, and the people were satisfied that his policy was of such a character that it would lift our country out of its despondency, foster its institutions, and encourage our labourers, manufacturers and artisans, as experience has proved it has done. The hon. member for South Oxford had something to say concerning our trade with Australia. The Government were proposing more favourable terms with that country, and the hon. gentleman is prepared to find fault with those terms. Why? Be-

cause he imagines that the products of Australia sent into this country will interfere with the trade of Canada. And yet the hon. gentleman preaches free trade. But the very moment that the Canadian Government is desirous of extending our trade and commerce with our sister colonies, the very moment that the representatives of these colonies are here, we are found fault with because we are taking hold of enlarged ideas, and desire to extend those opportunities of trade and commerce which are likely to advance the best interests of the whole Dominion. Again, what do we find? As was pointed out by the Minister of Railways in his able address the other evening, the hon. member for South Oxford found fault with the Finance Minister for going into the English market to borrow money. He charged the Finance Minister with always borrowing and spending more than is absolutely necessary. And in the same breath, the hon. gentleman criticises the Finance Minister for not having borrowed more when he had the opportunity of doing so, and for not having taken more than was absolutely necessary for our requirements. He blows hot and cold in the one breath, but that is a characteristic of the hon. gentleman, and I am not at all surprised. The fact of the matter is, after listening to the observations made by the Opposition in the last few days on matters of trade and commerce, I am impressed very strongly with the sentiment which flowed from no less a person than the national poet of Scotland as being applicable to our friends in the Opposition:

> O, wad some pow'r the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us.
> It wad frae monie a blunder free us
> And foolish notion.

There is another thing the hon. gentleman charged to the Government. He almost said that the National Policy was the cause of the fall in wheat. Do not we know perfectly well that there has been a remarkably heavy drop in the price of this article throughout the world. And why? Because it is now being produced in great quantity in the Argentine Republic, India, and Russia, and, owing to the climatic conditions of these warm countries, and the low price of labour, it is very easily produced, and consequently there is actually more wheat grown than is absolutely necessary for the requirements of the country, but, forsooth, because it happens to be low in price, that is entirely due to the National Policy, and the Liberal-Conservative party.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman repudiate the proposition that the National Policy has the power to raise the price of cereals?

Sir JAMES GRANT. I think that the National Policy, by exercising a fertilizing and progressive influence on every industry in the country, cannot fail to beneficially affect the price of wheat, though not sufficiently to counterbalance the other influences of which I have spoken. There are two subjects which are somewhat of a novel character that I desire to bring before this House and the country, inasmuch as they are intimately connected with the status of the provinces and the financial condition of this country. We have two great sources of revenue, our great forests and our mineral resources. We know that at present those forests are partly under the Dominion, and partly under the control of the Provincial Government, and our mineral resources occupy the same position. But we know perfectly well that to-day the large revenue from both of these lines is more under the control of the local than of the Dominion Government. and yet, notwithstanding this, we find the uttermost farthing extracted in the way of provincial demands on the central purse. That is a very important point, and one that really should not be lost sight of. The forest primeval is the most valuable inheritance that this generation possesses. In fact, it is the ready cash of the soil. It is that cash which always turns up wherever it is touched. To-day, our forests are more valuable and extensive than even those of the great neighbouring republic. Professor Macoun, in a very able paper presented to the Royal Society of Canada, last year, said, after a careful consideration of this whole subject, that our forests extended to the Pacific towards the unknown regions to the north and southwards until they came to Lake Superior and joined the deciduous forests of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, having a breadth about two hundred miles and width of about three thousand miles. These forests are extremely valuable and extremely important. We know that portions of these forests are under the control of the Dominion Government, particularly the Indian reserves and the central poplar regions of the North-west Territories. Now forests have become so important in the opinion of the people of the various European countries that the governments of those countries have appointed agents who are called chiefs of the forestry departments to take entire control and superintendence of these areas. And, as a result, millions of dollars have been saved in various portions of Europe which would have been entirely lost, were it not for the care and supervision exercised over these immense sources of revenue. In Canada we know perfectly well that more forests have been destroyed within the last 25 years than would have built the Canadian Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean. And let me say that even since that Pacific road was constructed, having made three trips myself to the Pacific Ocean. I have been amazed beyond measure to find the enormous destruction of forest and forest wealth along the line of the railway,

owing to the want of careful supervision of the forests on either side of the road by the company or by those who are employed as its servants. Prof. Macoun says that the forests of the North have an area of 600,000 square miles. In fact, he goes beyond that and estimates them at a million square miles. He estimates the poplar region which extends from Edmonton to Vancouver, a distance of about 900 miles at an average width of 50 miles, which gives a total area of 45,000 square miles of forest for use of the settler. Now, it is well known that these poplar lands are extremely valuable. Wherever those trees grow there is invariably good soil. I trust that the same supervision that is being exercised over the forest lands of European countries will be exercised over the forest lands of this country. In this connction I wish to quote briefly from an address delivered before the Natural History Society at Montreal, no later than a few days ago by Hon. J. K. Ward, a member of the Legislature of Quebec :

> In my thirty years of experience I have come to the conclusion that most of the bush fires has been the work of fishermen and hunters, who not only destroyed valuable timber, the property of the public, but also the shanty and material of the lumbermen. In view of this being the case, I would suggest that the Government, which is most interested in the preservation of forests, employ as many men as are thought necessary in each agency, to look after and trace the origin of fires on the public domain, giving them the power to take evidence, so as to bring to punishment who either wantonly or carelessly set fire to or cause the destruction of such valuable property. I would also suggest that no lands unfit for settlement should be offered for sale ; from what I have seen in my travels on the rivers running into the St. Lawrence and Ottawa from the north, a very large proportion of such territory is of this character.

I mention these facts in the hope that they may lead to greater care in the supervision of these valuable forests. And not only that but I would suggest that, as they do in Europe through their various governments, the farmers of the North-west Territories should be encouraged to devote a certain time each year towards the planting of trees, so that in the future they may have something of value in itself and exercise a beneficial effect upon the climate of the country. There is another point to which I wish to draw attention—the mineral resources of this country. I believe there is no subject which may better engage our attention to-day than that of the mineral development of Canada. When I heard the observations of gentlemen on the other side of this House the other evening, I was amazed beyond measure at the doleful view they took of Canada, its prospects and its future ; and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in bringing these statements before the House to-night I have done it mainly with the object of letting the country know how enormous our resources are, what great wealth we have in store. I wish to show what a future the Finance Minister has to con over in preparing his addresses, as I have no doubt he will for years to come ; for the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada, who have taken such an energetic part in developing these resources have held the confidence of our people and by their indefatigable perseverance have prompted the development of the powers and resources of this country and will continue to do so and, entrusted with the people's confidence will continue to win for Canada a name and reputation even greater than that she already enjoys. From 1886, when the Geological Survey first began a systematic collection and analysis of mineral returns, the value has grown almost steadily from $12,000,000 to $20,900,000 for the year 1894. All this represents real wealth, produced from our natural resources, not made by gains in trade by selling and buying. It is wealth, too, of a kind not easily exhausted, for in very few cases is any sign of exhaustion found. We find that the Geological Survey, whose men are of scientific merit not to be surpassed in the known world, who, in the investigations east and west have achieved a name and reputation which is a credit to Canada, have by their energy and ability, guided by the head of the department and under the influence and prestige of the Liberal-Conservative party, led to this return of no less than $20,900,000. We find that this outcrop of minerals is a merely surface indication, and that further investigation by the opening up and developing of these tracts brings to light even greater resources. All these may be counted as assets of this country. Running over the statistics of mineral production for 1894, and comparing these with the figures of the three foregoing years, the following particularly hepeful and striking facts may be noted :—In 1894 chromic iron first produced in any quantity value $36,946. Lead, a great increase in the past four years, owing to the working of the rich silver-lead ores of British Columbia. They never turned out so much of this material as they did in 1894. Of nickel, now nearly 5,000,000 pounds are produced annually, valued at $2,000,000. Will any man tell me what was the cause of this production ? How did it come about ? Was it by accident ? Was it the work of some bush ranger, or of some of the aborigines of that country striking a pick into the ground ? No, far from it ; it was the result of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which opened up this tract and discovered this mineral, which scientists at once knew was the basis of an extraordinary metal that is now attracting the attention, not only of Canada, but of the civilized world, and bringing hundreds of people in here to occupy those mines and develop them. Still we are told that the people are flocking away to other countries,

although these other countries are nothing like as attractive as is our own. Then again we find that silver, notwithstanding the fact that it has fallen so much in price within the last two years, that many silver mines cannot be worked owing to the low grade, I observe that mines are being worked in British Columbia of so high a grade, and the silver contained in them is in such quantity, that it pays remarkably well to the hundreds of people going in there to develop those mines. I would strongly recommend any young men who want to make homes for themselves and to carve out a name and reputation, to go out to British Columbia, and there they will find something worth working for, and in a country and in a climate inferior to no other in the world. Then again as regards asbestos, we know this material has been found in large quantities in Quebec. Last year the product amounted in value to nearly half a million dollars. Of coal, the outputs are steadily increasing. In 1894 there were 3,853,235 tons, valued at $8,447,329. Of gypsum, about $200,000 was taken out, principally in the province of New Brunswick. In mineral waters, from $95,000 to $100,000 worth were consumed last year. Now, this is a very important point, and I wish to say a word about it. The idea is prevalent that the mineral waters of the Humber and the Spas of Germany are far superior to anything we have on this portion of the North American continent. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no country in the world that possesses more valuable mineral springs than the Dominion of Canada. Hundreds of people are coming in from Great Britain, from Europe, from the United States, to enjoy the benefits of our mineral springs. These call for increased railway facilities, increased housing accommodation. The mineral springs of Canada, those of Caledonia, those of Banff, those of the Pacific, and those of the Lower Provinces, are attracting such attention to-day that shortly they will become the source of a larger revenue for the Dominion than they are at the present time. Then in natural gas, the borings in Canada not only supply our wants but they also supply the city of Detroit, and many thousands of dollars accrued to the revenue of our Dominion from this source, in consequence of those scientific investigations that are being carried on through our geological survey. Last year no less than $300,000 worth of natural gas was sold. Petroleum we find is slowly increasing in the quantity produced. In 1894 there were 829,104 barrels taken out of the earth in the Dominion of Canada. Of salt, 45,000 to 60,000 tons were produced last year, salt of the very best quality. Almost every where throughout the Dominion the most gratifying progress is being made in the further development of its mineral wealth. Beginning with British Columbia what do we find? Mr. Speaker, there is no province in the Dominion to-day that has a greater future before it, that has greater prosperity in store for it, than British Columbia. I have visited it and gone through a great portion of it, and I am thoroughly convinced that it is now only in the initial state of development. We know that it sends first-class men to this Parliament, and it likewise produces first-class minerals. The minerals developed on the Pacific slope have been chiefly coal. Recently, explorations of the Geological Survey have pointed out that in one part, particularly in the vicinity of the Crow's Nest Pass, a very large deposit of coal exists, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway is continued from Macleod by Crow's Nest to the Pacific, there will be opened up a very large country, and by the combination of iron and coal, both of which are know to exist there, I have no doubt that we will have shortly on the Pacific slope, a great black country developed, such as has made the name and reputation of old England in respect to her manufacturing industries. In metalliferous mining, the Kootanie district is at present taking the lead, wonderful discoveries of ores yielding silver and gold have occurred there during the past few years, and thousands of miners, building towns and calling for banks and post offices have entered this region of country, which till lately was a wilderness. In West Kootanie, the vicinity of Kootanie Lake is ribbed with veins holding argentiferous lead ores, and Toad Mountain includes the celebrated Silver King lode, with silver and copper. Kaslo and Slocan with ores chiefly of silver and lead, and Trail Creek, with pyrrhotites rich in gold, are names already well-known in the mining world, but destined to become better known, for the actual output of ore has so far been small as compared to the deposits from which these first gleanings are derived. Then let me mention East Kootanie, the McMurdo district and many others. In Okanagan, Fairview, Boundary Creek, &c., there are gold mines. The Cariboo district, famous in past years for its placer mines, is now entering into a new era of development with abundant capital and the introduction of hydraulic mining on a large scale. In the north-west country, the chief mineral wealth, examined and mapped out in large part by the Geological Survey is coal of various kinds, varying in character from anthracite to lignite. The investigations of the Geological Survey likewise give reason to believe that a great petroleum region may soon be developed in this region. Boring operations under the auspices of the survey are now in progress at Athabasca. In Ontario we find veins of gold-bearing quartz in process of discovery and development at the Lake of the Woods, Rainy Lake and Seine River, Sault Ste.

Marie, Sudbury and in Madoc and Marmora—all in rocks of the Huronian formation. Silver has long been mined in the vicinity of Port Arthur, and Sudbury is the site of a great and growing industry of nickel and copper mining. Iron ores are plentiful throughout the province and petroleum, salt, natural gas, gypsum and other minerals have already settled down to a satisfactory yearly output. It has, besides gold, large deposits of asbestos, iron ore and minerals of various kinds. New Brunswick is not destitute of minerals, with its gypsum, granite and grind-stones. Nova Scotia, the last province to which I shall refer, is now attracting a very great degree of attention. And why? Because a great change has come over the spirit of their dreams within a short space of time. By the investigation of scientists, it is found that it is not only valuable to dig those mines which show ore in large quantities, but through the introduction of different processes of mining, that is, crushing rock of low quality, the same as is done in Alaska, where this process is carried out on rock that contains ore worth only a few dollars to the ton, there never was a brighter future for Nova Scotia than there is to-day with respect to its mineral resources owing to the improved appliances and machinery and advanced investigation with respect to the extent of gold ore in the province. The province also possesses deposits of iron and coal which contribute very materially towards its prosperity. If I have gone to-night over these matters somewhat in detail, I trust I will be excused doing so because I have been stirred up to adopting this course by the ideas thrown out with respect to the future and the prosperity of our country. I trust that no man will live in Canada and think we are in a state of decay and ruin. Such is far from being the case. We find that in 1886 the output of the mineral products of Canada was only of the value of $12,000,000, whereas in 1893 its value was $19,250,000, and in 1894, the grand aggregate of $20,900,000. Nothing affords me greater pleasure than to have had this opportunity of placing before the House and the country the importance of our resources with respect to forests and minerals; and when I speak of our forests, before concluding my remarks, I must say that I feel thoroughly satisfied that the forests of Canada to-day are more valuable than those of the United States. What do we find in a report made by Prof. B. E. Fernow, Chief of the Division of Forestry of the United States. In his report to the American Government, he said:

> The total annual product of wood material of all sorts consumed in the United States may be valued in round numbers at $1,000,000,000, representing, roughly speaking, 25,000,000,000 cubic feet of wood, or the annual increase of the wood growth of 500,000,000 acres of forest in fair condition. This value exceeds ten times the value of our gold and silver output, and three times the annual product of all our mineral and coal mines put together. It is three times the value of our wheat crop; and with all the toil and risk which our agricultural crops involve they can barely quadruple the value of this product yielded by nature for the mere harvesting.
>
> If to the value of our total mining product be added the value of stone quarries and petroleum, and this sum be increased by the estimated value of all the steamboats, sailing vessels, canal boats, flatboats and barges plying in American waters and belonging to citizens of the United States, it will still be less than the value of the forest product by a sum sufficient to purchase at cost of construction all the canals, buy up at par all the stock of the telegraph companies, pay their bonded debts, and construct and equip all the telephone lines. The value of the annual forest product exceeds the gross income of all the railroad and transportation companies. It would suffice to pay the indebtedness of all the states, if we leave out New York and Pennsylvania, including that of all counties, townships, school districts, and cities within those states (in 1880); and it would more than wipe out the remaining public debt of the United States. In fact, ranking manufactures of all kinds and agriculture as respectively first and second in importance, as far as production of values goes, the forest product occupies the third place. This was the case according to the census of 1880. It is claimed that since then the lumber industry has enlarged to such an extent as to make its product second, if not first in value.

Under these circumstances, is it not evident that we have no reason to fear with regard to our resources, with regard to the future of our country, with regard to the call of our Administration for money to carry on the affairs of this country, when we know we have in our minerals, in our forest lands, such an extraordinary outcome of material not only for the present but for coming generations, and long may these remain under the control of and under the supervision of the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada? On the subject of finance, there are one or two points which I wish to bring to the attention of the House. In discussing the progress made by Canada during the last quarter of a century, reference has frequently been made to money accumulated in our savings banks. However, we know perfectly well that it is a substantial structure to build upon. But there are other channels of investment for the surplus earnings of our people. We know perfectly well that every family in our country takes into serious consideration the advisability of life insurance, and at no time in our history was life insurance in a more prosperous state than it is to-day. Let me tell the House that one company in the Capital of Canada, the Metropolitan Life, one of the largest industrial companies in the world, has forty agents at work to-day in this city insuring the lives of our people. And it is perfectly extraordinary how much is expended every day, week

and month as an investment in this direction. Then we may look into the history of the Canada Life Insurance Company of Canada? Was there ever an institution that made greater progress or advancement? To-day, not only is it one of our leading insurance companies, but it is also one of our leading financial institutions. Out of whom did the company make their money? Out of honest investment of capital in the insuring of the lives of our people. If we turn to-day to the records of our companies, is it not pleasing and gratifying to see what they have accomplished in giving insurance and building up the fair name and reputation they enjoy throughout the Dominion. Life insurance is considered almost indispensable in every family. We find, on examining statistics—although hon. gentlemen opposite, with their blue ruin ideas, cannot see it—that the amount of premiums aggregate $106,458,863 during the last twenty years. If, from 1875 to 1894, we have been going from bad to worse, as has been stated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it so happens that of the $106,458,863 of insurance subscribed, contributed and paid as premiums in Canada during the last 20 years, no less than $75,640,436 have been paid up during last ten years, as against $29,818,027 during the ten years previous. Is that no evidence of the advancement, of the progress and of the resources of the people, and of their ability, out of their honest earnings, acquired by the exercise of brain and muscle, to pay that money, and thus insure their lives and build up the institutions of the country. The net amount of life insurance in force in 1875 was $85,009,264; in 1885, ten years later, that had risen to $149,962,146, and in 1894, it reached a total of $308,795,881. The number of people covered by this insurance can be inferred from the fact that the number of policies in force in 1893 (I have no later figures) was 166,384, whereas in 1885 the number in force was only 90,517. Surely these indications show that Canada is able to stand a rainy day, and what better prospects can we have of the prosperity of our people than to know that life insurance has quadrupled during the last ten years. I do not believe that there is anything like the cloud of desolation spoken of by the hon. gentleman opposite as overshadowing this country, since the regime of the Conservative party commenced. I believe that we are living under a clear sky and that we have as prosperous a future before us to-day as we ever had in the history of this country. I have not spoken of all the Insurance Associations, for I have not included the numerous benevolent and friendly societies such as the Foresters and the United Workmen, in both of which associations a large amount of money has been invested. These are only still further evidences of the prosperity of our people such as I have endeavoured to bring before the House and the country on this occasion. There is one other very gratifying feature of our present condition in this country to which I wish to refer. It is connected with the education of our people and the building up and fostering of our higher educational institutions. We know perfectly well that those to-day who go to schools and colleges are not as they were some fifty years ago, children of the wealthier classes; but they are the children of the middle classes, the ordinary labourer and mechanic. Those people are acquiring wealth enough to educate their children so as to enable them to compete with other individuals no matter in what walk of life they be. As long as they have brain and muscle these channels are open to them in this country, and that is the reason we encourage all classes of our people to be thoroughly and well educated. Let me remind hon. gentlemen of these figures. The number of students attending McGill University in 1892 was 926, and in two years afterwards they had increased to 1,149. The number of students attending the Toronto University in 1891 was 857 and in two years later that number had increased in 1,132. These are gratifying facts. This state of affairs has not been confined to these two universities but we find the same thing in Queen's University, in Laval University, in Dalhousie University, in Manitoba College and from one end of our country to the other. Those privileges of education have been extended to the ordinary classes in life who have now the means to give a higher education to their children and that is proof positive of the undoubted prosperity which marks the growth and progress and advancement of the people of this country. The hon. the leader of the House (Mr. Foster) gave us a great many facts in his Budget speech, but before I refer to these, I wish to advert to one fact mentioned in a very able article emanating from the pen of our worthy Clerk of the Commons, Dr. Bourinot. In a leading article on the progress of Canada, in the "Edinburgh Review," Dr. Bourinot points to our advancement in science and literature, and what better proof can we have of the prosperity of a people than that those higher channels of education should be utilized? It is a proof that our people are availing themselves of that which not only tends to the comfort and happiness of themselves, but which will go down as a legacy of happiness to their children who come after them. Dr. Bourinot says:

> We have already seen the low condition of education fifty years ago—only one in fifteen at school; but now there are nearly 1,000,000 pupils in the educational institutions of the country, or one in five, at a cost to the people of upwards of £2,000,000, contributed for the most part by the taxpayers of the different municipalities in connection with which the educational system is worked out. In Ontario the class of school

houses is exceptionally good, and the apparatus excellent, and the extent to which the people tax themselves may be ascertained from the fact that the legislature only contributes annually some £52,000 out of the total expenditure of about £800,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the financial condition of Canada. We know perfectly well that the Budget speech presented to us by the hon. Finance Minister was so exhaustive in its character that it is scarcely necessary to add anything to it. But notwithstanding that, when I hear gentlemen, like the hon. member from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) give to this House and to the country such extraordinary ideas with reference to our financial condition, I think it well to quote to the House some statistics which show the marked progress and development of Canada, and which may be of some use to our people who may have an opportunity of reading them, and who take an interest in our welfare. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in one of his excellent speeches delivered in Western Canada says :

" Life may be divided into two great divisions : the producing and the distributing."

No matter what may be produced in a country, it is of very little consequence unless it is also distributed, and the great aim and object of the trade and commerce of this country is to find not only a home market but a foreign market as well. Our surplus products have been going to the foreign market in Europe and long may they continue to go in the same direction. The exports of Canada in 1879 amounted to $71,000,000, and in 1893 they amounted to $118,000,000, or an increase of 66 per cent under the National Policy. Our imports in 1879 amounted to $81,000,000, and in 1893 they amounted to $129,000,000, or an increase of fully 60 per cent in the same period. Taking our total imports and exports together, we had in 1878 a business with other countries amounting to $153,000,000, whilst in 1893 that total business had increased to $247,000,000, or an increase of 65 per cent. Our shipping and railroading trade shows a solid and substantial increase. In 1878, the sea-going tonnage amounted to 6,500,000 tons entered and cleared from Canada, and in 1893, it amounted to 10,500,000 tons, or an increase of 60 per cent in the period. The coasting trade tonnage increased in the same period from 11,000,000 tons in 1878 to 24,500,000 in 1893, or an increase of about 110 per cent. The inland and water tonnage of Canada which is a good indication of our increased trade was as follows :—Entered in the ports in Canada in 1879, 5,000,000 tons and in 1893 that was increased to 8,000,000 tons, or an increase of 60 per cent. The circulation of our banks, in 1879, was $19,000,000, and in 1893 it actually reached $34,000,000, an increase of 80 per cent. We find the same increase in our telegraphs, our post office circulation, and our natural products, for instance, in cheese. We know that the Hon. George Brown, during his lifetime took an active and energetic interest in Canada's trade and commerce, and when the reciprocity treaty was abrogated he did not fail to express his conviction, not only in his journal, but on the public platform, that it was not going to be so detrimental to the trade and commerce of Canada as was supposed. I was glad, indeed, to hear him say so. I was glad that he had that largeness of heart, comprehensiveness of mind, and acuteness of observation to enable him to recognize that Canada was not going to be demoralized by the abrogation of that treaty, but was going to go on and prosper, as she has done. In 1878 our export of cheese amounted to 46,000,000 pounds, valued at $4,000,000 ; whereas, in 1893, it amounted to no less than 134,000,000 pounds, valued at $13,000,000, being an increase in value of 240 per cent. Our cattle export in 1878 was valued at only $1,500,000, and in 1893 it reached a value of $7,500,000, being an increase of 500 per cent. Who will have the hardihood to assert on the floor of this Chamber, no matter what he may think to the contrary, that the National Policy has not been the basis of the strength and the stability of this Dominion, for the developing of our resources and the building up of our trade and commerce. In an able address, delivered only a short time ago, while presiding over a dinner given in London, in honour of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, brought out some very important facts, which I wish to cite now, because an effort has been made to prove to the country that the Conservative party have actually used the resources of this country for their own personal aggrandisement and advancement, instead of for the building up of the great works of the country, which have given us such a high reputation throughout the world. In that able address, what did Sir Charles Tupper say ?:

Canada has expended on her canals and that great interoceanic line of railway from Halifax to Vancouver—works absolutely vital to the defence of that section of the Empire, and that half of North America—$141,000,000. In deepening the St. Lawrence $3,384,000 have been spent, so that, whereas a few years ago a vessel drawing nine feet of water only could reach the city of Montreal, the largest ocean steamer may now ride in safety in its harbour. (Cheers.) We have also expended $2,700,000 in the construction of graving docks, built under the superintendence of and in concert with, Her Majesty's Government to receive for repairs the largest ocean steamers frequenting the Atlantic or the Pacific. We have paid $7,000,000 to obtain the control and rights of the Hudson's Bay Company and organize the North-west country for settlement. * * * Within the last twenty years, we have paid $13,500,000 to keep good faith with the Indian subjects of Her Majesty. * * * When we turn to the Pacific coast, we find Canada spending

$250,000 in conjunction with Her Majesty's Government for the construction of fortifications at Esquimalt, and I have the satisfaction of learning that Her Majesty's Government is satisfied in the highest degree with the manner in which Canada has come forward to share one-half of the cost of constructing the fortifications and the entire cost of maintaining the garrison there. Taking these items altogether, we have a total of $174,839,000, and I record it as some proof to the people of this country, with whom we are very proud to be connected, that Canadians are not slow to recognize their duty towards the Empire. * * * And what does Canada expend to maintain her militia force? No less than $1,300,000 per annum. For the Mounted Police, that most efficient protective force in the North-west Territories, she spends $625,000 per annum, for the maintenance of the fishery protection service to discharge duties formerly falling upon the British navy, she pays $128,000 per annum; for the war cruisers plying between Vancouver and Japan and China, at the command of Her Majesty's Admiralty, as the most efficient means of protecting the commerce of this country, and for the steamers plying between Vancouver and Australasia, equally prepared to come to the service of the Empire in time of emergency, Canada pays $200,000 per annum; while Canada is also ready to-morrow to pay $750,000 per annum more to obtain a fast steamship line across the Atlantic.

Talking of this fast Atlantic service, gentlemen on this side of the House have been actually taunted because they mentioned a fast Atlantic service. What does a fast Atlantic service mean, Mr. Speaker? It is one of the most important propositions ever submitted to this House. What did we find the other day? We found passengers who had arrived at Vancouver by the "Empress of India" from Japan, China, Australia and India at our very Ottawa station, passing through the very centre of this Dominion. This shows what the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada have accomplished, in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, which a few years ago, when I first had the honour of a seat in this House, was not known—when it took three months to go from the capital of Canada to Winnipeg, the capital of the North-west Territories, as compared with to-day, when you can reach that point in three days: and still are told that the Conservative party of Canada are slumbering on their oars and doing nothing. When the hon. leader of the Opposition was in the North-west last summer, delivering those eloquent addresses to the people there, and enjoying the luxury of a special car on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, I was glad to find him enjoying, did he tell the people there what had been accomplished by the Conservative party to cause Winnipeg to grow, in a few years from being an Indian post to be the Chicago of the North-west? No, not a single word. He gave all the credit to the aborigines of this country, and to the early voyageurs, and not to those who were instrumental in building up the great work of the country, establishing law and order, planting centres of Government, trade and manufactures, and bringing population into the country. Rely upon it, Mr. Speaker, that we have something more to consider than mere subterfuge. We have to look at this question in a broad and comprehensive spirit; and, when we think of those passengers from the great eastern hemisphere coming through central Canada, wending their way towards that great country to which we are all proud to belong, and to which I hope we shall long continue to belong—when we think of what the Canadian Pacific Railway is accomplishing, we have but to remember that it is but one line in the great chain of communication; and if the public men of Canada are to-day contending for the maintenance of its supremacy on this northern continent, one of their purposes is not only to establish a line of communication from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but to connect with fast steamship lines, one great hemisphere with another, and, as much as possible, to shorten that route, because we have a great competitor to contend against in the Suez canal route. We know that Sir John Pender, a gentleman of great energy, zeal and ability, who controls the continental lines of telegraphic communication throughout the eastern world, and who was the pioneer of the electric cable system of to-day, looks at us with a great deal of interest, because he fears that the day will shortly arrive when the voyage through the American continent will be so shortened by this line that this route will become the great way of travel connecting the two great hemispheres and be preferred to the Suez route on account of its better climatic conditions and other advantages. I trust the day is not far distant when Canada, notwithstanding the efforts of the Opposition, will see, under the auspices of the great Conservative party, the shortest line possible across the North American continent an accomplished fact. Another matter to which I shall call attention is the Hudson Bay Railway. I find in the "Daily Nor' Wester," the following reference to Mr. Laurier's visit to the North-west:—

When Mr. Laurier visited Winnipeg in September last, he found the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway was a crucial question in so far as the general support of the electorate was concerned. As he said, he was not a Minister, and could not make promises; but he would contrast what he would do, if in power, with what Ministers, in their lukewarmness, had not done. He said: "Not only have they been unable to make up their minds, but they are also not in favour of a railway to Hudson Bay."

Then we find that the hon. member for Winnipeg said:

The Government do not care to take the trouble to make any investigation as to the character of the Hudson Bay navigation. Well, I can say this for the Liberal party, it is our duty to make an investigation of these resources.

Mr. Robert Watson and several others expressed themselves to the same effect. I am not going to enter into any discussion of this subject, which we know is a sort of bete noir, because I do not know anything about the policy of the Government, except what emanated from the able statement of the Premier in the Senate the other day. That was a plain, straightforward, common sense statement, and any man who reads may learn. I look upon that road with a considerable degree of interest. We know that the currency of the North-west is its wheat and that the only way to give that wheat its greatest value is to bring the North-west as close to the English market as possible. Nearly seven-tenths of the wheat of that country finds its way to Port Arthur, through Port William down to Buffalo and thence to American seaports. And why ? Because there are more bottoms in New York market for shippers than they can possibly get in Montreal. But time will change that, and we will be enabled to ship our wheat through Canada to greater advantage. There is a great future before the North-west. It is the thorax of the Dominion. The prosperity of the North-west means the prosperity of Canada. Our Ministers are showing their sense of the situation by putting great energy into the development of the country, and certainly in the last twenty-five years they have accomplished wonders. We know well that we are passing through a very serious financial crisis throughout the world, and we feel certainly the necessity of being economical ; but the day must come when that railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay will be built. I have looked into this whole question. I have examined its history and all the explorations made in that country, and I am thoroughly convinced that history will repeat itself so far as Hudson Bay Railway navigation is concerned. I recollect thirty-five or forty years ago when it was said that the St. Lawrence was not navigable owing to the immense quantity of ice at its mouth ; and last session, when the question of the fast service was discussed, the leader of the Opposition quoted from some old, dusty literature to prove that even the St. Lawrence was not suited for fast navigation. The then Minister of Marine (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) pointed out that the literature quoted from was as far behind the times and as antiquated as the policy of the Opposition itself. I think that we will see the same change of opinion with regard to navigation of Hudson Bay. I have friends who have lived there for years, and I have had occasion to look into the statistics, and I am satisfied that the day will come when Winnipeg will be 1250 miles nearer to Liverpool than it is now. It will be just as near Liverpool as Montreal is. As the building of this road will give an increased stimulus to farming in the North-west, the whole subject should be most thoroughly inquired into. Our Dominion has a wonderful future. We will have more poeple in the next half a century west of Red River than we have in all Canada to-day, and it is the duty of every true patriotic Canadian to contribute, as far as he can, to this enterprise. I thank you, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, for the kind attention you have given the few observations I have had to offer. I am here but as a humble Canadian, a citizen of the capital, to assist as far as I possibly can any advance in the prosperity of this country. And, if there is one circumstance more than another that gives me pride and satisfaction, it is to be a humble member of the great Conservative party which has done so much to develop the resources of this Dominion of ours.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to ; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Permanent Reserve Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate Gilmour & Hewson (Limited).—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

IMPORTATIONS OF SUGAR.

Mr. GIBSON (for Sir Richard Cartwright) asked, What amounts of raw and refined

sugar were imported into the ports of Montreal and Halifax from the 30th of April to the 3rd day of May in 1894 and 1895, respectively ?

Mr. WALLACE. 1894—Montreal : 3,304,389 pounds raw sugar were imported and entered duty free at the port of Montreal between 30th April and 2nd May inclusive, 1894. No refined sugar was imported during that time at the port of Montreal. 1894—Halifax : 2,174,287 pounds raw sugar were imported and entered duty free at the port of Halifax between the 30th April and 2nd May inclusive, 1894. No refined sugar was imported during that time at the port of Halifax. 1895—Montreal : 9,285,499 pounds raw sugar were imported at Montreal between the 30th April ultimo and the 2nd May inclusive, and passed through the Customs duty free and delivery obtained during that time ; also 141,830 pounds refined sugar. 1895—Halifax : No sugar was imported at Halifax between the 30th April ultimo and the 2nd May inclusive. 23,547,313 pounds raw sugar had been imported between the 23rd February and the 26th April and stored in sufferance warehouse, and entered free through the Customs and delivery obtained between the 30th April and 2nd May inclusive ; also 11,035 pounds refined sugar.

MR. L. J. A. McMURRAY.

Mr. LEGRIS asked, 1. In what capacity is Mr. L. J. A. McMurray employed at the Experimental Farm ? 2. How many years has he been so employed ? 3. What was his work in the years preceding this, and what is his present employment ? 4. What pay has he received each year ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The answer as supplied to me by the Department of Agriculture, is as follows :—1. Mr. L. J. A. McMurray is now employed at the Central Experimental Farm in general office work and in showing visitors over the farm. 2 and 3. Mr. McMurray was at first engaged on the Experimental Farm as a day workman and received $1.25 per day, paid weekly. He was employed chiefly in outdoor work in connection with the experimental plots of grain. Beginning with October, 1890, he was paid monthly, at the rate of $35 per month, and from that time to the present has been chiefly employed in general office work and in showing visitors over the farm. 4. From 2nd May, 1890, to 30th September, 1890, he received $1.25 per day ; from 1st October, 1890, to 30th June, 1891, $35 per month ; from 1st July, 1891, to 31st October, 1892, he received at the rate of $500 a year, and from the 1st of November, 1892, to the present time, he has received $600 a year.

VOTERS' LISTS—CORRECTION.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to correct an error in the revised "Hansard," to which my attention has been called. Some days ago the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) asked a question which stood in his name, as to whether the lists would be revised during the present year, and my answer was that the lists had been revised this year and that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill, which is now being introduced, legalizing the non-revision of the lists this year. I see that an error has crept in and that my answer is given in "Hansard" : That we intended to introduce a Bill to legalize the new revision of the lists this year.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means ; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to notice that my esteemed friend from Ottawa (Sir James Grant) is not in his place this afternoon. We were greatly delighted last night with the very interesting address he gave us. He usually affords us considerable merriment when he speaks, but I do not at all intend to deal harshly with him, and I propose to offer only a few remarks in reply to his statements. He told us about the balances in the savings banks, and also about insurances and many such things, for the purpose of endeavouring to prove that the country was in a prosperous condition and that the National Policy had accomplished a great deal for Canada. I would judge from what he said that he made insurance a hobby, and I dare say that immediately when he is called in he advises every one of his patients to insure their lives. I heartily commend the hon. gentleman for doing that. Now, the hon. gentleman also said something regarding the Hudson Bay scheme. My hon. leader (Mr. Laurier) is often found fault with in this House for not expressing himself very distinctly upon important questions, but although Parliament has already been in session for a month, and the question of the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway has been agitated in the country and in the press, we have not yet had the slightest inkling either from the Government or from any of their followers,—not even those from Manitoba—as to what they intend to do with regard to that project. Last night my esteemed friend (Sir James Grant) professed to be fully cognizant of the peculiar character of the country through which the pro-

posed line was to be built, and he told us he knew a great deal about the Hudson Bay territory. He said, for instance, that he had some relations in Hudson Bay. Well, I never thought for a moment that the hon. gentleman was so nearly related to the "finny" tribe; but we have his own word for it, for he said that his relations were resident in the Hudson's Bay, and not on the shores surrounding it. I understand that there is an hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has taken a good many notes of the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant), and I will, therefore, not follow him further. I have, however, to deal with some statements made by the Minister of Finance, and I will commence by referring to what he said as to the interest. A great many statements have been presented in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of showing that the per capita interest charge of this country has not been largely increased. The hon. Finance Minister stated that the per capita interest at one time stood at $1.86, and that it was down now to $1.79. He did not say that it was during the Mackenzie regime that it rose to $1.86, and had he said so it certainly would not have been correct. I have looked over the different years of the Mackenzie Government, and I cannot find that the per capita rate of interest ever reached that amount, so that if it did reach it, it must have been under the administration of the present Government. They are better hands at raising the rate of interest and borrowing money than they are at reducing the annual expenditure. If it had not been for the fortunate fact that the rate of interest in the money markets of the world has considerably fallen off during late years, and if we were now compelled to borrow at the high rates charged during the time the Mackenzie Government was in power, the per capita interest to-day would be nearly double what it was during Mr. Mackenzie's time. It is fortunate, in the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite, and fortunate for the country also, that the rate of interest has greatly decreased during recent years, because while to-day we are paying an enormous amount of interest, let the rate be what it was years ago, and sad indeed would be the drain on our resources to meet the demand. In 1881 the net interest paid was $6,826,795 on a population of 4,324,810, or $1.57¾ per capita. The net interest paid in 1891 was $8,677,558 on a population of 4,833,239, or $1.79½, or very nearly $1.80 per capita. So that there has been a steady increase in the interest in place of a decrease; and this is greatly to be regretted, because last year the Finance Minister told us in his Budget speech that the borrowing period in Canada's history was about ended, that we were drawing near to the time when we would begin to reduce our debt, and that everything pointed to a considerable reduction year by year. We have not yet begun to experience the fulfilment of that prediction. It is in accord with a great many predictions which hon. gentlemen opposite have made in past years. With regard to the blessings of the National Policy, we are accustomed from year to year to hear those predictions reiterated, and when they fail to be fulfilled, hon. gentlemen opposite have no explanation to make; and I am sure that they will treat in the same way the announcement made by the Finance Minister last year with regard to the stoppage of borrowing. The hon. Finance Minister appeared to speak in a very boastful way of the manner in which he had relieved the people of this country from taxation by taking the duty off sugar, claiming that he had allowed them to keep some $4,900,000 in their pockets. But while that tax was removed, so far as the revenue was concerned, its protective feature in the interest of the sugar refiners, was kept intact. The hon. gentleman put on eight-tenths of a cent a pound on refined sugar coming into Canada, and admitted the raw material free. Eight-tenths of a cent a pound on 250,000,000 pounds, the quantity we imported last year, makes $2,000,000 of taxation which the consumers of sugar paid, but none of which found its way into the Dominion treasury. It all went into the pockets of the refiners of this country for the purpose of protecting them against competition. This is the feature of this vicious policy that we desire to call the attention of the House and the country to. During the present session we have had a change in the duty on sugar. The Finance Minister has proposed a duty of half a cent a pound upon imported raw sugar; but he has not removed the duty of six-tenths of a cent a pound which is still kept on in the interest of the refiners; so that the consumers of sugar in this country will have to pay one and one-tenth cent a pound of taxes from the day the Finance Minister made his Budget speech until that tariff is altered. But out of that one and one-tenth cent a pound for protective duty, only half a cent goes into the Dominion treasury, while the six-tenth cent goes into the pockets of the refiners. We have evidently reached a period where we are producing so largely the commodities that enter into every-day use that we are now forced to turn around and put a duty on raw materials to produce a revenue, and we have commenced with sugar. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite, if the people permit them to continue to occupy the treasury benches, will go on putting duties on other raw materials in order to provide a revenue. Now, what must be the fact with regard to sugar next year? Suppose we import 300,000,000 pounds, the quantity that we imported this year, we shall obtain from that $1,500,000 of revenue, but in addition to that we shall

have to pay the refiners $1,800,000, making together something like $3,300,000 of taxation. That is the condition of the tariff with regard to sugar at the present moment. The Finance Minister also drew attention to some increased trade with Spain, Italy, Belgium, China, Japan and Australasia. We in Canada, owing to the fact that we have been largely deprived of the market to the south of us, appear to be hunting the world over in the effort to find an outlet for the commodities we have to sell. We had a very advantageous and convenient market in the United States for a great many of those commodities before the tariff wall that separates us from that country had been erected. But, Sir, from the time we introduced the National Policy down to the present time, the barriers of restriction have been growing higher and higher, until we are now almost absolutely shut out of that market. The hon. Finance Minister said last year that our gross trade with the United States had dropped $13,000,000, and he appeared to rejoice in that fact. Permit me to tell him that there never was a change in the tariff of Canada or in the tariff of the United States that the people of this country felt more seriously, or deplored more earnestly than the change which brought about the present condition of things. In the United States, our people found, and would to-morrow find, a very desirable outlet for a great many commodities which we can most lucratively and conveniently produce. But we have been shut out of that market, and we are now compelled to sell a very large proportion of our products in the slaughter market of creation—the British market, where all the products of the world are gathered, and where keen competition from all climes and countries has to be met. The agriculturists of this country cannot afford to compete with the cheaper labour of India, Northern Russia, Africa, and other countries. We want, if we can, to get a fancy market for much of what we have to sell, and that fancy market is to be found in the United States; but, in place of hon. gentlemen opposite making an honest effort to secure the advantages of closer trade relations with that country, they have, by every possible trick and deception, laboured against a treaty with the United States; they have fooled and humbugged the people of this country in regard to it, and the condition we are in to-day is directly attributable to their action. That has been the outcome of their course. I shall say a few words more with regard to interest, because that appears to be a question upon which there has been considerable dispute. In 1882, the net interest was $6,667,359.93. In twelve years we have increased that amount to the sum I have already given, $8,933,787. That is the increased drain upon the resources of the people in that number of years of $2,266,427.23, or an increase per capita in interest alone, in twelve years, of $50 per head of the population. That is a very important matter when you come to consider that it covers every Indian, every half-breed, every papoose in the cradle, every inmate of the asylums, every inmate of the jails, and every tramp that walks our streets. Somebody has to pay the increased interest, for it is there to be met. It thus becomes a matter of very serious moment for our people. But start with 1878. The actual interest paid in 1878 was $7,194,734. The actual interest paid in 1894 was $10,212,596, or a net increase in those sixteen years of $3,017,862. This is unquestionably a very serious bit of financial history for this country. It shows how rapidly we are running into debt, and when we take into consideration the very limited progress we have made in population and development, we must look upon that increase very seriously and begin to realize what an enormous drain the people are subjected to in having to pay that sum every year. I shall now deal with some features of the National Policy. It is contended, and I notice that it has been contended by Ministers on the stump as well as in this House, that the continuation of the National Policy does not tend to increase the prices of the commodities which enter into the everyday use of the people. I have noticed on several occasions that they have declared that on goods purchased in this country our people pay no taxes. There are, they say, no taxes paid on woollens and cottons, and the other lines manufactured here. I wish to show that such statement is not correct. Last year, 1893-94, we imported raw cottons to the value of $2,610,538, and of manufactured cotton, $4,001,618. On the manufactured imports we paid a duty of $1,139,068. The estimated consumption of cotton in Canada is $9,000,000, a year. Take the avergae duty of 30 per cent on $9,000,000, and you will find it will amount to $2,700,000. Now, we collected in duties on the manufactured commodities imported, $1,139,068, leaving a balance of $1,560,132, which went into the pockets of the cotton manufacturers. By this statement we see, and I challenge contradiction, that there is a pretty good thing in the National Policy for the cotton manufacturers, and it is not to be wondered at that they should sound its praises and blessings. If it tended to contribute to the financial well-being of every other class as well as the cotton manufacturers, it would certainly be a blessing all round, but it has, on the contrary, taken that amount of money out of the pockets of Canadian consumers to give it to the manufacturers. Take another article, because, in my opinion, this is the only proper way to point out the advantages which the National Po-

licy confers on the manufacturers and how injuriously it affects the consumers. Take starch, the consumption of starch is 5,000,000 pounds. The protection on starch is 1½ cents per pound, or $75,000. We imported last year 44,088 pounds, on which we collected duties, $14,473.61. Taking that from the protection on the amount consumed, we find there is $60,526.39 which the people have paid and which never reached the Dominion treasury. They paid the whole $75,000,000, of which the small percentage of $14,473 only reached the treasury, and the $60,526.61 went into the pockets of the starch manufacturers. There is, therefore, a considerable benefit in the National Policy for the starch manufacturers, and they have a very nice thing. Not much wonder that they should clamour in its behalf. It is stated, of course, in reply that they pay 7½ cents per bushel duty on corn, but looking over the exports and imports of corn, I am surprised to find that although we have four very large distilleries in the country and some five or six starch factories, and although there is quite a quantity of corn used throughout the west, all the duty we got on corn last year was $120,000. We imported over 11,000,000 bushels, but have credited over 10,000,000 bushels as exported, and the small percentage left is what we collected the duty on. It is rather singular, with all these establishments in existence, that we get so small a revenue from corn. Then take sugar. We imported 303,789,809 pounds free, and 2,823,448 on which we paid $22,230.66 duty, which shows that the manufacturers sell the product refined up to the price at which it can be imported. Should we import the same quantity next year, the consumers of sugar will have to pay that, and in addition the half cent a pound which goes into the Dominion treasury, so that there is a very considerable advantage to the sugar refineries in the National Policy, and we need not be surprised that they should urge what a blessing it is to Canada, and loudly call for its perpetuation. Take agricultural implements. Last year, 1893-94, we imported 755 self-binders, on which was paid $24,478.50 duty, or $32.42 per binder. This will be found on page 117 of General Statement of Imports. I have good reason to believe, because it has been stated to me on reliable authority, that the Massey-Harris Company manufactured some 12,000 binders during the last year. The protection is $32.40 per binder, which on 12,000 would amount to $389,040. But they claim that they pay a duty of $5 per binder on the stuff which goes into its manufacture. Well, taking that off, there is still left the net sum of $329,040 protection to the manufacturers of 12,000 binders. This is, in my opinion, a very considerable protection against competition. Sometime ago the threat was made that the Massey-Harris Company were going to move their factory to the other side of the Niagara River. I think, if the protection is what is indicated by the blue-book, they have a very decided advantage over all outsiders and should be well satisfied. It is not they, but the people who use the binders who ought to complain. We will take spades and shovels. We imported last year, according to our returns, 2,637 dozens of spades and shovels. The duty paid upon that importation was $5,599.91, or $2.12½ per dozen. Now, the Gananoque spade and shovel factory turns out, according to the Finance Minister, 9,000 dozens a year. Their protection on that at $2.12½ would be $19,125. They employ about 80 hands, so that we pay toward their wages about $240 to their average hand each year. This shows that, so far as the Gananoque factory is concerned, it is quite natural for the proprietors to praise the National Policy; for it does a great deal for them and gives them a great advantage over their outside competitors. I have no doubt that the proprietors of the factory are ready at all times to hold up their hands and throw up their hats in favour of the National Policy. Let us turn to another item, that of wall paper. The consumption of wall paper in Canada is about half a million dollars a year—the year before last it was $495,000. We produce in Canada about $300,000 worth each year. The average protection on wall paper is 42 per cent. On our total consumption that would be about $207,900 of protection. How much did the treasury get last year from this source? Only $61,249.19. So that left $146,650.81 to go into the pockets of the wall paper manufacturers of this country. These people should be well satisfied with the tariff. They should be pleased to be authorized by law to compel the consumers of wall paper to give them such a comfortable profit each year. I believe there are three factories that manufacture wall paper in Canada. If that is so, they are protected, on the average, to the amount of $48,883.60 to each factory. It is not much wonder that you find the manufacturers gathering together and passing resolutions expressive of their strong approval of the continuation and perpetuation of the National Policy. This policy has undoubtedly done much for them, but the consumers of the country are being made the victims. I contend that this policy of levying a tariff first with a view to granting protection to special industries, while making the question of revenue a secondary consideration, is a vicious fraud and wholly unjust to the consumer. Why, Mr. Speaker, it simply means levying taxes in Her Majesty's name but not for Her Majesty's purposes; it means levying taxes for the purpose of putting into the pockets of certain individuals money that they never earned and are now entitled to. Without further dwelling on the advantages that

specific manufacturers get out of the operation of the National Policy, I shall simply repeat, because I think they are worth repeating, the statements made by my esteemed friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) last night with regard to what the census of this country clearly proves. I have here a statement which I should like very well to have some Minister of the Crown or some other gentleman deal with and to explain away if he can, the inferences which must be drawn from it, or justify, if he can, the enormous drain to which it shows the people of this country to be subjected under the operation of this system. Now, this is the statement of the manufacturers themselves, and you will find it in table No. 2, page 382, Vol. III. of the census of 1891. I commend it to the study of every man who takes an interest in the affairs of this country. It shows that the number of manufacturing establishments in Canada is 75,968. The capital invested in these establishments is as follows:—In land, $31,466,324; in buildings, $60,303,043; in machinery, $81,401,247; working capital, $181,450,136. That makes a total of $354,620,750. Remember, these are the manufacturers' own figures; these are the statements that they themselves have voluntarily given the census enumerators. The value of raw material used in these manufacturing establishments in a year is $256,119,042; the value of labour engaged—wages paid—is $100,663,650, making a total of $356,782,692 for raw material and labour. Now, they give also the value of the articles produced, the total being $476,258,886. Now, taking the raw material and wages from that and we have left $119,476,194, which shows the profit on the investment on capital. Now, what percentage is that? That is a percentage, Mr. Speaker, of 33½, showing a clear profit at that rate on the capital invested and money used in these manufactories. I challenge any denial of these figures; they are as stated by the manufacturers themselves. These are not our figures; they are compiled by the manufacturers themselves and are the reports given by them to the census enumerators about their own business. Now, Sir, I would like to know of any other business in Canada—that of the farmer, the fisherman, the lumberman or any other that will give a clear net return on the invested capital.

An hon. MEMBER. That is their profit?

Mr. McMULLEN. That is clear profit after paying for raw material and wages. After paying for these there are only the four items of investment—land, buildings, machinery, and working capital, and the sum I have given represents the profit on that investment.

Mr. GILLMOR. The consumers pay that.

Mr. McMULLEN. The consumers pay it, because they buy the articles and have got to pay it, and they report that the gross amount sold is the sum that I have mentioned to the House. Now, my hon. friend behind me gave you the figures in regard to the farmers. He shows clearly that the farmers of this country, allowing only 5 per cent for the money invested, allowing only ordinary wages to be paid for the men, allowing only ordinary wages for themselves and their families, after all that, over 10 millions of money have been lost by the farmers of this country within the last year, as compared with the advantages enjoyed by the manufacturers of this country. I have prepared some figures with regard to the condition of agriculture in Ontario. Total value of the land in Ontario, $680,000,000; total value of buildings, $180,000,000; total value of stock, $104,250,000; value of implements, $48,500,000; making a grand total of $1,012,750,000. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to this fact, that, although in one line of business, in one province alone very nearly three times as much money is invested in the interest of agriculture as is invested in manufactures, yet the policy of this country during the last fifteen years has been to build up manufacturing institutions and to cripple and hinder the farming industry. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are doing good work for the farmers, but you cannot get any sensible, intelligent farmer in this country to swallow that statement nowadays. When you remember the fact that the Patrons of Industry and the Grangers of this country, in almost every lodge, in almost every meeting, have passed resolutions condemning in the plainest terms the policy that is now in existence in this country, it must be admitted that they have shown clearly that they consider themselves victims of an imposition under the operations of that tariff; they have shown that by the intelligent manner in which they have dealt with the question of a protective tariff and a revenue tariff. Now, Sir, when hon. gentlemen go out on the stump, they do not hesitate to say to the farmers of this country: Why, you are protected in your pork; if American pork were not excluded, you would have to take considerably less for the pork you raise. I am glad to notice that the Controller of Customs is listening to me while I speak about pork, because he has made that subject a hobby, and has been telling the farmers that they were protected against competition in pork, and that, if they were not so protected, American pork would come in here and flood the market, and they would get very much less for the pork they raise. Well, Sir, what are the facts? Here are the figures taken from the blue-books: In 1889, we exported 4 million pounds of pork; in 1891, we exported 7 million pounds of pork; in 1892, we exported 12 million pounds of pork; in 1893, we exported 20 million pounds of pork. These figures show that, instead of bringing pork into this country, we export a large

quantity of that article. If you take the reports in any of the newspapers with regard to the price of pork, you will find that the price in Chicago and Buffalo is quoted considerably higher than it is in Canada. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to produce a paper that will show that pork has been higher in Toronto at any time during the last six months than it was in Chicago or Buffalo. It has been higher, and it is now higher. You may take either dressed hogs or live hogs, and I give hon. gentlemen the opportunity of testing either. I know whereof I speak, because I have kept a close watch of the hog market for some time back, and I know that the market in the United States has been higher than it is in Canada. Now, Sir, to try to fool the farmers with the idea that the removal of the duties on hogs would endanger the price here, is trying to persuade them to believe something which no intelligent and well-informed farmer will believe. Now, with regard to the North-west and the exportation of wheat from that country, in my humble opinion, it is becoming more evident every day that the natural course for the surplus crop of that country to take would be to go to St. Paul and Minneapolis, as well as Montreal. I do not believe we shall ever succeed in trying to carry it north. Let us remember the fact that the Americans' wheat crop was short last year, according to their own report, being some six and a half millions less than they are able to consume. Therefore, I believe that the day when Americans are able to export wheat to other countries is rapidly drawing to a close. They have largely gone over the virgin soil of their country, and, notwithstanding their efforts to cultivate their land, they will not be able to raise wheat for export, and they will find year after year, as the population increases, that, instead of being exporters of wheat, they will have to become importers. I contend that under those conditions it would be most desirable to make a market for Manitoba, to have an opportunity of selling wheat there, if they choose, or else send it to Europe, if they found a better price. Now, I contend that protection does not always protect. In 1870, when the Americans adopted their protective system, they had a very large supply of sheep, and they put a duty on wool for the purpose of increasing the number of sheep and increasing the production of wool. After that duty had been in existence for over fifteen years, when they came to take a census in 1891 and enumerate their flocks of sheep, they found that in five of the largest wool-producing states, they had 3,600,000 sheep less than they had when they put on a duty for the purpose of increasing the production of wool. That fact shows that, while the Americans believed that the imposition of a duty would have the desired result of increasing the production of wool, they were mistaken, as it did not have that result. The reason was not that it did not pay the Americans to raise sheep and produce wool, but it was because the farmers of that country were so pauperized under the operation of the National Policy that they had in force in that country for twenty-five years, that they could not afford to keep sheep, and they had to sell the sheep they already possessed. The result was that in place of increasing the production of wool, the quantity of that article produced by the farmers notably fell off. We must admit that the National Policy has caused a boom. We have, no doubt, enjoyed very large expenditures in this country for the last number of years. From 1880 to 1893 we have been continually borrowing money. We have borrowed, in that time, something in the neighbourhood of $610,000,000, including money borrowed by the Dominion on our national credit, as well as on railways and on the credit of the provinces. That money has been spent on railways and in other directions. But, Sir, the only percentage we have left at the end of these years is the comparatively small sum now lying in the post office savings banks, and in kindred institutions: the money which has been borrowed has been expended and carried away from the country, and we are left largely in debt. We have gone largely into the construction of public works; but, what is their value to-day? They are monuments of the greatest folly, and we have many such. They were entered upon, not because they were necessary to the country's requirements, either at the present time, or in the future, but they were entered upon for the purpose of perpetuating the occupancy of the treasury benches by hon. gentlemen opposite. Have we not had most scandalous exposures with respect to the construction of public buildings throughout the country? For example, there was a post office built at a place called Farnham, where the revenue is only $460. It is impossible to point to a single public building erected by hon. gentlemen opposite that the plans have not been changed and the price largely increased, but I am glad to say that this rule does not hold with regard to buildings erected by the provinces. Where is there a Government railway which has been constructed within the original estimate? There is not one. We have had post offices built which were estimated to cost $20,000 or $30,000, but ultimately cost $54,000. We have also the Langevin block, which stands as a monument to scandalous and reckless expenditure, and which in centuries to come will be pointed to as an evidence of the gross corruption which existed at the time of its construction. Then we have the St. Charles Branch Railway, a road that was to be built for less than $15,000 a mile, or a total of about $150,000, but which actually cost in the neighbourhood of $2,000,000. We have also the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, which was to cost less than $1,000,-

000, and has cost $2,000,000. And so hon. members may go from place to place and find public works that cost from 25 to 50 per cent more than the original estimate. To cap the climax, we must turn to the Curran bridge. That stands as a monument of the grossest kind of corruption, and I notice by the newspapers to-day that Mr. St. Louis has been acquitted. And why did the judge acquit him? Because the judge said that the contract had been so loosely drawn that there was room for all the corruption and extravagance that had been committed. Yet the Finance Minister will sit day by day, with his hon. colleague and he will throw charges across the floor that hon. members on this side are incompetent to conduct public affairs—he will sit with a colleague who was connected with a public work which was to cost less than $200,000, and on which $200,00 has been actually lost, as it has cost over $400,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Stolen, and no one punished.

Mr. McMULLEN. Stolen. I say that all these facts afford evidence of the reckless extravagance that has been committed, and they show clearly and distinctly that the National Policy has had a most injurious effect on this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have borrowed money and spent it for the purpose of holding their seats on the treasury benches, and I believe they are prepared to-day to resort to anything before they will consent to remove from those benches. They will sink the credit of this country financially until it will not be worth 50 cents on the dollar; and, if the erection of another Langevin block would perpetuate their occupancy of office for another term of years, they would willingly build it. We have, at all events, one building in this Dominion, in the erection of which there was no rascality, and that is the Parliament building in Toronto, built by Sir Oliver Mowat, a man who has a record for honesty and uprightness unequalled by any man except, perhaps, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who has gone.

Mr. BOYLE. How about your present leader?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He has not been in power.

Mr. CHARLTON. Put him in power, and he will show you an example.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can say for my leader, he is a man who has a record in Canada that is untarnished and untainted by any scandal. He has never sat in the House with the position of Collector of Customs in his pocket, and the hon. gentleman should be the last man to bring up this fact.

Mr. BOYLE. I wish to say——

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will take his seat, I will allow him a chance to reflect a little on the answer he will give me.

Mr. BOYLE. I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Monck has not the right to interrupt the speaker.

Mr. McMULLEN. Years past, when we pointed out to hon. gentlemen opposite how reductions could be made in the annual expenditure, they persistently insisted that it was impossible to cut down the Estimates. We are glad to see that when the necessity arose the Finance Minister was able to make a few slight reductions, but not so many as should have been made. I will point out some further reductions which can be effected. I observe that the Finance Minister has given notice of the introduction of a Bill regarding superannuation. I wonder if he is prepared at this late date to abolish this pernicious system. It has been very objectionable simply because it has been recklessly administered, simply because hon. gentlemen opposite have been prepared to utilize that system for party friends and purposes. They have shelved men who were in health, and capable of performing their duties, in order to find comfortable places for their own friends, and the result is that to-day there are over 550 superannuated officers of this Dominion drawing $263,000 of the people's money, and living at ease. I say the people cannot tolerate this system any longer. Had the Act been honestly administered, such results would not have flowed from it; but we claim now that the civil servants should be required to provide for themselves in their old age, if they reach a period of life when they are incapacitated from performing their work. We should abolish the superannuation system. The Minister of Railways and Canals claims that he has made a very considerable reduction in the running expenses of the Intercolonial Railway; but I believe that vast reductions can yet be made in connection with that railway. In a great many cases an immense number of employees on that road are altogether unnecessary. I believe the number of trackmen is double what is necessary, and that the number of men at the stations in the shape of baggage men and so on is altogether too much. I have had a look through the figures connected with a portion of that line, and I am satisfied that if the Government wished to do so, they could make considerable further reductions in the operating expenses. Mr. Speaker, I claim that we should reduce the number of our Cabinet Ministers instead of increasing them. We have altogether too many of them now, and the country should not be burdened to sustain such a large

number in comfortable and easy positions at the rate of $7,000 a year each and $1,000 each for sessional allowance. I believe that the affairs of Canada would be better administered, and I have no doubt that the rows and rackets that take place in the Privy Council would be fewer if there were less men meeting there. We should get rid of three of them, at least, and save $21,000 a year. Then, in regard to the civil list. We are now paying over three and a half million dollars for the Civil Service, and under a proper administration the staff and expenditure could be very considerably reduced. But, Sir we cannot expect hon. gentlemen opposite to do that. They have too many friends and relations to provide for. It appears to become a weakness with every Minister when he is installed in office, to place his friends and relations in positions, and when Ministers set that example, it is only natural that their followers should try and benefit by the example. I do not know of any Minister occupying a seat on the treasury bench who has not done something for his relations. When we come to deal with the Estimates, I shall have the privilege of pointing out something specially interesting to the Finance Minister in this direction, which I hope he will be able to explain.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes ; I will explain it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I now forewarn the Finance Minister so that he may be prepared to give the explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very kind of you.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, there have been some men who have been recently superannuated. I don't say they are relations of his own, but you know that when these men undertake to do something for friends, they do not stop at second cousins ; but their uncles, and their aunts, and their wives' relations of all kinds, are usually provided for.

Mr. FOSTER. You seem to know how it is done.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Finance has had a considerable hint of what is before him, and he may expect to get it when we reach the Estimates. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that we should abolish the Franchise Bill, and it is my opinion that we should do that at once, and adopt the municipal lists. Look at our enormous and useless expenditure for immigration. For the last ten or fifteen years that money has been absolutely thrown away, and we should now, at long last, completely change our system in this regard. We should quit paying these men to travel and deliver lectures. I notice that there is one gentleman belonging to the city of Ottawa, a very venerable man, no doubt, and one who probably can give a very good lecture ; but, after all, I do not think we should have paid him $1,000 and travelling expenses for going home recently and delivering a few lectures. We have Sir Charles Tupper in England, and he should be able to deliver all the lectures necessary, because he does not seem to be able to do anything else. We got our cattle scheduled when he was in England, and he has never been able to get the embargo removed. When Sir John Macdonald asked the consent of the House to send Sir Charles Tupper to England as High Commissioner, he assured us that we would save from $25,000 to $30,000 a year commission on our debt, yet we have never saved a cent in that respect, and two years ago when the Minister of Finance returned after making his financial arrangements with the Bank of Montreal, he declared that he would not be able to use Sir Charles Tupper for that purpose at all. If we cannot make anything out of him in London we should bring him over here. However, I do not know, after all, that we have much use for him here, and I dare say that he would cost us just as much.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Superannuate him.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, he does not want superannuation, because I understand that he is a millionaire already. Then, again, we could save a great deal of money on our public works if the Government would use the money prudently and carefully in place of squandering it as was done in the case of the Curran bridge. I am glad to notice that hon. gentlemen opposite propose to make a reduction in the Mounted Police Force, and I think it is full time that they should do so. While a few men might be necessary out there, still I believe that the large number maintained on the force has not been a necessity. The First Minister stated to this House last session that the Mounted Police performed a desirable duty in preventing the smuggling of goods into Manitoba and the North-west Territories : but if preventive officers are necessary up there, they should be under the control of the Customs Department, and their expenses charged to it. I am sorry to notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have not decided to abolish the Land Board at Winnipeg, because, in my humble opinion, that is an unnecessary organization. From the time of its inception down to the present, it has never done any work that would justify the expenditure of $35,000 or $40,000 annually on that board. Mr. H. H. Smith, who is the manager or president or chief official up there, gets $5,000 a year, but yet I believe that a very large number of cases that come before the Land Board at Winnipeg are reported at Ottawa, and reconsidered in the offices here. Now, that is paying two sets of officials for performing the one kind of work, and in the face of the limited increase of population in Manitoba and the North-west, and the limited

proceeds from lands and other resources of that country—because we are not receiving $1 for every hundred that was promised, on account of the opening up of that country by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—we should abolish the Land Board at Winnipeg and save so much to the people of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, something has been said with regard to free trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite are ever ready to point out to the farming community of this country, their contention that the inevitable result of the introduction of free trade in Canada would be to impose a tax upon every carriage used by the farmer, upon every gun he has, and all that kind of thing. They say that under free trade we would have direct taxation, and that the people will be fleeced right and left. Now, they have no authority whatever for any such statement as that. Neither Mr. Laurier nor any of his followers ever made any such statement, and the assertions of hon. gentlemen opposite are therefore based upon pure fiction.

Mr. COATSWORTH. How about "free trade as it is in England."

Mr. McMULLEN. I will let my hon. friend (Mr. Coatsworth) know something about free trade. When it suits him and his political friends, they like to point to England, they like to praise the old flag, and they like to hurrah for the Queen when it suits them to do so; but, Sir, when it does not suit their purpose, and when American ideas and American principles suit them better, they are quite willing to take the other side and to desert English principles. Now, Sir, I will give hon. gentlemen opposite some little idea of what Britain has done under free trade. In 1846, when England adopted free trade, her debt was £850,000,000 sterling. Since that time she has had many wars—the Russian war, her Indian Mutiny, and other minor wars. She has paid the cost of all these, and in addition has reduced her national debt by $900,000,000. But she has done more than that. She has reduced her paupers 50 per cent and her criminals 71 per cent; she has sold 13 jails, because she had no criminals to put into them. She has improved the education of her people 100 per cent. She has increased the wages of her workingmen 25 per cent, and she has decreased the cost of all necessaries of life 50 per cent.

Mr. COATSWORTH. What about tea and coffee?

Mr. McMULLEN. When my hon. friend gets cornered in one place, he flies to another.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have to do that to follow you.

Mr. McMULLEN. In this country we have four sources from which we may expect to develop this country, to increase its population, and to make our people happy and comfortable: these are our fisheries, our forests, our fields, and our mines. These are the four sources from which we have to draw what will enable us to get rid of our national debt, reduce our expenses, and make our people prosperous. None of these four sources have received any benefit from the operation of the National Policy; they have been virtually overlooked and forgotten. Their interests have not been considered to the same extent as the interests of the manufacturers. Why, Sir, to-day we have a fast steamship line running from Vancouver to Australia and subsidized to the extent of $125,000 a year. We have recently sent Mr. Larke to Australia at a cost of $3,000 a year, in addition to living allowances. What has he gone to do? Is he going to accomplish anything for the farmers of this country? Is the prosperity of the farming industry of Canada going to be promoted by the establishment of a trade agency in Australia? I do not think anyone is foolish enough to think so. The sending of Mr. Larke there is virtually money wasted, apart from the interests of the manufacturers. We have already sent some manufactured products to Australia. The First Minister went there, at considerable cost to this country, for the purpose of promoting the business of our manufacturers. I carefully read all the speeches he delivered during his absence from Canada, and I could not find a single word that he uttered in favour of the interests of the farmers of this country. Their interests were not considered, nor are they considered to-day, and there is no hope that anything will be accomplished there from a farmers' standpoint. I contend that the subsidy to that steamship line should be abandoned, unless it can be shown that something more substantial will be accomplished than we have experienced in the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish further to continue the debate; but before I close I want to emphasize what I have already said with regard to the necessity of reducing our annual expenditure. I believe the time has fully come when Ministers should at once frankly state that very considerable reductions must be made. The people of this country cannot afford to continue the present condition of things, and there is no possible escape from the heavy burdens to which we are now subjected except by the practice of rigid economy in the public expenditure. What the people of this country require is to be severely let alone. What they want is a tariff that will exact from them only what is necessary to meet the demands of the treasury. We want a tariff that will not take money out of one man's pocket and put it into the pocket of another man without a consideration in return. We want a tariff that will enable people to live without being fleeced and robbed, as I contend they have been by the tariff we have had in this country during the last

fifteen years. It has created millionaires in Montreal and Toronto, it has made sugar kings and cotton lords; but it has robbed the masses of the people and pauperized the farmers and working classes. There is not a farmer in this country to-day who will not find, if he puts his hand in his pocket, that his condition is not as good as it was years ago. To whom does this country belong, anyway? To the sugar kings and the cotton lords; to be utilized for the purpose of keeping the Tory party in power? No, Sir; and I hope that the people of this country will rise in their might and pronounce in favour of reforms, which have to be made if they are going to escape their present troubles, and that they will install in office men imbued with ideas that will tend to promote the people's interests and permit them to sell in markets where they will get a lucrative price for what they have to sell, and to buy in the cheapest market, restricted only by the necessities of such a revenue as will meet the demands of an economical expenditure.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, since this debate has commenced, as day has followed day and speaker has succeeded speaker, I have been waiting, as I am sure this House and the country have been waiting, to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite a fair discussion and comparison of the financial policies which at the present time are or should be before the people of this country. I understand, Sir, that in a Budget speech, the Finance Minister is supposed to lay before this House, and through this House before the country, the financial policy of the Government; and I presume that when hon. gentlemen opposite take the course they have taken, and properly taken, on this occasion, of introducing an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, that was the time for them to lay their financial policy before this House and before the country. Now, it seems to me, with all due respect to hon. gentlemen opposite, that in their discussion of this question, they have very carefully avoided saying one single word which could enable this House or the people of this country to form the slightest conception of what their policy is. This, it may be said, is a natural sequence of the policy they have pursued in years gone by. We know that in the great Liberal convention which was held in the city of Ottawa only two years ago, a financial policy was adopted, which was drafted in such terms that a jury of Philadelphia lawyers could not discover what it meant; and the amendment before the House at this very moment is drawn in such terms that the hon. gentleman who drew it must know that not one man in the Dominion of Canada could put an exact and definite meaning on the words he there uses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the matter with it?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I will tell the hon. gentleman what is the matter with it; and when the difficulty is pointed out, I hope these hon. gentlemen will, as honest men, endeavour to explain it to this House, and also endeavour to explain the policy which for years past they have been trying to place before the people of this country. If we read the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, we will find that the whole gist of his amendment depends on the meaning to be given the words of tariff for revenue. He says:

> It is expedient that, in making provision "to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure," as recommended in the Speech from the Throne, the existing tariff be so modified that it may be made a tariff for revenue only.

I say here, in all sincerity, and with the consciousness of what I am saying, that no living man who has studied political economy in any school under the sun, would pretend to attach any precise, definite meaning of the words "tariff for revenue only." If the works on economy are not clear and conclusive on that point, the very utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite will convince us that they do not attach any definite, precise meaning to the term, because hardly any two of them so far have agreed as to what it does mean. If we examine into it, we find there is a certain technical meaning to be properly attached to those words, and also a meaning which, in common colloquial phrase, has been attached to the expression, and there is a third meaning which hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to attach to it and which is not found anywhere. What is the meaning of tariff for revenue? Using the term in its technical sense, it is a tariff which levies duties exclusively on articles not made at home. That is one meaning of tariff for revenue. Then there is another definition: "or which compensates the duties on articles made at home by equal excise duties on the home production."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where does the hon. gentleman get that definition?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Where it would be probably better for the hon. gentleman to look for definitions—in scientific works.

Mr. CHARLTON. What scientific work?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Give the work and the page where you got that definition?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I accept the hon. gentleman's challenge, and before the debate is concluded he shall have the book in his hands with the page marked.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Give it now.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Having accepted the challenge of the hon. gentleman, I am en-

titled to the promise in return that he will do me the courtesy of reading the work, studying it and trying to understand it. In addition to these meanings, for there are two meanings to the expression tariff for revenue, hon. gentlemen opposite have attached other meanings to it. Take the hon. member for South Oxford, who moved this amendment, and who should be supposed to know what is meant by the term. He explains to us :

I am not going for one moment to conceal from the House the fact that a considerable customs tariff must be enacted for some time to come, but it must be a just tariff, it must be no tangled mass of dishonest absurdities like the one under my hand ; it must be something which is fairly and honestly framed for the purpose of bringing revenue into the treasury, and not at the dictation of a protected manufacturers' association, for the purpose of enabling them to divide with the Government the plunder unjustly obtained from the people.

No person desirous of ascertaining the views of the mover of the motion, and seeking to discover those views from his language, could possibly say what particular line of fiscal legislation the hon. member for South Oxford intended to suggest, because any line of legislation which any hon. member would like to suggest could properly be described in those words. If we turn to the speech of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) who spoke the other day, in support of the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, we find him telling us, replying to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals :

Sixteen years should not have entirely obliterated from his mind the policy which was in vogue in this country prior to that when we had a tariff for revenue. That policy was in vogue when confederation was formed, it was continued for six years under a Conservative Government, and for another five years under a Reform Administration. Surely, the hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that, and surely he must remember that it is the policy which he and his friends are so fond of contrasting in its effects with their own policy. Sir, it was held by the Reform party at that time, as it is to day, that to depart from the principles which then guided us in fiscal matters, and to adopt a protective policy, would be a mistake.

The hon. member for South Brant attaches to the words tariff for revenue, just such a tariff as we had from 1873 to 1878. But every one knows that if you put on a duty, be it 1 per cent or 50 per cent, on any article manufactured in this country, the duty is to that extent protective. It is idle for hon. gentlemen opposite, who raised the scale of duties from 15 to 17½ per cent —and who raised it indiscriminately and without appreciating how they might at the same time assist the country while increasing the revenue—it is idle for them to contend that a policy such as that is not in one sense a protective policy, inasmuch as every imposition of duty on the manufactured article is a protective duty. Another gentleman, who appears to stand high in the councils of hon. gentlemen opposite—the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) —gave us his understanding of these words "revenue for tariff only." It will be found on page 954 of the unrevised "Hansard." He said :

I say that the policy of the Liberal party, so far as the tariff is concerned, is the policy of Canada as it was in the Conservative period from 1868 to 1873, and as it was in the Liberal period from 1874 to 1878. I have said myself to the people of the North-west Territories, that the Liberal party have made a pledge that, when they came into power, every vestige of protection would disappear from the tariff. I meant by that statement that I understood the Liberal leaders meant that, where there is an item of taxation, the effect of which is protective only, or so far as it is protective only, that is, to exclude exports, that such would be done away with.

Then he continued :

The Liberal party intend to raise a revenue by a tariff for revenue, and where a tariff for revenue has the effect of giving protection to those industries which are suited to Canada.

Evidently the reporter, or the printer, left something out here.

Reference was made by the Minister of Militia to an old speech delivered by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in which he stated it was his policy to encourage industries natural to the country. That is still the policy of tho Liberal party.

Then we have the hon. leader of the Opposition touring throughout the country not very long ago. He is reported to have said, and he has never contradicted the statement :

His idea of the policy of the Reform party was free trade as they have it in England.

Well, free trade as they have it in England, would be in no way inconsistent with the amendment to go into Supply, moved by the hon. member for South Oxford. Hon. gentlemen opposite are, at least on this ground, entitled to be called the Liberal party. So liberal are they in their views of fiscal legislation that they will admit any one into their ranks, no matter what he may believe in or what he may say, provided he does not believe in the National Policy. When hon. gentlemen opposite accuse members on this side of being wedded to protection, and then give all sorts of definitions of the meaning they attach to the word "protection," they are not treating this House or the country fairly. The Conservative party have been before the country for years, and its policy should be well understood. We know well that in the case of protection as well as free trade, or tariff for revenue, different meanings are attached to the same term, and we find hon. gentlemen opposite attaching to protection a meaning not given by hon. gentlemen on this side, and then blaming us for the con-

sequences. They have stated that the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was opposed to the policy which has been and is still, and will be for years to come, the policy of this country. We have been told again and again that the right hon. gentleman was not in favour of a policy such as that at present imposed on this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an address by him to his supporters in Kingston, published in 1861. In this address, he gives quotations from different speeches he made throughout the land, showing that at that time he was thoroughly in accord with the policy now in force in this country. At page 8. in referring to what had been done by the Government of the day in regard to fiscal legislation, he says :

We have, however, readjusted the tariff on imported articles so as to secure a sufficient revenue, and at the same time, incidentally, to encourage home manufactures. The success of our policy in this respect is already shown by the numerous manufactories of every description which have sprung up in both sections of the province.

Looking through this little book I find, at page 61—I give the page in case the hon. member for Queen's may be anxious to see this book—Sir John Macdonald spoke at a dinner in Hamilton, and on that occasion he said :

It is, as I have often said before, useless to discuss the abstract principles of free trade and protection, but it is a matter for consolation that the tariff has been so adjusted as incidentally to encourage manufacturing industries here. I hope all will see the advantages of a home market. * * * . If we were altogether an agricultural country, we should be dependent for the value of our produce on the quantity of the harvest on the Baltic and Black seas. As it is, when we have attained our full development, we shall not be so. Manufactories are springing up, east and west, and I hope this great commercial city will see the advantage of encouraging them.

In the same speech, he refers to the protest which was made by a number of Sheffield cutlers against the scale of duties. The objection of the Sheffield people was as follows :—

The merchants and manufacturers of Sheffield have no wish to obtain special exception for themselves, and do not complain that they are called upon to pay the same duty as the American or the German, neither do they claim to have their goods admitted free of duty. All they ask is that the policy of protection to native manufacturers in Canada should be distinctly discountenanced by Her Majesty's Government, as a system condemned by reason and experience, directly contrary to the policy solemnly adopted by the mother country, and calculated to breed disunion and distrust between Great Britain and her colonies.

It goes on to say :

It cannot be regarded as less than indecent and a reproach that, while for fifteen years the Government, the greatest statesmen, and the press of this country have been not only advocating, but practising, the principles of free trade, the Government of one of her most important colonies should have been advocating monopoly and protection.

Again, in a speech made at St. Catharines, and referred to in the same work, he says :

Some of you will be surprised to hear that we have not raised the taxation higher than it was during the time of Mr. Hincks. We have, however, readjusted the tariff, reducing the duties on articles of necessity and raw materials and increasing those on what is required for home manufacturing—this being a direct encouragement to our artisans and mechanics. It is as if there had been half a dollar duty on a hat and half a dollar on a silk necktie, whereas there are now three-quarters of a dollar on a hat and one-quarter on a silk necktie ; thus protecting the maker of hats, which we can manufacture in this country, and letting the consumer have his silk necktie cheaper, which we cannot produce.

These utterances by Sir John Macdonald were along the same line as his utterances as long ago as 1846, when, in the Parliament of that day, he urged the support of a Government resolution calling for the adoption of a differential scale of duties on manufactures of leather on the ground that the measure was a protective one, and, as such, deserved unanimous support. So that we see that as long ago as 1846 and 1860, Sir John Macdonald was in favour of what has been called a protective policy. But, Sir, while it is said that the policy supported by gentlemen on this side of the House is a policy of protection, again, I object to this as a most misleading term. As I understand, Sir, a policy might be protective even though there were no tariff ; for, under a scale of bonuses we may seek to assist and encourage any home manufacture. That, certainly, is not the style of protection we have at the present time. A policy would be protective, Sir, if the duties were imposed upon goods simply for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture of these goods in the country, utterly irrespective of the revenue of the country. But that is not the policy advocated by the Government of the day. Sir, the policy that has been laid before the people of this country, and again and again approved by the people, is a policy that does not insist or suggest levying one cent of taxation upon the people for the protection of any manufacturer in this country. But the Government, recognizing that a certain amount of revenue must be raised, without desiring to increase that revenue, desire to collect it in such a way that the collection shall injure as little as possible, and assist as much as possible, the various manufacturing interests of this country. Now, when hon. gentlemen opposite speak of this subject of the National Policy as they have been doing for the last few days, it seems to me that the references that they make to the state of affairs existing within the last few years, as compared with the state of

affairs existing from 1874 to 1878, are not wholly fair, and are, in some sense, misleading. We know that in the years between 1874 and 1878 there was a depression the world over; and it is worse than idle for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), an ex-Finance Minister, to stand up in this House and ask us in heroic terms, if we blame him for the depression that then existed in the United States. No, Sir, we are not so hard up for arguments as that? but I can tell him what we do blame him for. We say that between 1874 and 1878 there was a depression the world over, and, among other countries, Canada suffered. And we say that at that time, something might have been done to assist the struggling industries of Canada, and we blame him that nothing was done. And we say that hon. gentlemen opposite had not even the excuse of invincible ignorance for their conduct, because they were told again and again what was required, not only by those outside of this House, but by those in this House, and not only from the opposition benches, but from the ranks of their own supporters. We know that at that time the farmers of this country, in whom hon. gentlemen now take such an interest, sent a mammoth petition containing, I believe, some hundred thousand signatures, praying for the protection of the farming interests of this country. And we know that all the satisfaction the petitioners got, and all the assistance they received was a gentle intimation from the Finance Minister practically to the effect that they could work harder, eat less, and wear cheaper clothes, and thereby they could, perhaps, attain the prosperity they desired. And the manufacturers represented to the Government and the Finance Minister that, from one end of the land to the other, factories were being closed, and industries prostrated. And all the assistance they received was a hint to betake themselves to a locality where, by all accounts, manufactured goods would require insurance immediately on their arrival. And not only by outsiders, not only by the leader of the Opposition, at that time, but by the very gentlemen who sat behind the Government of the day, it was pointed out that the policy then existing was a failure, that something could be done, and that that something was the adoption of a system of protection. I do not intend to take up the time of the House in reading long extracts from the speeches of these gentlemen. But I think that when gentlemen opposite, when discussing the state of affairs between 1873 to 1878, as compared with that of the last four or five years, declined to face the fact that the leaders of the Reform party, having the means of remedy suggested to them were unwilling to adopt them; when we find, as I shall show, that the leaders of the Government of the present day did adopt means to protect the people, and when we find that the results were just as it was said they would be—then we have a right to blame hon. gentlemen opposite for having done nothing. If they would not listen to the people of the country, to the farmers and manufacturers, they might, at least, have listened to leading men in the ranks of their own supporters. Why, Sir, here in "Hansard" for 1875, page 840—I give the page for the benefit of my hon. friend who is so precise in relation to some statistics and so grossly careless about others—I find the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) advised the Government to this effect:

> It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions, notably the case of Great Britain. When industries are adapted to the land, it is the duty of the Government to protect them.

He proceeds to give reasons for protection, saying that arts and manufactures do not spring up readily on a virgin soil; that trade has a tendency to remain in beaten tracks; that advantage is on the side of a nation where manufacturers are established, because money is more easily obtained than in a new country; that possession of organized and skilled labour in a country where manufactures long existed, is an advantage that such country possesses over a new country. He goes on to say:

> I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were three thousand miles away. With a home market established by protection to manufacturers, the farmer can benefit his soil by a rotation of crops.

He then answers the objection that protection prevents foreign commerce, by referring to the domestic trade of the United States in 1875, as computed at 200,000,000 tons, valued at $10,000,000,000. He then went on to say:

> They had heard a great deal said about protection vs. free trade, but that was not the issue at the present time. The issue was as to the relative degrees of protection it would be proper to afford our industries. We have now what some considered an efficient protection, and what others claimed to be insufficient.

So the hon. gentleman at that day was prepared to lay before the House and before his leaders, as strong a protectionist opinion as could be expressed even by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). But he did not stand alone by any means. There was an hon. gentleman at that time who represented South Brant. The name is the same as that of the hon. gentleman who to-day so worthily represents that important riding, but the identity cannot be the same, the opinions are so dissimilar. I find that the hon. gentleman representing South

Brant in 1878, spoke to this effect, as appears at page 110 of "Hansard":

I hold that the position is impregnable! that there is a duty other than the collection of revenue devolving on a Minister of Finance. Let us look for a moment at the article of boots and shoes. Within my own recollection almost all these goods were imported from the United States, and I remember that when the tariff was raised to 10 per cent, a great stimulus was given to that branch of our industry which now finds employment for tens of thousands of persons. I am not one of those who believe in erecting a wall so high that you cannot trade with any other country, but I must admit I am in favour of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what we see in this country.

You see, Mr. Speaker, how the change of position will sometimes affect an hon. gentleman's mind.

We live beside a country with a population ten times greater than ours, whose industries have been fostered by protection until they are enabled, even in some articles in which Britain excells, to challenge supremacy with her. While that nation has erected against us and other countries a hostile tariff, we have our hands bound, and give them a free and unrestricted right to trade in our markets. The other year, the Minister of Finance, in revising our tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry that it never had before. The result was that a thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany, were literally transported by the tariff, to Canada, and set to work here.

Gratifying as was the addition to the population, and gratifying as it was to the hon. gentlemen opposite to have that addition to the population, mark this—I give my hon. friend as my authority—for he continued:

The cost of the article was not increased one iota.

It might seem puzzling, but there was an explanation, and the hon. gentleman, with his usual astuteness, gave it.

The middlemen suffered a diminution of profits, but for them no one seems to care much. It is inevitable that a like result would flow to other manufacturers under the same policy. If the Minister of Finance finds that such is the case, I trust that the wisdom——

"Wisdom," not folly, mark you, but "wisdom."

—which led him to yield that point, will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism will tie his hands.

At page 186 of the same report——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the hon. gentleman please answer one question. What Minister of Finance did that?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is a matter of utter indifference to me, because, as a matter of fact——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was the hon. member for South Oxford who accomplished that.

Mr. NORTHRUP. So I would have thought.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What year was that?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When he made that change he has alluded to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But you asked him to make still further changes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I asked him to make them in the same direction, to bring in more people here, but not to raise the tariff.

Mr. NORTHRUP. In the year 1876, protection was the only reasonable policy for the Minister of Finance, and when the Minister of Finance did take the advice of the hon. member for South Brant, he praised him for doing it, and hoped that he would go still further. But times change, and we change with them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I ask the privilege to make a correction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; sit down.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a matter of fairness, I ask for the opportunity to make an explanation.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have no desire to prevent the hon. gentleman making any correction, with the consent of the House. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. CHARLTON. If I am allowed to do so——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. CHARLTON. I asked to be allowed to make a correction. The hon. gentleman who is speaking, has permitted me to do so, but the leaders of the House do not propose to allow it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman can only rise to make a personal explanation.

Mr. CHARLTON. So I do.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the explanation?

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has quoted certain words from my speech delivered in 1876, and I ask the privilege of giving the concluding and qualifying portion of that speech, in a few words. These concluding words are as follows:——

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) is quoting from a speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and it is to be presumed that he is quoting it correctly.

Mr. CHARLTON. I only want to say this——

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman can state that the hon. member for Hastings is not quoting his words as they are printed in the "Hansard," that fact might give rise to a personal explanation, it might give rise to a contradiction or denial. But it is preposterous for the hon. member for North Norfolk to ask the hon. member for Hastings to quote the whole of his speech. The hon. member for Norfolk will have a chance to explain afterwards.

Mr. LAURIER. There may be something after all in allowing the hon. member for North Norfolk an opportunity to explain his speech, as my hon. friend opposite explained one of his speeches the other day.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, you might explain yours, too.

Mr. LAURIER. As soon as you speak, I will be prepared to speak.

Mr. OUIMET. You will speak in good time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for North Norfolk has not yet spoken upon the question before the House, and, of course, he will have an opportunity later on to make any qualifying explanation in regard to his speech delivered in 1876.

Mr. LAURIER. Pardon me. It has always been allowed to any hon. member to interrupt the speaker, and to make a correction, with the consent of the hon. gentleman who has the floor. This is the first time that right has been denied.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg your pardon. A moment ago when the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was speaking, the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) rose to a personal explanation, and the other side of the House howled him down.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; he sat down.

Mr. SPEAKER. My view with reference to a personal explanation is this: An hon. member who has already spoken upon a question before the House, if his statements are misquoted or misunderstood by a subsequent speaker, would have a right, with the indulgence of the House, either at the moment, if the speaker chooses then to give him the opportunity, or when the hon. member in possession of the floor concludes, to make the personal explanation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We might as well settle the point now. There is a vast difference between correcting a misquotation or a mis-statement, and reading the balance of a speech to which an hon. member referred.

Mr. LAURIER. That altogether depends on the speech and the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did not, at the time the quotation was made from his speech, make any objection at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I sent for "Hansard."

Mr. BERGIN. An objection was taken to a quotation made by the hon. member for Hastings from the speech of the hon. member for South Brant, and the questions were answered. Some time after that the hon. member for North Norfolk interrupted.

Mr. CHARLTON. So soon as I obtained "Hansard."

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman interrupted the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I ruled that he was out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rose at the moment I obtained the "Hansard."

Mr. NORTHRUP. When this interruption occurred, I was taking the liberty of instructing the House as to the views of political economy which prevailed in 1876. At page 186 of "Hansard," I find it was laid down by the hon. member for South Brant, as follows:—

> At the last election, when my opponents told them that they need not expect any protection from the Reform Government, I had to assure them that, whenever this subject came up in the House, I would raise my voice in their behalf.

I am sure every hon. member will frankly and unhesitatingly admit that if the voice of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had been raised in this Chamber, or within any reasonable distance beyond this Chamber, we would have heard it. That hon. gentleman also pointed out that in any attempt to gain American markets he would have something to give. At page 646, he is reported to have said:

> Eight days before the tariff was introduced he had spoken regarding the appointment of the Depression of Trade Commission, and he took the ground that it was the duty of the Minister of Finance in the introduction of a tariff, to see what industries could be cultivated, what was already established, whether any were being crushed out, and whether any could be successfully fostered. If he thought the Ministry were going to retrograde in regard to incidental protection and sweep away the duties, he would withdraw his confidence, but they had no intimation that such a step was contemplated, and, in point of fact, the contrary was announced.

It is just possible it might still be urged by the Finance Minister of those days that although the hon. member for South Brant raised his voice in the House on the subject, he had not been heard, so I take the liberty of appealing to the utterances of the ex-Finance Minister to show that he, too, had heard something about this legalized robbery, as it is now declared to be, the principle of protection. The ex-Finance

Minister, in 1876, page 241 of the "Hansard," said :

It may be well before going further to offer a few observations on the causes of the prevailing depression, which we all deplore. I do not propose at this present moment to enter fully into the discussion raised as to Canada being a sacrifice or slaughter market, but I must admit candidly and honestly——

The hon. gentleman distinguished the sense in which he spoke on that day from the manner of statement he usually made :

—that I have no doubt that the distress of the manufacturers has been aggravated—I will not say to what extent—by this cause. I do not entirely agree with those gentlemen who maintain that there is no ground for the champions for the protectionist party. I have always myself been of the opinion that in a new country like this there is considerable force in the argument that it is not well to allow ourselves to depend exclusively upon foreign manufactures, and if we do, there is some chance that we may be supplied with a mere refuse exportation. As to the curious argument made by the protectionists, that, if our manufacturing friends are sufficiently protected, it will not increase the cost of the consumer, as sufficient competition will arise to cut down prices so low that we will be just as well off as under the present tariff, I have simply this to say, that I think in time the result would be produced, but I also think it would take time, and during that period a few gentlemen would make large fortunes, while the rest of the community would have to pay an enormous price for that benefit. Neither do I wish to lose sight of the fair-play which is due to our manufactures. It is undoubtedly a hardship that they should be excluded from the markets of the United States, while our tariff enable American manufacturers to compete with them in ours, or, as it is called, slaughter our goods here. Theory apart, there are very few others who would object to a moderately low rate of duty, or would care much to be found opposing a tariff, though in defiance of free trade theories, which would bring a large addition of population to the country at a very moderate cost to the remainder of the population. In concluding, I might say, Sir, that I am exceedingly sorry that I have been obliged to differ in opinion with some friends whom I value highly. I admit that there was considerable force in the arguments they employed. Uundoubtedly, a great deal of distress exists among certain classes and in certain parts of this country, and I regret exceedingly that the Government have not been able to see their way to relieve this distress, except at the risk of inflicting ultimately very great and permanent injury on the whole population of Canada.

I think the leader of the Opposition has no particular reason to be ashamed of his utterances in 1871 and in 1876, when he declared he was a protectionist, that had he been living in England he would have been a free trader, but, as Canada was his home, he was a protectionist ; he had no reason to regret those utterances, or to apologize for them when he found himself in such excellent company at that date when he held those opinions. But the reason I spoke of those opinions was simply this : That the subject which is now engaging, or should now engage the attention of the House is the most important question before this Parliament, the regulation of our fiscal matters, and, at such a time it was the duty of every legislator to endeavour, to the best of his ability, be it great or small, to contribute something to the settlement of this vexed question ; and we on this side of the House have the right to demand of hon. gentlemen opposite, who, a few years ago, declared themselves to be diametrically opposed to the views they entertain to-day —not to accuse them of dishonesty because they changed their views, not to accuse them of stupidity because they differ from us—that, as a matter of fair-play, they should give the reasons, for there surely must be reasons, for that change. And that is the reason why, at the opening of my remarks, I complained that I had not heard one word from any hon. member opposite in defence or explanation of the arguments they had advanced some eighteen or nineteen years ago. We would be deemed presumptuous and impertinent if we suggested that hon. gentlemen standing so high in the councils of a great political party had changed their views without some reason. We would be called to order if we suggested the reasons that prompted the change, but if hon. gentlemen opposite dare not state them, they cannot complain if, recognizing the undoubted probability of the existence of such reasons for the change, we should ask them to give us the benefit of the reasons which undoubtedly caused them to make this change, since, peradventure, thereby we, too, might follow their example, and enter into the broad light of day in which they now live.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who has changed ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. One thing is clear, —who have not changed. In the days I have referred to, between 1873 and 1878, when an appeal was made to the Government to assist in developing manufactures, the reply was given that nothing could be done, and nothing was done. The Conservative party at that time declared that something could be done ; and the proper question to consider is whether the reasons that existed in 1878, which led an overwhelming majority of the people to support the adoption of the National Policy, still exist, or whether changed circumstances have arisen, so that the reasons which, at that time, were good, no longer prevail. Looking at the facts of the distress in the years between 1873 and 1878, what were the obvious difficulties under which the country then laboured ? It was admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, in the extracts I have quoted from their speeches, that one great difficulty was the existence of the slaughter market, which had destroyed our manufactures. Now, the slaughter market also affected our farmers, and it being admitted that an injury was being done to manufac-

turers and farmers—admitted by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who said he would oppose the Government if they endeavoured to remove the protection they had then given—and recognizing the existence of these evils, what could the Government do? "Nothing," said one side; "something," said the other; and something was done by the Conservative party, and the question now is: Was it effectively done or not? There being a slaughter market, as was admitted by the Finance Minister of the day, the question arose: Whether it was not better to get rid of that slaughter market? and by putting up a customs duty we did get rid of it. And so, when the next wave of depression struck the country in 1891, whatever other difficulties we had to contend with, at all events, we escaped that difficulty, in that we had no slaughter market which tended to the injury of our farmers and manufactories. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will stand by one thing which they said once or twice within the memory of hon. gentlemen present, and that is: That the population of this country was not increasing in those days at the rate they liked to see it increase, and that, in fact, during the Liberal Administration there was an exodus of the able-bodied men from this country. The Government, thinking on this subject again, had an opportunity of laying down a principle which would get rid of this trouble. Here was the remarkable fact that able-bodied men were leaving the country, and the question arose: Can anything be done to keep the people in the country? The first question was: Why were they leaving? some going to farming in the Western States, others going to work in American factories, and others seeking the advantages they believed existed in the large cities of the United States. Here, then, we saw the evil, and we also saw the cause. How was the evil to be removed, and the answer came: By giving the young men of Canada equally good and cheap lands within this country, and under our own flag; by building up manufactories in this country, so that those who were compelled to go to the other side of the line to work in factories could work in similar factories at home, and by so doing, we found that we would be able to build up cities in this land, so that here too we would have, as it were, a magnet to attract those who were enterprising and desirous of the advantages of city life, without making it compulsory for them to go to the large cities of the American republic. What was done by the Conservative Government? Is it not well known that by opening up the North-west—a scheme which hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to be able fully to decide, to this day, whether they wish to claim credit for or not—is it not well known, I ask, that by opening up the North-west we furnished cheap farms for our people? Many hon. gentlemen sitting in this House know friends and acquaintances who are out in our Canadian North-west, and they know thousands of people who left the older province of Ontario, who are now settled in the North-west, and who would have been settled in the Western States had not our own western country been opened up to them. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House by quoting figures to show this, because they have been quoted time and again. The wonderful growth of our factories shows that employment has been provided for hundreds of thousands of people in Canada, who otherwise would have been compelled to go to the United States. The growth of our cities throughout the length and breadth of the land—a growth complained of by hon. gentlemen opposite, and somewhat regretted by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, owing to one of the causes which leads to it—has given an opportunity to the erterprising young man to find a suitable forum within our bounds in which to exercise the abilities with which heaven has blessed him. The evils and difficulties existed during the regime of the Liberal Government and nothing was done to remove them. The Conservative party found that the National Policy professed to be able to remove these difficulties. We claim that it did remove these difficulties, and we say, looking at the depression of the last four years, that the particular incidents of that depression which were most conspicuous and most objectionable between 1874 and 1878, did not exist in Canada during the last four or five years. Therefore, we join in asking the people of this country to stand by a policy that has done what it was promised it would do, and we ask them to open their own eyes, and to see for themselves the practical fruit of that policy, instead of discrediting it merely on account of reckless assertions by members of the Opposition, assertions which are generally made without the slightest atom of truth in them. Now, Sir, if there is one theme more than another which hon. gentlemen opposite grow eloquent upon, it is on what they call the woes of the unfortunate agricultural classes under this policy. If I held the same views as hon. gentlemen opposite, it seems to me the deepest source of regret that I would have is that the agriculturists of this country are so stupid, that suffering all these woes they do not seem to know it, because when the opportunity is afforded them at the polls of overthrowing or supporting this policy, in the overwhelming majority of cases this policy is triumphantly supported even in agricultural districts. But, Sir, as a matter of fact, and trying to look at the subject dispassionately, let me ask: Has the Government done anything or not for the farming classes? The last speaker (Mr. McMullen) referred to the great advantage it would have been to the farming

classes of Canada if they could have had the American market. He intimated, although he did not say it in so many words, that if hon. gentlemen opposite had been in power, our farmers would have been enjoying this great American market of sixty millions of people for the last few years. Now, was there anything that occurred in the course of the reciprocity negotiations that were undertaken when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, which would give a colour of support to his statement? Was there any result that flowed from these negotiations to lead the people of this country to be so perfectly sure that the mere fact of the Liberal party undertaking the negotiations was a guarantee of success? No, Sir, the statement is as absurd as the story of the "sixty millions market" for our farmers. The changes have been rung on the American market of sixty millions from one end of the country to the other, and yet, if hon. gentlemen only pause for one moment to reflect, they will fail to see where, in the United States, the farmers of Canada could ever find a sixty million market. Why, half the population of the United States are farmers, and therefore at one single stroke and at one fell swoop, off go thirty millions of that market. The farmer of Canada is not more likely to sell to the farmer of the United States, than he is to sell to his own next door neighbour, and yet hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party in their desire to increase the advantage of this wonderful policy of theirs, have pointed, without a blush, to the "sixty million market" for our farmers to be found in the United States. Apart from the thirty millions which have been wiped out from the calculation, let me ask: how many states there are in the American union, which, because of their geographical position, the farmers of Canada cannot send any of their products to? That consideration is altogether apart from the well-known objection that those who have similar products to sell are not apt to make money dealing with one another. When hon. gentlemen refer to the condition of the farmers, and refer to the fancy market to the south of us—on reflection the hon. gentlemen will see that it is a "fancy" market because it exists only in their own fancy—it might not be out of place to remind the House of what the Government has done for the farmers of this country. We know that one of the reasons that always has been given for the National Policy, and one of the reasons which has been verified by experience, is of course the number of hands that are employed in the various manufactories, and who are fed by the farmers of this country. I do not intend to occupy time by referring at length to that. Sir, I do not myself know of any class in the community which has had so much done for its welfare, as a class, as that class which has experimental farms, for their benefit, scattered throughout the land. How is the condition of the farmer to be improved in this country? We all know that many an enterprising farmer with all the ambition and energy and push desirable, lacks the means to undertake those experiments which are necessary to successfully improve his mode of cultivation. Then, Sir, this Government steps in, and with the money of the people of this country, freely given for such a purpose, it makes these experiments which the individual farmer cannot make for himself. Not to deal in theory or prophesying, but to look at the practical results we have before us at the present time, our farmers are directly benefited by the instructions they have received, by the seeds that have been distributed to them, and by the many ways in which the experimental farms, and dairies, and creamery factories, have assisted them in this country. A short time ago when the Government undertook to furnish a market, —as it were, to guarantee a market in the old country—for the sale of our butter, they were blamed for so doing by the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite as if they had initiated a novel and unpardonable course. The same course was tried in New Zealand with the most gratifying results, and this Government now in power, always willing to borrow experience from good results—even willing to borrow experience from the Opposition—were prepared to follow the example of New Zealand which had been proved to be a success, and they thus have inaugurated a trade with the old country which may grow to great dimensions. We know that the cheese industry of this country has grown to an enormous extent, and we know, strange to say, that while it has been growing, the cheese industry on the other side of the line has not been growing. We cannot but connect the improvement in our cheese trade, and the improvement in our cattle exportation, and the improvement in the North-west Territories under which our farmers have bettered their condition; we cannot but connect all these with the wise policy which our Government has adopted. Now, Sir, there was one observation made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that I have heard before, and it seems to me that it betrays a signal misconception of the real differences that lies between parties who hold opposite views on this particular question. He spoke about the removal of the restrictions on trade. Although it may sound strange to his ears—if he requires page and volume for my assertion, I can give it to him without doubt—although it may seem strange to his ears, yet those who are in favour of protection—and they may go much further in that than is necessary for hon. gentlemen to go to support the Government in their policy—those, I say, who are protectionists out and out, are just as much in favour of the removal of the restrictions on trade as any hon. gentleman opposite. The

only difference between the two parties is that while one party recognizes restriction another party does not. Let me illustrate what I mean. If a farmer in my riding raises his crops and brings his crops and stock to the county town for sale, I suppose he goes there to trade, and he engages in the occupation of trading when he is selling his stock there. As one who supports the present policy of the Government, I say that anything that tended to hinder the carrying on of that trade, or placed a barrier between the producer and the consumer, would be a restriction upon that trade. If that barrier is in the shape of goods coming in from the United States and depriving our farmer of his home market, that is a restriction upon his trade just as much as any tariff restriction would be; and we on this side of the House recognize it as a restriction which ought to be removed. Suppose a gentleman in this country wants to start a woollen mill. He has to meet the competition of the woollen millers of the old country. He puts his goods on the market here, and anything that prevents his customers obtaining those goods is a restriction upon his trade. As a matter of fact, the difference in the rate of interest or the difference in the price paid for labour in the two countries gives the old-country manufacturer an advantage over the Canadian manufacturer. A difference in the cost of raw material, in consequence of the manufacturer there getting it in the morning and using it in the afternoon, while the manufacturer here has to get his raw material six months ahead, also gives the former an advantage. All these things are restrictions on trade which the Conservative party recognize as such, and are determined to remove. The great difference between hon. gentlemen opposite and us is that we are determined to remove restrictions from the trade of the people of Canada, while hon. gentlemen opposite seem determined to remove restrictions from the trade of outsiders. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute the statement that there are two ways, and, perhaps, only two ways, in which the Canadian market can be secured and maintained for the Canadian people. One way is by grinding down the wages of employees and the profits of capitalists, so that we can produce more cheaply in this country than any other country in the world; that is the way of hon. gentlemen opposite. Another way is to put up a tariff which will make outsiders who wish to come into this market pay something for the privilege; that is the Conservative way—the way in which we propose to keep our market for our own people. In fact, the difference between the two parties could be stated thus: The policy of the Reform party is, if possible, to make this country a cheap country to live in. Everything is subservient to that; that is the goal of all their ideas. If I understand the policy of the Conservative party, it is first and foremost and above everything else to see that for every Canadian throughout the length and breadth of the land, who is able and willing to do an honest day's work, there shall be an honest day's work to be done, and an honest day's wages to be paid. Hon. gentlemen opposite frequently find fault with us criticising this, that or the other detail of the National Policy. I take for granted that there is no gentleman on this side of the House who believes for one moment that the National Policy, or any other policy ever framed by any body of men, was an ideal piece of legislation. In all legislation there must be an infringement on some one's liberty. No large class can ever be benefited without someone being, in some way, injured, and I have no doubt that, from time to time, our experience of the working of the National Policy will show—sometimes because the facts were not thoroughly understood in the first place, sometimes because conditions have changed, sometimes because of new inventions, sometimes because of increased capital—for a thousand reasons—that changes should be made, as they were made a year or two ago, or that the protection should cease when the end aimed at is accomplished. The Government may change the incidents of the tariff while maintaining, all along, the underlying policy. But when changes are made, we are taunted by hon. gentlemen opposite that the making of these changes is an admission by the Government that the tariff was wrong from the very beginning. When I hear an argument of that kind, it appeals to me as one of the very strongest arguments in favour of the policy which I have the honour to support; and if hon. gentlemen opposite cannot discover a better argument than that, I think we on this side may fairly conclude that the National Policy is not as bad as it is painted. We have heard something, too, in the course of this discussion, about the fall in value of farm property throughout Canada. Now, I am not here to say that farm properties have not fallen in value; but I do say, and I say unhesitatingly, that farm values have not fallen one-tenth of what hon. gentlemen opposite say they have. Let me explain what I mean. We hear of a farm having been sold for $7,000 or $8,000, which, a few years ago, was worth $10,000. Suppose it was worth $10,000 a few years ago, the things which the value of that farm would then buy were correspondingly higher in price than they are to-day. We know that dollars are but the medium of exchange; and the man who, a few years ago, could sell his farm for $10,000, if he wished to-day to convert it into the various products which he required, would obtain just as much of those products for $7,000 or $8,000

in consequence of the reduction in prices which has since taken place. We must not forget, either, the extraordinary fall in the rate of interest which has taken place in this country, which itself makes a wonderful difference in the apparent values of many things. But hon. gentlemen opposite will continue to make the broad statement that farms have fallen in value so many dollars, and, therefore, that the National Policy is to blame. Now, as hon. gentlemen opposite have frequently spoken of the mother country as the ideal land, the land of free trade, I have taken the liberty of bringing here the report of a commission appointed by the Liberal Administration of Great Britain on the state of the agricultural depression which exists there, and the remedies asked by the farmers themselves to meet it; and this volume, which contains reports compiled by various commissioners, I commend to the study of hon. gentlemen opposite. Though it shows on every page the clear and avowed preference of the writers of free trade, yet, having been appointed to make a report, he was bound to report the facts as he found them. I refer first to the report on the Isle of Axholme and the Ongar, Chelmsford, Maldon, and Braintree districts of Essex, pages 13, 14, and 15: the commissioner reports:

> The position into which it has been my duty to inquire is very peculiar and painful. It is peculiar, in that the mortgagees rarely foreclose so long as the interest is paid. They take what they can get, and add the arrears to the outstanding account. The fact of a man remaining undisturbed, although he may only have paid 2 instead of 4½ per cent for each of the last five years, does not save him in the future. It only means a big bill of arrears to be presented on the first favourable opportunity. Should times mend and agriculture once more become a flourishing industry, many a year's hard-earned profits must be paid over before the back dues are written off.
>
> It is painful, in that the rent now due in the shape of interest, far exceeds what would be a fair rent. The people realize the hopelessness of their position, and most of them are in utter despair. The weight attached to the neck of many a freeholder in the Isle of Axholme is heavier than he can bear, and it is the general opinion that without assistance their position is doomed.
>
> The continuation of agricultural depression from about 1877 till the present time has had one unmistakable result in this district. All connected with the industry are poorer, and their credit is gone. Farmers are loaded with debts to merchants, tradesmen and banks, and their rents are heavily in arrear. Landlords are sorely hit by the great and numerous reductions in rent, and in some cases are almost ruined; indeed, estates burdened in the good times do not now bring in sufficient even to pay interest on mortgages.

He gives one case from which you may judge many:

> The owner of this estate, which is 3,500 acres in extent, has been compelled to take what rents the tenants could pay. He says: "If we had been strict to mark iniquity or insist upon payment of rent in full, hardly an old tenant would have been left on the estate. Our 1893 accounts are worse than ever. Plenty of land has been put up for sale of late, but can't be sold, unless for a mere trifle. Persons won't lend money now on landed security. Considering the bad payments of rents and the fact that taxes and rates must be paid, there is almost nothing left over for the estate owner."

But naturally finding this state of affairs, he inquired as to what remedies the people had to suggest; and just as in this country between 1873 and 1878, the people seemed to be a unit in their opinion of the remedy required so in England to-day—and I give the fact to hon. gentlemen opposite that they may take what profit from it they like—throughout the length and breadth of the country, the invariable reply of the suffering agriculturists is protection. I read from this report under the heading of "Summary of Complaints and Suggested Remedies":

> There is one point on which the people are unanimous, and that is that the free importation of corn is one of the chief causes of depression.

Mr. FLINT. Will my hon. friend read any extracts in which they recommend a protective duty on these articles?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I will give you a dozen before I get through. There is another report by the assistant commissioner in the counties of Oxford, Gloucester, Wilts and Berks and the neighbourhood of Taunton, Somerset. On page 30, he said:

> There was only one opinion that I received, wherever I went, as to the cause of the depression. It is mainly caused by the general fall of prices owing to foreign imports, aggravated by unkindly seasons at home. This is the opinion firmly held by farmers in every locality, and I don't think any one can doubt its soundness.

As to the remedies suggested, we find on page 37:

> Farmers throughout the districts which I have visited, recognizing the fact that it is to foreign importations that their misfortunes are mainly due, are very much in favour of some measure of protection which will tend to restrict this importation. It is said that agriculturists would be greatly benefited by a duty which would discourage the importation of flour. In support of this farmers point to the number of mills now disused, and the abandonment of which both cause a diminished demand for labour and makes it more difficult for the farmer to sell his corn than it used to be, for the local miller was his best customer.

That sounds like an extract from one of our campaign speeches. At Cincenster it was said:

> If it were not for the two local mills still left, we should be unable to sell our wheat here at all.

In this same report this commissioner has given an extract from the "Spectator." The commissioner is himself a free trader, and a paper was handed to him to read, containing an extract from the "Spectator," a

free trade journal, to which I would like to invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. The writer says:

Perhaps the most distressing, depressing and discouraging feature is the feeling in favour of protection which is growing in strength, even among the more educated classes of the community.

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

After Recess.

Mr. NORTHRUP. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was giving the House some extracts from the report of the agricultural commission appointed by the Liberal Administration in the old country to inquire into the depression at present existing in England and the causes thereof and the remedies suggested for its removal. I proceed to give an extract from another report made by the commissioner of the Andover district of Hampshire and the Maidstone district of Kent. On page 5, he says:

I made a point of asking all farmers whose experience had been of sufficient length, how the present crisis compared with that of 1879. The answer invariably was, that the existing depression is worse, far worse, than that of thirteen or fourteen years ago.

On page 7, he says:

In the area that came under my observation, I did not meet with a single exception to the rule that rents had been reduced during the past twelve years. In some cases these reductions had been so great that the tenants are practically keeping on their farms at their own rental. A large tenant farmer said to me: It has come to this. You may regard the land as practically of no value, and look upon the rent as merely covering the interest on the outlay on house and buildings.

Speaking of suggestions for the removal of this depression, on page 16, he says:

Only better seasons and improved prices can, it is argued, restore agriculture to a flourishing condition in this district. As the seasons are beyond control, the question remains, by what means can improved prices be established. The answer I received in nine cases out of ten, in all parts of the district, may be summed up in one word—protection.

On pages 27 and 28 of the same report, he says:

In seeking for a comparison between the existing depression and that of 1879-80, I was invariably told that matters are worse now than they were then.

As to the rents paid, on page 28, he says:

In some parts of the district, especially outside of the hop lands, very material reductions have been made in the rent.

On page 37, he thus speaks of the remedy suggested:

There is in the district a widespread, though by no means universal, feeling in favour of protection. It was argued that flour being a manufactured article—and one farmer maintained with considerable skill, that wheat also comes within this category—its importation in large quantities lessens the home demand for labour, besides diminishing the local value of home-grown wheat. Many millers in the district used more imported than home-made flour. Hence it was contended that the duty on flour would help the labourers. I was informed that it is a common practice for local millers to buy foreign flour in marked bags, mix it with some of their own grinding, and sell all as English flour.

In the report from the district of Somerset, on page 8, we find:

The farmers of this district do not, as a rule, keep count accurately, but there can be little doubt they have suffered loss during the past two years. Large farmers are said to have suffered most.

On page 10:

I have heard, from various sources, of great loss caused by forced sale of cattle, dairy stock having been sold at an average of four pounds ten shillings per cow. Very considerable reductions in rent have been made in arable farms. In one case a farm of 1,300 acres, formerly rented at £800, has been reduced to £650; and another of 1,600 acres, which formerly let at £1,000, is now offered at £450.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is blue ruin.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Under free trade.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Under the British flag.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am very glad that our hon. friends have at least learned one lesson, and that is that blue ruin can exist under free trade. At page 12:

Throughout the whole of the district I have no prominent example of a farmer who had succeeded in a much greater degree than his neighbours.

And here, also, when the remedy is asked for—page 13:

In almost every reply I received, the chief causes of depression are attributed to low prices resulting from foreign competition and bad seasons, with consequent failure of corn and hay crops. For the latter no remedy but patience can be found, but the former is considered removable by a change in the fiscal system which would force the foreigner to pay a corresponding tax to that borne by the producer of home-grown corn and hay, by the maker of cheese, butter, &c., and by those engaged in every agricultural industry, which is now severely handicapped by the preference given to the foreigner. This, it is urged, should take the form of duty on all foreign manufactured articles, which would include flour, articles which cannot be produced in the United Kingdom being admitted free of duty. * * * It is pointed out that the imposition of a tax upon foreign flour would enable farmers to procure bran and offal at a much cheaper rate than at present, would give much employment to artisans, and help to reinstate the milling industry in England, where it is now practically ruined. At the same time it is argued that the price of bread would be increased infinitesimally by the proposed tax.

Again, at page 29:

It is a somewhat difficult task to select successful men in a district avowedly suffering from agricultural depression, and it will be found in each case where success can be noted, that there are certain conditions of soil and situation which conduce to its attainment.

The remedy again is suggested in pages 31 and 32:

The causes of the depression are stated by all farmers whom I have conversed with, or heard from, to be "Low prices of farm produce, especially of wheat, caused by excessive foreign competition."

* * * * * * *

In all but a few instances, "protection," in some form or other, is advocated as the remedy, the majority indicating a tax on foreign manufactured articles, including flour. This, it is pointed out, would not interfere with the supply of food to any appreciable extent, and would benefit the nation at large by finding employment for workmen in mills which are now being abandoned or destroyed. The fall in the value of this kind of property is stated to be at least 70 per cent in twenty years.

It is pointed out also:

That thirty years ago, the home-grown crop, according to the official returns, reached 17,922,048 quarters, and 7,000,000 quarters were then imported. The last returns show a total of 22,263.000 quarters imported, and, according to Sir J. Lawes' estimate, less than 6,000,000 quarters are grown this year. * * * Whether the displacement of such an amount of home-produced food is beneficial to the nation at large, is a question requiring grave consideration, especially as the purchase money for the extra figures, 12,000,000 quarters, which were formerly grown in the United Kingdom, is now paid over to the foreigner instead of the Englishman.

I find in the report from the manufacturing district of Lancashire, pages 14 and 17:

Although agricultural depression has existed since 1880, to some extent, in North Lancashire, and has been more particularly felt during the last three or four years, the evidence of its existence is, perhaps, not so marked as in many other counties, partly because it has been of longer duration elsewhere, though I venture to think that it is more acutely felt than appears at first sight.

* * * * * * *

Thus at the present time in some districts it is the farmers' sons and daughters who have suffered, rather than the land, for they have been, and are, giving their best energies towards its cultivation, receiving no reward in the present and with but little prospect of any in the future. How far they will consent in the future to stop with their parents, under such conditions, remains to be seen.

* * * * * * *

But, apart from these considerations, there is plenty of evidence that farmers are feeling the depression very acutely, and indeed it must be so in a country which is largely grass, and where the prices of stock have dropped 30 or 40 per cent in the last few years.

Further on, he gives a quotation from some of the evidence adduced:

Most of the farmers are nearly ruined, and many are farming on borrowed capital.

Mr. NORTHRUP.

The chief cause of agricultural depression in North Lancashire is stated to be foreign competition in food products, especially in cattle. And here the remedy is suggested—page 28:

A good many witnesses advocated that a duty should be put on live cattle and all manufactured articles coming into the country, and numbers said that all cattle should be killed on landing.

This, remember, is in the manufacturing district of Lancashire:

The chairman of the Liverpool Farmers' Club advocated putting a duty on imported flour and manufactured articles as long as other nations put duties on English exports, adding: "If this country is right, all the rest of the world must be wrong; for every other country has a tariff."

I will not occupy the time of the House reading a table which is furnished, but which hon. members who desire to do so can read at page 81. It relates to the district of Northumberland, and gives a list of properties and the reductions which have taken place in the last few years. But I may say generally that the rental of land has decreased from 20 to 25 per cent since 1879.

On the Duke of Northumberland's property, 150,000 acres, the permanent reductions made in rents since 1882 come to 25 per cent of the rental.

On the Marquis of Waterford's estate at Ford, the permanent rental is lower by 24½ per cent than it was in 1879.

In the report relating to the Glendale district of Northumberland, the remedy is suggested:

Many farmers advocate fair trade, and say that a duty should be placed on imported manufactured goods as long as English exports are subject to duties in foreign countries.

It is represented as being grossly unfair that English goods should be subject to taxation abroad, while at the same time the foreigner pays no duties, and has the free use of the English markets, contributing nothing to the taxation of the country, besides having better terms on the railways than Englishmen. With such advantages as these, the farmers say it is impossible to compete with the foreigners.

I have here a report for the county of Lincolnshire. I read from page 59:

The yeoman farmer, who in the good times bought a farm at double its present value, is usually in a worse plight than a tenant, because a large proportion of the purchase money was left on mortgage, and the rate of interest paid now represents a considerably larger sum than the land would be worth to rent. Not unfrequently, family money was put into such farms, being considered a remunerative and safe investment, and also because it was a source of pleasure and pride to assist one of their members into a position of independence, to which at the same time certain social advantages were attached.

Many of such men have already sunk, overwhelmed by the burden of interest they had to pay. A number of this class were the first to go when the bad times began, and they were quickly followed by a large number of tenants between the years 1879 and 1883.

Here are two suggestions made as to the remedy for depression—page 110:

The majority of farmers I met were in favour of either protective tariffs on certain foreign imports, usually manufactured ones, or that retaliatory duties should be imposed until other nations consented to admit free trade principles.

The last report I will give the House is that on the Vale Aylesbury, and the county of Hertford. At page 22, I find the following:—

Here, as elsewhere, farmers have been seriously injured by the fall in value of articles of produce, more particularly as regards cattle and milk, and by unfavourable seasons. The fall in rents already mentioned is itself clear evidence of the existence of the depression. There has also been a considerable fall in the selling value of agricultural land, though not so much as in arable districts.

The suggestions made include the following—page 27——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman was quoting from. Was it a committee of the House of Lords?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture, presented to both Houses of Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you happen to remember who composed the committee?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I can give the hon. member, if he wishes, the names of the gentlemen of the various committees who sent in these reports. They are all stated in the reports. This commission reports:

The remedy suggested in this district (of Hertford) were mainly the same as those in the first district reported upon by me. Several farmers of position and intelligence, who have hitherto always been free traders, said that they had been convinced by recent experience that the agricultural interests in England could only be saved by checking the importation of foreign corn and flour. There was a very general expressed opinion in favour of an import duty on foreign manufactured articles, the object being more particularly to discourage the importation of foreign flour.

I think these quotations, which I have given the House in these reports, show that at all events the depression of which we have heard so much, is not confined to this country, is not confined to countries which have the benefit of a national policy or a protective system, but is found in an extreme degree in the one country, the only country in the world, to which hon. gentlemen could point, as a country supporting the principle of free trade. But since at an earlier period in this debate Great Britain was referred to as being the mother of free trade, it may not be out of place to consider the circumstances under which free trade was brought about in that country. I do not intend to weary the House with a long historical dissertation on the protectionist measures of England for many centuries, but it must be a fact known to all that at the time the corn laws were repealed in 1846, there was a contest, a struggle, between the two great interests in the island. On the one hand were the manufacturers who had lately come into prominence and had acquired great wealth, and had so prospered that at that time Great Britain was literally the mistress of the markets of the world. On the other hand was the agricultural interest which had been protected up to that time. But, Sir, at that time the manufacturers—I presume the hon. gentlemen opposite would say as they always do—desired more protection, and it must be patent to all that there was but one way under the sun by which further protection could be given to the manufacturers of England. They had then control of the markets of the world. A duty of $1 a yard, or $10 a yard, on cotton or woollen goods would have been no protection to the manufacturers of England, since other countries were not exporting to her shores, but were buying from her. Therefore, the only possible protection that could be given to the manufacturers of England was a protection on the other side that would reduce the cost of the necessaries of life to their employees whom they had to pay. And so it was that on the one hand the manufacturing classes were striking for further protection, and on the other hand the landed classes were bitterly opposing the removal of the duties which were imposed for their benefit. Those who have read the literature of those days must remember well the promises that were made on the one hand by the advocates of free trade, and the direful predictions made by those who represented the landed interests. It will be remembered that those who advocated free trade said that within ten years all the nations of the world would have thrown their ports open to the goods of England; and it is well known to every member of this House how entirely that prediction has been falsified. On the other hand, it was predicted by the landed interests that the removal of the protection which they had always enjoyed and under which they had prospered, would mean direful ruin indeed to them; and I think I can appeal to the reports coming from the mother land, those which I have just read to this House, to prove that those predictions have been unfortunately verified to the very letter. Now, Sir, alongside England there is another country which has had a little experience of the beneficial effects of free trade. It has been the custom to look to that unfortunate island lying to the west of England as one that is hopelessly doomed to misery—hopelessly, I say, simply because, owing to the circumstances and power of the larger island by its side, the means which it was supposed would secure its prosperity, the means which

were adopted and did give prosperity to Ireland, were banished in the interests of the manufacturers of England. I am not here to-day to make an oration on the woes of Ireland, but those who have read the history of Ireland and know how completely her manufacturers were then choked out of existence in order to maintain the manufacturers of England, those who know how those manufacturers flourished in the twelve or fifteen years while having a Parliament of her own, she legislated along the lines that this Parliament has followed, giving protection to home industries—those who have read the history of those days will know that both those who were the friends of Ireland, and those who were the foes of Ireland, admitted that during those twelve or fifteen years there was no nation in the world that progressed at the rate Ireland did. But, Sir, after the union, when, in order, as I say, to protect the manufacturers of England, the manufacturers of Ireland were exposed to this fierce competition from their competitors in England, one after another the interests of Ireland were choked, and from that day to this she has been suffering for the reason that the people who were employed in those industries were driven back to the land through the stoppage of those industries, thus overcrowding the land when there was no market for the products of the land. I have here a statement sufficient to illustrate what I am saying, as to the effect upon the industries of Ireland produced by the union: In Dublin, in 1800, there were 30 master wool-combers, and 230 hands. In 1834, there were 5 masters and 66 hands. Of carpet manufacturers, in 1800, there were 13 masters and 720 hands; in 1841, there was one master and no hands. Of broad silk loom weavers, in 1800, there were 2,500 at work: in 1840, 250. Of calico looms in Balbriggan, in 1799, there were 2,000 in full work; in 1841, 226. Take the city of Cork, only to give one or two illustrations which could be paralleled, if I took the whole country, place after place:

	1800.	1834.
Braid weavers	1,000	40
Worsted weavers	2,000	90
Hosiers	300	28
Wool-combers	700	110
Cotton weavers	2,000	210
Linen check weavers.....	600	none

I say when we find the industries of a country thus closed, the trade paralyzed, what wonder is it that misery and depression have notoriously existed in Ireland during all these years. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing the depression between 1873 and 1878, have forgotten that the causes which led to the accentuation of that depression between 1874 and 1878, namely, this country being a slaughter market, and our farmers being deprived of a home market for their goods, did not exist in the last two years. I would like to ask any hon. gentleman opposite, in face of the fact, which he must admit, that world-wide depression existed at that time in the United States to a degree far worse than existed in this country, how could any sane man say for a moment that the interests of the farmers and the manufacturers of this country in those times of depression would have been benefited by throwing our markets open to goods from a foreign country? I submit that the mere statement of the proposition give its own answer. Now, we have heard a good deal during this debate, and at other times, with regard to the story told by the census; and hon. gentlemen opposite seem to base the greater portion of their attacks against the National Policy on the results shown by the census. It is rather surprising that gentlemen, who presumably desire to arrive at a true conclusion, should be so perfectly indifferent as to the premises from which they argue. Every argument which has been urged by any hon. gentleman opposite with regard to the failure of this country to increase in population, as it was contended that she should, must of necessity be based upon the accuracy of the census returns for the year 1881. If, as a matter of fact, the census returns for 1881 were wholly unreliable, then it is quite clear that any argument based upon a comparison of the census of 1881 and those of 1891 is fallacious and misleading. Now, what have hon. gentlemen opposite said themselves as to the census returns of 1881? I do not ask them to take what has been said by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, or by gentlemen outside of the House, but I think we can fairly ask them to show some reason for refusing to accept the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly when these hon. gentlemen occupy so prominent positions as the two hon. gentlemen whom I shall quote. By reference to "Hansard" of 1882, page 165, we will find what was said by an hon. gentleman who has been admitted by all members of the Reform party, and by hon. gentlemen differing from them in Parliament, to have been one of the greatest minds that has ever been in the Reform party of this country—I refer to the Hon. Edward Blake, who gave his opinion of the census returns of 1881 in this language:

> In some cases they have counted every person who belonged to a house, even though that person had been for a very long time resident in foreign parts unless the head of the household would say that he was quite sure the person was not coming back. In other instances, men who had been absent 8, 15 or 20 years have, as I have been informed by persons in the locality who were familiar with the circumstances, been counted.

Then, on page 166, he stated again:

> It is entirely uncertain, then, under the circumstances, what our population numbers. Nobody

can tell by this mode of taking the census the actual number of our Canadian population.

Now, if there was any doubt as to the accuracy of the Hon. Edward Blake—possibly hon. gentlemen opposite might have some doubts on the ground that he was not a born financier—we have an expression of opinion by another hon. gentleman who has filled a most prominent position in this House, I refer to the late Minister of Finance, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). In 1885 he gave his opinion of the census returns of 1881, as found on page 213 of "Hansard," on which returns I venture to say he has based hundreds of arguments to attack the Government and the Conservative party throughout the length and breadth of the land. He said :

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this. During the taking of the preceding census, we, from this side, called attention to the manifestly fraudulent intention with which it was taken. The result of that census has been that we have paid $500,000 for a document as to which we only know this, that it does not contain one single statement that can be relied upon ; that in the very first statement, the most important of all, the statement of the number of people who are now in the Dominion of Canada, that census had been deliberately and fraudulently falsified, and falsified for a purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On both occasions, precisely in the same way.

Mr. NORTHRUP. No doubt it was for a purpose. The hon. gentleman continued :

And that the purpose, so far as the hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, and those who support him, could make it, was, I believe, to deprive the province of Ontario of its legitimate representation.

Further on, the hon. gentleman said :

What I say is, that that census has been taken in a way to render the statements made in it worthless. That census has been taken in a fashion which has caused several thousands of people in every province to be put down as residents of this country who are not residents there. There may have been many purposes for that.

Omitting some sentences, I find the following :—

But whatever may have been the object, whatever may have been the purpose, the fact remains that we have a census that cost us $500,000, if not more, and of that census no man who takes the trouble to analyse it, to scrutinize its tables, can affirm with certainty any proposition except that in the most important part of all, it exaggerates, by thousands of people, the number of persons supposed to be resident in Canada.

If there is no reliance to be placed on the census of 1881, what possible reliance can be placed on the arguments of hon. gentlemen, which were based solely and exclusively on that census ? But the hon. gentleman whom I have last quoted does not appear to be always particularly happy in his reference to the census. I noticed the other day on page 667 of the unrevised report of "Hansard," speaking of the growth of population in the United States, he said :

And if a further indication is wanted, I will call the attention of the House to this further fact—that in the United States, during a period when their population corresponded with ours, from 1790 to 1800, and from 1800 to 1810, and downwards, their average natural growth of population appears to have been rather more than 3¼ per cent. Their growth was 3¼ per cent per annum from 1791 to 1820, without considering the assistance from immigration.

That statement may be right or it may not be right ; I do not profess to express an opinion as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of the statement. But allow me to give to this House the opinion of a reliable and honoured member of this House as to such a statement with respect to the growth of population being 3¼ per cent per annum. On page 273 of the debates of 25th April, it was observed by an hon. gentleman as follows :—

I do not know whether I correctly heard what the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) stated, but if his statement be correct, that the United States estimated their natural increase in ten years at eighteen millions, I beg to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the attention of the House to the fact that that would be an increase very considerably more than 3 per cent per annum, a rate I never heard given by any man who deserved to be called a statistician or who possessed any information on the subject worth noticing. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggests, that is an increase which may take place in a rabbit warren, but hardly, I think, in a civilized community.

Will it be believed that the hon. gentleman just quoted was the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) ? I wish to be fair, I have no desire to misrepresent the hon. gentleman ; I have no desire that any one on this side of the House should misunderstand my words, and, therefore, I call attention to the fact that in the last statement I read there is no real contradiction of the statement I read in the first place. On its face it might be thought that there was a contradiction, but the hon. gentleman does not say the statement is false, but only one that he never heard given by any man "who deserved to be called a statistician or who possessed any information on the subject worth noticing." It is amusing to hear hon. gentlemen discussing the census figures with a glibness and recklessness of assertion which I venture to think could hardly be found in any deliberative body outside of this. Without any grounds whatever as a basis for a proper annual increase of population, they violently attack, or hurl against, this side of the House accusations, because, forsooth, in Canada the increase of our population between 1881 and 1891 was only 10 or 11 per cent ; and it is charged against the Government as one of the most serious offences of which it can

be guilty, that our increase of population has fallen far behind that of all civilized people. But let hon. gentlemen opposite give facts and figures to show on what they base their opinion, that an increase of 10 or 11 per cent is not a reasonably good increase. I have shown already that the census of 1881 is unreliable ; I have shown from the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite that the population was exaggerated at that time. So that even if our census returns show by a comparison of 1891 with 1881 a nominal increase of 10 or 11 per cent—the facts I have stated being borne in mind—why should not that be a satisfactory increase ? What is the experience of other countries ? Look at France. It had a census in 1886 and in 1891 ; in the former year the population was 38,218,903, and during the five years the population only increased by about 100,000, it being in the latter year, 38,343,-192. Take Germany. In 1885 the population was 46,855,704 ; in 1890 it was 49,416,-476, an annual rate of increase of 1·06, or for ten years only about 10 per cent. But hon. gentlemen say that emigration accounted for that. From 1886 to 1890 the emigration only amounted to 456,136, and so that it does not afford a sufficient reason. Belgium in 1876 showed an annual increase between 1876 and 1880 of ·85 per cent, or about 8·5 in ten years. The Netherlands showed an annual increase of ·09 between 1880 and 1890, or an increase of about 9 per cent in ten years. Great Britain showed an increase between 1881 and 1891 of 8·17 per cent, the population in the former year being 35,241,-482, and the latter year, 37,888,153. Scotland showed an increase during the same period of 7·96 per cent. So if we look at the civilized nations of the old world we find that in no case has there been an increase equal to that of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of looking to the republic to the south of us, and every hon. member is well aware that as regards immigration the United States possess wonderful advantage over us, owing to the form of Government they enjoy. People living in the old European countries are often anxious to escape a form of Government which is objectionable to them, one which has proved restrictive, and they seek that liberty which they think is to be found in a republic on a foreign shore ; and so the United States have an advantage in that respect as regards attracting immigrants which we, as a colony, must necessarily lack. But what are the facts if we look at a hundred years ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So much the worse for British connection.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Take a period of one hundred years and examine the figures relating to the United States, and take that part of British North America which is now the Dominion of Canada and institute a comparison. We find that the population of the United States was 3,929,214 in 1790. That population increased eighteen times in one hundred years. On the other hand this little country a hundred years ago had only a population of 200,000, but its population increased twenty-two times during the century. So that if we go back a hundred years, we find our population has increased more times than the population of the republic to the south. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House at much greater length on the subject of the census but I desire to call attention to one feature to which frequent reference is made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Most of the speeches we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly last session, were composed of attacks on the absurdities of the census and the unreliability of the census on account of the ridiculously large number of small establishments, which, not being entitled to be considered manufacturing or industrial establishments have been so considered. We know, Sir, that a bitter attack was made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last session, based almost entirely on the conclusions which he drew from his ridiculous increase, as he called it, of the smaller establishments, and hon. gentlemen sitting opposite have advanced the same arguments to this House. Now, what do we find from an analysis of the census ? Suppose we throw out altogether every single manufacturing or industrial establishment whose annual output is under $2,000 a year. Surely, an establishment whose output is more than that is worthy of being considered, and if we throw out all the establishments whose output is under $2,000 we only lose $20,734,000 in 1881, and $32,255,000 in 1891. If we throw out the smaller establishments to which I refer, we find that the total output in 1891 was $576,000,000, less the $32,000,000 to be subtracted ; so that, by comparison of these figures it will be found that, looking at the percentage, all these smaller establishments with an output of under $2,000 only amount to 6·7 per cent of the sum total of the output of our manufacturing establishments. And, Sir, it was charged that the enumerators had been instructed to swell the returns, and that they were paid for the results they discovered in order that the returns might be swollen. If that be the case, it is a most marvellous thing that the increases between 1871 and 1881, and the increase between 1881 and 1891, in those same establishments with an output of under $2,000 a year, is precisely the same, namely, 6·7 per cent. But, Sir, were we to take the establishments with an output of over $50,000—and surely hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that these should be included—we find that in 1881 the output was $153,000,000, and that in 1891 the output was 260,000,000, or over $100,000,000 increase in the output of the large estab-

lishments. The instructions given to the enumerators were :

An industrial establishment is any place where one or several persons are engaged in manufacturing, altering, making up or changing from one shape into another, materials for sale or for consumption.

It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to ridicule the small establishment employing one or two hands ; but if the object of the returns is to find the annual output in industrial and manufacturing lines in this country, how else could that be obtained than by enumerating every establishment that has an output ? In a large city, such as Ottawa, for instance, with a population of, perhaps, forty thousand, if we take the item of boots and shoes and allow two pairs a year to each person, or, in round numbers, 80,000 pairs, to be consumed in the city of Ottawa, it is quite conceivable that probably half would come from wholesale establishments outside the city, and probably half would be the product of the small shoemakers' establishments in Ottawa. How, in such a case, could we show the output of our Canadian industries if we only considered the larger, and carefully shut our eyes to the smaller establishments. Now, Sir, it was suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that if his party came into power certain changes would be made, and I refer to those remarks of his because they are the only approach to a suggestion in that line of any definiteness which we have received form gentlemen on the other side of the House. He pointed to the fact that the superannuation of officers would come to an end when his party came into power. I do not intend to discuss that subject with that hon. gentleman, but I refer him to his own speech delivered last spring in Bowmanville or Oshawa, at all events some place in Central Ontario, in which he discussed this very question, and without committing myself to the literal accuracy of his figures in round numbers, this was the result that he discovered. He said that there were from 460 to 500 superannuated officials, and he showed what an outrage it was in this country that so many men who were able to discharge their duties should be walking the streets ; and holding up his hands he glorified himself and his party and remarked : That of the whole 460 or 500, only 130 had been superannuated by the Reform party. Well, just consider for a moment what that statement means. A party that has been out of power for sixteen years, and yet had conducted the superannuation in such a way that, after the lapse of sixteen years, there were still 130 officials walking the streets who, sixteen years ago, were also able to walk the streets, and, for all we may know, may be able to walk the streets sixteen years hence. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman took objection to the number of Ministers. He complained that there were too many Cabinet Ministers in Canada. Does any one seriously believe that, with an annual expenditure in this country, enormous as of necessity it must be, any burden of taxation would be removed from any suffering taxpayer's shoulders by decreasing the Cabinet by one, or two, or three Ministers. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite are not so fond of discussing that question now as they were a few years ago, when they maintained that in the motherland there were only about as many Ministers to govern Britain as we have here ; but their attention was called to the fact that there were fifty Ministers in Great Britain ; and from that day to this, until the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) brought it up this afternoon, we have heard nothing on this subject. The hon. member told us also that we would save a good deal of money by the abolition of the Franchise Act. I was rather pleased, in one sense, to have the hon. gentleman advocate this, because it is the nearest we have come yet to any expression of opinion from members of the Opposition as to what they think of the resolution of my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), which was discussed here a few days ago. We were anxious that day to get an idea of what hon. gentlemen opposite thought of the provincial franchise, but we failed to secure any expression of opinion then. To-day, however, one gentleman was bold enough to say that he would advocate that this House should adopt the provincial franchise, which he evidently, therefore, considers to be a proper franchise. I would congratulate my friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), were he here, that he has at least one supporter on the other side of the House, because an hon. gentleman who believes that provincial franchise to be founded on a correct principle, surely cannot object to its etxension into the Dominion Franchise Act, which he declares to be so defective. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) also would wish to economise with regard to the North-west Mounted Police. He would remove a number of them—he did not say he would dismiss them—but he would remove them from the duties they were now discharging, and, inasmuch as they very efficiently discharged the duties of preventing smuggling in addition to their police duties, he would attach them to the Customs Department. I always thought that that was about the way that the hon. gentleman would administer the affairs of the country if any unlucky chance ever put him on this side of the House. At the present time the North-west Mounted Police discharge two kinds of duties ; their police duties and their duties in connection with the Customs Department, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), in order to effect, not an economy, but a change, though the change be not an improvement, would have them cease to discharge their police funct-

tions. According to him their pay would go on all the same, but he would only allow them to discharge their duties as customs officials. Now, Sir, in conclusion, I would like to ask the House to seriously consider what suggestion has fallen from hon. gentlemen opposite as to the way they would manage the affairs of the country were they in power? We found the other day the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—and I am sorry he is not in his seat just now—showing by comparison of the figures between 1874 and 1884 what he considered the proper way of comparing the success of his party as administrators with the success of the administration of the present Government. If the hon. gentleman were in his seat, I would like to ask him how, in his own business, he would like to have a similar parallel drawn? If we could imagine a young and enterprising dealer, prior to 1874, anxious to promote his business and to secure success, and in order to secure the very best articles that could be obtained, he bought his pickles, jams and jellies from the member for South Brant; and he carried on his business so successfully that after a term of five years he was $25,000 ahead. Surely, under such circumstances, he would have reason to think that his business connection with the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was successful and satisfactory. But, allured by the promises of a rival firm, we will suppose that this enterprising dealer left the safe and conservative establishment of the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and dealt with a less reliable and less successful firm, with the result that, at the end of another five years, his capital was all gone and he was $50,000 in debt. Late in the day, as a sort of death-bed repentance, he returns to his first love, and again he begins to deal with the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), with the inevitable result that his business increases, his style of goods are better—they having been improved under the protection of the National Policy—and after another five years in business he has paid off his debts and is worth $5,000. Would not the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) be rather indignant if any person referring to the dealings between him and this customer were to say: Well, your dealings with him have not been profitable to him. Ten years ago he was worth $25,000, and now he is only worth $5,000; we will compare 1874 with 1884 and 1884 with 1894 in his business. Don't you think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) would very properly point out that when he took this unfortunate man in hand the second time, he, through his fault in leaving the firm which led him safely through dark places, having lost an accumulated fortune, had regained a part of it after he renewed his business relations with the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). Would he not point out that during the time he dealt with the other party he was insolvent, and would he not ask you to compare the two periods that he dealt with him, and exclude the time he spent in dealing with the other party? And so with regard to the dealings of this country. In 1874, we had a trade of some $217,000,000, and my hon. friend says, "you only put it up to $240,000,000, in 1894," but we did not start our administration with a trade of $217,000,000; we started in 1878 with a trade of only $153,000,000, to which it had declined during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and from that figure we worked it up to $240,000,000 in 1894. Now, what is it that hon. gentlemen opposite offer to this country, except the one old threadbare cry of economy, which we have heard from every platform in the country for years—economy, economy, economy. But have we any reason, derived from our experience of that party in the past, to expect that the economy which they have promised so loudly would be realized should they succeed in gaining power in this country? We have had experience of their political administration in all the provinces of this Dominion; and has that experience been such as to lead us believe that on the ground of economy, this country would be likely to be a gainer by their accession to power? We know one province, not very far from here, which no one in this House would dare to say was economically administered during the time its late premier, a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, held office; but, we have yet to hear any one of those hon. gentlemen denounce the rascality that distinguished that Government. I admit that for several years there was a man at the head of the opposite party whose nobility of character, integrity and honesty no one can dispute. I am willing to bear testimony to the virtues of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, although I do not forget the treatment that he received from some of his friends. We know that he wrote a letter in 1875, in which he detailed the woes to which he had been subjected when he came to occupy the treasury benches. In that letter, he said:

> I would like much to be relieved of the Pubile works Department. * * * Friends expect to be benefited by offices they are unfit for, by contracts they are not entitled to, by advances not earned. * * * I feel like the besieged, lying on my arms night and day. I have offended at least twenty parliamentary friends by my defence of the citadel.

Why, Sir, when we look to the records of the past, and see the illustrations that they present of the conduct of the Reform party, while in power, I think the people of this country will want to leave them where they have been for many years, and where, at all events, they will do no harm to the best interests of this Dominion.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on this very important question, I may say that I have been rather astonished at the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) calling out "economy, economy, economy," and asking if the Reform party practiced it when in power. Let me tell him that they did practice that economy, and I will give a little statement of the condition the country would be in to-day if the Conservative Government had practiced the same economy. When the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie came into power in 1874, he found a per capita expenditure of $6.10. When he went out of power, he had reduced it by 34 cents per head. Now, it has been admitted on the other side of the House that if a Government does not increase the expenditure in a greater ratio than the increase of population, it is fairly economical. Well, the population increased during the time of the Mackenzie Government fully as rapidly as it has done since, although, during the same time they reduced the per capita expenditure by 34 cents. In 1879, under hon. gentlemen opposite, the expenditure was increased 14 cents per head, which cost the country $580,476. In 1880 it was still increased 14 cents per head, which cost the country $600,154. In 1873 there was an increase of 72 cents per head, which caused an increase in the expenditure of $3,194,187. In 1885 the increase was $1.96 per head, an expenditure greater than that of the Mackenzie Government of $8,886,000. And when we come to the year 1886 we all remember the bungling which caused the expenditure in that year to be increased $2.74 per capita, or $13,674,000 over the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government, in consequence of the North-west rebellion, which would never have occurred under the Mackenzie Government. Coming down to 1894, it shows an increased expenditure of $14,000,000, of which $5,600,000 is a justifiable increase, while $8,700,000 would not have taken place had the Conservative Government administered the affairs of the country in the same economical manner as the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. From 1878 to 1894, there has been an over-expenditure for which the country has received no corresponding benefit, of $104,975,000. I have taken these figures from the Statistical Record, so that it is a fair statement to show the reckless expenditure of the present Government. That large sum of money would have been saved if the Government that succeeded the Mackenzie Government had fulfilled their promises, because Sir Leonard Tilley stated at St. John, in 1879, that had the Government of which he was a member been in power in the last five years, they would not have required to spend more than $22,500,000, which was $1,000,000 less than the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government in 1878. Sir Charles Tupper also stated that they would not require so large an expenditure as the Mackenzie Government—that as they had carried on the Government with a small expenditure in the past, they would be prepared to do the same thing in the future. Now, we have been asked by the last speaker what means the Reform party intend to take to remove the depression. That is the cry of every individual on the Government side, both from the treasury and the back benches. What are to be the tactics of the Opposition, they ask, they appear to have no tactics? And they would like very well that the Reform party should show their hand. It is very seldom that I indulge in prophecy, but if the people get a fair opportunity, if the Government does not bring on something in the shape of reciprocity or something else of that description, as they did in 1891, when they went to the people with a false cry, they will soon find what the policy of the Reform party is. I was astonished at the statements of the last speaker. He said there were fifty Cabinet Ministers in England. Why, I made a comparison a short time ago, and found that the number was about equal in Canada and England. There was another statement he made at which I was very much astonished. When he undertook to show how the manufacturing industry in Ireland had been depressed and crushed out of existence, what period did he choose? He took the period from 1799 to 1834. But during that period protection ruled supreme in Scotland and England and Ireland, and it was during that period that the Irish industries were ruined. He did not touch on the free trade period in Great Britain which commenced in 1846. His statement only proves that under the protective policy which brought England to the verge of ruin, the manufacturing industries in Ireland also suffered. I am going to take a few statements also from the report of the Royal Commission of Agriculture in Britain; and let me tell you, Sir, that there are varied suggestions for the removal of this depression as one could possibly find. A great many causes exist there that do not exist in this country. One cause is the law of entail upon real property. Under this law, landlords, in many instances, have a life interest in the property, and will not pay their tenants for any improvements, so that the lands become exhausted in many instances and will not give crop, and the landlords will not give the tenants redress in the shape of improvements to which they are entitled. There is something else. There is a cry all over Scotland and England that the depression among agriculturists is much intensified by the disease among the cattle. Two or three farmers in Scotland and England have shown that on account of tuberculosis they have lost 10 to 15 per cent on their stocks,

or what would be a fair remuneration for their labour. There were also other causes at work. In Scotland, in 1870, a new school law was brought in. Under the old school law, the landlords paid all the taxes, but under the new school law the taxes fees fell on the tenants at which they complained bitterly. They also complained of railway discrimination in not giving them proper railway facility. Another cause why the farmers suffered severely in Britain, is to be found in the fact that they had nineteen years and twenty years' leases, which when the depression came on, were still existing, and the farmers were ruined before they could get any reduction in rent. This has disappeared to a great extent because many farmers now are upon yearly leases. There was talk, it is true, of a certain amount of protection in certain quarters, but such talk was by no means universal as my hon. friend stated before recess. Protection to the farmer in Britain would impose on him a great deal of extra expenses in many instances. Here is a statement from the report of the district of Northumberland :

A number of farmers, who are opposed to putting a duty on manufactured articles, as a whole, advocate a duty on foreign barley, which, they urge, would not result in raising the price of food, and not necessarily of drink, while it would greatly benefit the farmers.

The Commissioner goes on to report :

On the other hand, there are farmers opposed to protection in any form.

Mr. Forster of Budle, says :

I pass from the idea of protection as something too childish to trouble with. As long as other nations send their produce here, it is quite clear it is the best market for our own as well as theirs. And there are others who recognize that the cost of living is cheaper for the whole community in consequence of free trade ; that probably it would be an impossibility to raise the cost of living of the community to assist the farming interest, and that remedies must be sought in other directions.

Now, there is another point which has not been touched by the hon. gentleman who quoted from the report of this commission, and that is the condition of the workingmen, even under free trade in England. Let me state that the country which is most prosperous is that where the artisan and the labourer live in comfortable circumstances and where wages are increased. That is the case in Britain at present. Farm labourers there are having their wages increased. Let me read the statement of a farmer :

All the labourers have a rise of 1s. 6d. a week. The blacksmiths' work has risen 40 per cent.

Can hon. gentlemen opposite show me this in any protective country ? I will show that in free trade Britain the workingmen get higher wages than in any protected country on the continent of America. I can show that wages are going up in Britain while the wages of the agricultural labourers are going down in the neighbouring republic. Here is another statement :

Labour has not been curtailed. I employ more men on the land I have left, and find the more machinery I have, the more men I require. My labour bill is much higher, according to the amount of land cultivated.

These are statements that cannot be set aside. According to the reports I have read, the average reduction of farm property amounts to from 30 to 33 per cent, while in some cases it is not more than 12. As regards my native country, I have a report from the parish to which I belong, and that shows that the reduction in the value of land there only amounts to 12 per cent. I will also show another farmer's views of the condition of things. He points out very vividly the condition of labourers in free-trade England. This is in the district of Wiltshire :

A very representative farmer of large experience gave me his views at some length on the present position of labour. He observed, that labourers, as a rule, practised considerable thrift, and the marked improvement in their condition is readily observable. He himself takes great interest in the welfare of the labourers' families, and is a teacher in the Sunday school. He observed that the dress of the labourers and their families on Sundays showed their well-to-do condition, and he stated that at least 75 per cent of the boys under twelve years old possessed watches, showing that there is money available for comparative luxuries. The fact that women now decline to do any field work, is another proof that they are in independent circumstances. On this farm 10 or 12 women used to be employed at weeding and hay-making, earning 8d. or 9d. per day. Now they will not even tie the corn in harvest, and will hardly carry their husband's dinner to them in the field.

Showing conclusively that even in free-trade Britain the condition of the working classes is being steadily improved. And let me say that as to the condition of the farmers, another farmer gives his views to the effect that protection would be of very little benefit to the farmers of Great Britain, because, as he says, if we have to get protection it would only benefit us for one or two years, until the lease expires, and then the landlord would get the benefit.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the farm labourer in England as well paid as the farm labourer in Canada ?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, Sir. I have visited Scotland within the last three years, and have been over a good many of the farms mentioned in the report, and the labourers are as well paid as the labourers in Canada, when you count all the perquisites allowed with their wages.

Mr. DAVIN. Are they as well fed ?

Mr. McMILLAN. They are—better fed ; for the simple reason that they get good porridge and milk. It is complained of the labourers in England they are not giving as good

service as formerly, and one reason is that they have given up porridge and milk and ground wheat, and have taken to flour and tea. Here is the news from Gloucester, Wilts, and Berkshire in England:

Feeding stuffs are generally a more important item on a grass than on an arable farm, and in this respect grass-farmers have benefited by the lowering of price of cake and the importation of cheap foreign corn. The latter was a specially important matter in 1893, when, owing to the drought, most farmers had little or nothing to feed their cattle on, and were compelled to purchase a large quantity of food. Many grass farmers said to me: "We like the importation of cheap corn. It is the only thing that saved us last year." "The low price of corn is an advantage to the dairy farmer."

In another place the report says:

Farmers in dairy and grazing districts, who have benefited by cheap foreign barley and meal and feeding stuffs, frequently said to me, that a duty on foreign corn would injure rather than assist them.

Let me say, there is a universal feeling, both in Scotland and in England that a duty ought to be imposed upon flour, but that wheat ought to come in free. The only grain they ask a duty on is barley. They also wish a duty placed upon malt. The duty has been removed from malt, and they believe that if the duty were re-imposed upon malt and a small duty placed on barley it would benefit the farmer. But, as a rule, they ask that no duty be placed upon feed. At page 47, the following statement is quoted:

Mr. King (butcher) thought the price of beef and mutton was high enough now, and it was impossible to return to protection, or they would have meat at starvation prices.

The people of England feel to-day that if they were to return to protection it would be impossible for them to keep their position among the nations of the earth; that if they were to put a tax upon beef, it would be so high in price that the majority of the people could not use it.

Referring to the commencement of the depression in 1882, the Commissioner asked how matters had been going on since the depression began? Mr. Bennett said, from bad to worse. One or two farmers observed that in 1879 matters were at their worst. Mr. Bennett said, that cheap corn was the salvation of the country for feeding cattle last year. A farmer stated that the matter worked out that they had to pay foreigners for stock and then send them the money for the corn, and when they sold the fat stock, they only got the same price as for poor stock.

Let me say, also, they have asked, as a redress for their grievances in both Scotland and England, that the Canadian cattle known as stockers be allowed to come into the country. They believe that with stockers and free corn they would be greatly benefited. Now, here is the rent roll of a very large estate, and I have just taken the parish to which I belong, the parish of Kirkconnel in Dumfrieshire. In 1879-80, the land rent roll was £9,157 10s., and in 1893-94 it was £7,973 2s. 6d. But when we take the total valuation, including houses and mansions, woodlands, fishings, shootings, and sundries, we find that in 1879-80 the total valuation was £13,920 17s.; and in 1893-94 it was £13,888 0s. 6d. This shows that there was very little reduction, the shrinkage being only 2·12 per cent. I need not pursue this question any further, because it is admitted on all hands that the wages of farm labourers have increased in some localities from 12 to 15 per cent. We have been told about the census, and about the large exodus from this country. Here is a statement made by the bureau at Washington, showing what the exodus from Canada has been. I find that in 1873 it was 37,871; and in 1878 it was 25,568. In 1881 it went up to 118,664. Under Tory rule up to 1873 the average exodus was 37,171. Under the Liberal Government from 1874 to 1878 it was 24,433, or 12,000 a year less than under Tory rule. From 1879 to 1881 the average was 83,212 annually. So that we see that as soon as the country was brought under the influence of this blessed National Policy, the number of those leaving Canada for the United States was more than trebled, showing conclusively the effect the National Policy had in driving the people out of the country. Another statement that has been made is that wherever the Canadian farmer puts his goods upon the market and the American farmer filled the Canadian market with his goods, the market of the Canadian farmer was restricted. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) also made a statement yesterday showing that the farmer was benefited by the National Policy in the prices that he received from grain. The Minister of Militia also made a statement with reference to pork, to the effect that the farmer had been benefited to the tune of $1,150,000 by pork being kept out of the markets of this country. Now, there is a statement here that shows conclusively the effect the National Policy has had upon the Canadian farmer in reducing the price of his grain. I find the statement in the statistical record for 1886, showing that in 1881 wheat in Montreal was $1.33 per bushel, while at the same period in the United States it was $1.11. It was higher in Canada by 22 cents than it was in the United States during the year 1881. There was a fall in other countries from 1881 to 1886, but that was at a time the blessed National Policy kept out all American grain. In 1886, under the influence of that blessed National Policy, wheat had fallen in Canada from $1.33 to 85 cents per bushel. Wheat had fallen in the United States from $1.11 in 1881, to 87 cents in 1886, or only 24 cents per bushel, did wheat fall in the United States during the same time that it fell 48

cents in Canada ; and instead of being high in Canada in 1886, it was 2 cents lower than it was in the United States. Now, here is a statement contained in that same record, which I will read :

> The very marked effect which the adoption of the National Policy, in 1879, had upon the imports of wheat and flour will be immediately apparent upon looking at the above table. It will be seen that, while the average importation of wheat in each year from 1868 to 1879 was $5,480,735, in the period 1880 to 1886 it only averaged $168,097 per annum, increasing the home market for wheat to the extent of $5,312,638 annually.

But there has been a marked decline in the price of wheat during the last five years. In Montreal, in 1881, it was $1.33 per bushel, and in 1886 it was only 85 cents, being a reduction of 48 cents. According to the United States reports, the export price of wheat in 1881 was $1.11, and in 1886 it was 87 cents, or a difference of 24 cents per bushel. That is the benefit that the Canadian farmer got from keeping out that $5,312,000 worth of wheat. There is a statement that cannot be denied ; and I am in a position to say that oats, barley and rye all fell in Canada more than they did in the United States during the existence of this blessed National Policy. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite, with a knowledge of all these facts, with these statements brought under their notice time and again, have the audacity to rise and say that the farmers have been benefited by the duty that is placed upon agricultural products. Now, let me give another statement. On 26th last February, cattle in Buffalo were $5.30 per hundred, the lowest being $2.80. In Toronto, at the same time, the highest price was $4 per hundred, and the lowest, $2. Now, here was more than $1.50 in favour of the American farmer, and if we had had reciprocity with the United States we would have got over a dollar a hundred for every animal we had to sell. I find that last year, when I made a speech upon the budget in this House, I stated that the best of our cattle in Canada was selling at $4.50 per hundred pounds, while they were selling in the United States at $6.10, showing that we are not benefited but injured by the duty that is placed upon cattle. We have been injured in more ways than one, we have been prevented from shipping our cattle in bond through the United States into the British market, which we would have been able to do had the duty and quarantine restrictions been removed. Now, how many cattle did the people of Ontario sell during this last year, and what was their loss on those cattle ? They sold 436,352 in the home and foreign market. Let me state that on the price of animals that we sold for export, and the price of animals that we slaughtered at home, we lost just the nice little sum of $10 per head, making $4,363,000 that we lost upon our cattle, which sum we would have saved under reciprocity with the United States. Now take hogs. We are told that we are greatly benefited by having a duty placed upon pork and hogs shipped from the United States. I find that in Buffalo, on the 26th February last, hogs were selling at $4.40 for the highest quality, while in Toronto they were selling at $4.30 for the highest. We sold 978,790 hogs, and taking them at an average weight of 170 pounds each, there was a loss to the Canadian farmer of $166,394. Now, in sheep we sold 575,934 to the United States at $1.25, for those over a year old, higher in the Buffalo market than in the Toronto market, while lambs were 75 cents higher. But there was a greater number of sheep sold over one year old than under ; therefore, on sheep there was just a loss, when compared with the United States market, of $575,934. Now, when we come to barley, who does not remember that we have been accustomed to sell barley to the United States ? Who amongst the farmers in this House does not know that barley was the best paying crop we had ? We could profitably raise that crop and send it to the United States until such time as the McKinley Bill became law. Now, I admit that we can get a good price for our barley since the Wilson Bill was passed. That Wilson Bill did more to relieve the farmers of Canada than all the legislation that the Tory Government has given us during the last thirteen years. Of barley we raised 12,000,000 bushels the last year before the McKinley Bill took effect, of which we sent 9,000,000 bushels to the United States, and reckoning a loss of 18 cents per bushel, we find that the farmers of Canada lost $1,800,000 upon their barley. How often upon the floor of this House have I asked the Government to give us free corn so that we could sell our barley to the United States. We asked this Government to reciprocate with the United States in order that they would give us free corn for our barley. Then take oats We raised 38,000,000 bushels of oats, and I find upon the same date mentioned above, oats were 3 cents a bushel higher in Buffalo than they were in Toronto. If we only sold half of that quantity, we would lose on our oats $1,600,000. Besides, instead of 3 cents we would lose 5 cents per bushel, because a bushel of oats in the United States only weighs 32 pounds, while in Canada it weighs 34 pounds. Now, take these with a few other articles, and the difference in price between the markets of Buffalo and those of Toronto represents the nice little sum of $7,691,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite will prate about the protection that the farmer gets in the Canadian market for his produce. There is no market in the world equal to the American market for the produce of the Canadian farmer. If you will go back to the year 1889 and see the amount of agricultural produce that was sent into the markets of

the United States and the amount that was sent into the markets of Great Britain ; you will find that the United States, in animals and their produce, and in agricultural products, took about the same sum that Great Britain did, if we leave cheese out of the question. So I hold that the United States is our best market. We were also told that farm property in Canada has not been reduced in value to any appreciable extent, this statement being made by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The very fact that such a statement is made by an hon. Minister shows that he is not posted on the subject, and I think before I resume my seat I shall be able to show that the value of farm property has been reduced to a great extent. Before I enter on this subject, however, I wish to devote some attention to the Intercolonial Commission. I am astonished at some of the statements made during the proceedings. We are there told that a large quantity of machinery will be shipped to Australia from Canada. But how will it benefit the farmers to know that the Government has passed an Order in Council to remove all duties on raw material coming into this country, when the manufactured implement is exported, and that our manufacturers will be allowed to send machinery to the furthest corners of the earth so that the people there will purchase farm machinery at a cheaper rate than do the Canadian farmers. They can send machinery to the Argentine Republic, which is competing keenly with us both in wheat and cattle, and also send machinery to Australia, as I have said, so that the farmers there will be able to obtain it at less price than do Canadian farmers. Not only so, but we are paying $125,000 a year as bounty to a steamship line to carry machinery so as to place Australian farmers in that advantageous position as compared with Canadian farmers. Many statements that are very injurious to our farmers were made at this Intercolonial Commission. The Minister of Finance stated :

> There are a number of things which have been mentioned, with regard to which I do not see why a good trade should not be done. I do not think you will be able to send very much of your butter here, except along the Pacific slope, where it will compete, to a certain extent, with butter from the eastern provinces, and perhaps a little from the United States.

Is it not absurd to subsidize a line of steamships to bring butter to Canada, while at the same time we are producing butter in our creameries and paying 20 cents a pound for it, which butter is afterwards sent to the old country where it only realizes 15 cents. Surely it is taking money out of the pockets of the people to subsidize a steamship line to bring agricultural products to Canada and dispose of them to the disadvantage of the farmers of the Dominion. The Finance Minister further said :

> You ought to be able to do a very good trade under the present tariff, which we reduced very much last session, in frozen mutton, along the Pacific slope, because, hitherto, we have been entirely unable to supply them with the meat that they require.

That statement is lacking in one essential element, and that is the element of truth ; because we have been able to supply the Pacific coast with all the meat the people require. Any one has only to visit Calgary and see the ranches there to know that all that is needed is to turn the supply of beef westward over the Canadian Pacific Railway and supply the Pacific coast with all its needs. It must have been in a moment of weakness that the hon. Minister of Finance made such a statement. He further said :

> —especially mutton, and they have imported it from the United States. I see no reason why you should not cut off a good deal of that trade which now comes from the United States.

How much mutton do the United States get from Canada ? The Trade and Navigation Returns of 1893 show that the quantity was about 7,000 pounds. No more than 29,000 sheep went into British Columbia. In 1894 there were something like 40,000 pounds of mutton and 40,000 sheep sent into British Columbia. Yet the Finance Minister has to invite the people of Australia to send products of animals to compete with the farmers of Canada, while at the same time we are bearing a tax in order to pay a subsidy for a line of steamships to drive our own products from our own markets. But the hon. gentleman is not content with simply driving the products of our farmers from our own market, but he also apparently desires to bring goods from other colonies to supplant the manufacturing products of Canada. With respect to binding twine, the hon. gentleman said :

> With regard to binding twine, I am afraid we cannot offer much to New Zealand under present conditions. We have reduced that duty to 12½ per cent on invoice prices. It is really a very small duty. If you have much of an advantage in raising the raw material and working it up, you ought to have a fair chance for our western prairie market.

The hon. gentleman desires to supply the market in the prairie province with a foreign manufactured article, and thus injuriously affect the cordage manufacturers of Canada. And then with respect to wool, the hon. gentleman said :

> Then, with reference to wool, I do not want to go farther than the Government would be willing to carry me out, but I do not think there would be much difficulty in giving New Zealand a chance, if there is anything she can give us a compensating chance for in her market. You must take things now as being in statu quo. We are commencing to make a bargain, and this wool business, I think, could be arranged so that you could get a differential on that, and I do not know how far it might go ; it might go clear to the line of freeing it, in return for a correspond-

ing advantage that you might give us upon something we send to you.

When the tariff was being revised last session the Minister of Finance put forward the idea that a small duty placed on wool would be a benefit to the Canadian farmers. But in order to carry out this imperial federation fad, with which he is now possessed, he is willing to sacrifice the interests of the farmers and compel them to pay a subsidy for a line of steamships to carry produce to supplant them in their own market. That is not all. I find that we are likely to be saddled with another line of steamships, for the Premier was perfectly willing that this should be done. He stated that in a very few years he hoped to see a line of steamship running from Halifax to Cape of Good Hope, for such an undertaking would require the investment of a very small sum of money. I do not know where the expenses of the present Government are going to end. They are subsidizing lines of steamers to carry merchandise to the antipodes. How much of this will consist of the products of the farm ? I see that Australia took our agricultural products to the value of $18 in 1893, according to the Trade and Navigation returns.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is an increase.

Mr. McMILLAN. We were also told by the Prime Minister that we are working up a large trade in machinery with the Australian colonies, and he stated at the Intercolonial Conference that we had sent 8,000 machines last year to these colonies, whereas, three or four years ago, we only sent about eight machines. Therefore, he contended that trade had developed in this direction. Now, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, we sent machines to Australia to the value of $79,356, and to New Zealand, to the value of $22,505, or, in all, $101,862 worth. If we sent 8,000 machines, they must have been very small machines, indeed, and, according to our Trade Returns, they would be only valued at $12.61 each. They were not binders, nor reapers, nor mowers, so they must have been some kind of small sewing machines. Yet, for this petty trade, the Prime Minister was willing to sacrifice the interests of the farmers of Canada. Last year, when the tariff was being revised, we were led to believe at first that a large reduction of duty was to be made in a good many lines, and that the tariff would be amended to a considerable extent by taking away the specific duties and making the duties ad valorem. In this, however, we were sadly disappointed, for we found that before the final revision of the tariff, the specific duties had all been reinstated. Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, the following figures to show what duties we are paying now on staple articles, and the figures will plainly show that the duties have not been reduced :—

During the month of December $5,305 worth of rice was imported, on which the duty was $4,189, or over 78 per cent ; 587,145 tons of coal, with duty of $142,523, or 24 per cent ; $13,077 cotton clothing, with a duty of $4,289, or 30 per cent ; $75,037 cutlery, hardware, tools and implements, with a duty of $22,480, or almost 30 per cent ; $16,173 boots and shoes, with a duty of $4,033, or 25 per cent ; $53,034 coal oil, with a duty of $48,822, or over 92 per cent ; $8,885 of soap, with a duty of $3,111, or over 34 per cent ; $18,125 of woollen clothing, with duty of $6,123, or 33 per cent ; $119,553 of dress goods, with a duty of $35,733, or almost 30 per cent.

These figures prove plainly, Mr. Speaker, that we are paying as high duties as we did before the reductions which the Finance Minister boasts so much about. Now, with reference to the position of the manufacturers in this country towards the present Government. Ever since the first necessity arose for the establishment of a Manufacturers' Association, we find that the report of the Association says "that it is a strong factor in Dominion politics." In the annual report of this association, published in February last, I find the following statement :

> Since the inauguration of the National Policy, Canada has prospered and the social well-being of the people elevated. Wages have been increased, and the working classes have received great benefit.

Sir, I take exception to such a statement, because I believe that the wages of the working classes have been reduced, and I think I will be able to prove that. In 1882, those engaged in the manufacturing industries in Canada had an average wage of $332 per annum ; while the average wage for last year claimed by the Government statistician in the Statistical Year-Book, is only $271. Here we have facts to prove that the reduction of the wages of those engaged in manufacturing industries in Canada amounts to $50 a year for each person since the year 1882. The report goes on :

> A matter upon which your committee laid strong stress, was that relating to drawbacks of duties upon exports. In frequent interviews with the Finance Minister, your secretary urged that this policy should be embodied in that of the Government, and this was finally done by an Order in Council. It is contended by the manufacturers that the Order in Council encourages sending abroad for certain lines of products that used to be made in Canada. * * *

The manufacturers go on to state that that must be remedied immediately, and, no doubt, the Finance Minister will bow to the dictates of his masters, the Canadian manufacturers, because we found last year, when the tariff was being reduced that there was some power behind the throne that we could not understand. Not a single reduction was made in favour of the farmers or the workingmen of Canada, but a great many changes were made at the

dictates of the manufacturers. In fact, they tell us themselves that this was the case :

The Association has just reason for congratulating itself upon the influence it possesses in assisting to mould public opinion in the matter of affording tariff protection to our manufacturing industries, and in shaping the laws in conformity thereto. There never was a time, since the formation of this Association twenty years ago, that its influence was stronger or more pronounced than now.

That is the language contained in the report of the Manufacturers' Association last February, when they had their annual meeting. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, especially the farmers of Ontario, who have read these statements which I have quoted to the House, begin to believe that it is time that those who should really rule the country should occupy seats on the treasury benches, and not have it, as it is now, that the country should be ruled by a set of manufacturers, whose dictum has become the law of the land. The report goes on to say :

On February 14th, 1894, a largely attended joint meeting of the Tariff and Executive committees of the Association and of other members was held in this office. The brief of the Associaton was presented to Mr. Foster, at Ottawa, on February 26th, 1894, the receipt of which was acknowledged by him, as hereinbefore alluded to. The fruit of this sense of responsibility is to be found in the fact that in many instances the very words of our recommendations to the Government regarding tariff features, are found in the Tariff Acts. We have in the past, and, it is to be hoped, we will in the future, devote any small surplus of our membership fees to spreading the truth by means of campaign literature and campaign speeches, following the manner, but not the matter, of the English Cobden Club.

We have always felt that there was some power that furnished the means to the present Government for more than campaign speeches, or campaign literature, and I believe, Sir, that the manufacturers have only acknowledged in this, a part of what they do. That is one of the reasons why the present Government have got to accept their brief, and to act upon it, in order that the manufacturers may be able to bring a more potent power than speeches and literature to bear upon the electors of this country when the general elections come off. We have heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about the condition of Great Britain under free trade. Before free trade was adopted in England, in 1842, the state of affairs in England under protection was quite appalling, and I shall quote from Dumbley's " Charter of Nations," page 67, to prove this. He says :

But it was in the manufacturing districts that the sufferings were most frightful. Some of the details are quite appalling, and testify to an intensity and universality of destitution, starvation and misery to which no period of temporary distress, since the adoption of free trade in England, can show the slightest approach. In Leeds, there were 20,936 persons whose average earnings were under one shilling a week. In Nottingham, 10,580 persons, nearly one-fifth of the population, were in receipt of parochial relief. In most of the leading trades of Birmingham the men were earning one-half, and in some cases one-third, of their usual wages, while some of the masters were so near ruined that they had on a Saturday night to pawn their goods to pay their men's wages. In Paisley thirty failures took place within two months, and one-third of the wage-receivers were thrown upon the public for support. In Manchester, 12,000 families, after having pawned every article of furniture and of dress with which they could possibly dispense, were supported by voluntary charitable contributions. One-third of the population of Coventry was out of work. In Spitalfields, 8,000 looms were idle, and 24,000 persons thrown upon parochial relief. In the metropolis, a thousand letter-press compositors and 9,000 tailors were altogether without work. But enough. There is no need to multiply instances to substantiate the fact.

Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have made a great deal of statements about free trade in England, and the other evening the Minister of Railways and Canals asked what effect free trade would have, and what the effect the abolition of the National Policy would have upon Canada ? He said that if the National Policy were abolished, all our manufactures would be swept out of existence, we would be paying for foreign labour, and sending our goods to a foreign market. Here is what Mr. Drummond says :

Mr. H. Drummond said that the end and intentions of the Manchester school were to discharge all British labourers and to employ foreign labourers in lieu of them.

That is a prediction that was made in England at that time, and it is made in Canada to-day.

Mr. Herries deprecated these attacks on a system which was the nursery of our flourishing mercantile marine, the foundation of our naval supremacy, and which, if once abandoned for the sake of a rash experiment, could never be restored. Mr. T. Baring called on all those who attached any importance to the national safety, to vote against the Bill, which he believed was forced upon a reluctant people and a hesitating Parliament.

But, in spite of all these predictions, the Bill abolishing protection in England was passed in 1849, and from that time, England took a start forward and has attained a position among the nations of the earth which she never could have obtained under a protective policy. Let me read a statement made by Sir William Harcourt at the opening of Parliament last spring :

Sir William Harcourt made an interesting comparison as to pauperism. In 1851 pauperism, on the total population was 4·5 per cent ; it is now 2·4 per cent, or about one-half. Of children under 16, it was then 5 ; it is now 2·3. From the ages of 16 to 60 it was 1·4 ; it was now ·5. In old age, after 60, it was 21·5 ; it is now 13·7. In 1849, the mean adult pauperism was 13 per 1,000 ; it has

now fallen to 7·7 but it never fell much below that figure until after 1871, when the fall in prices began. This has reference to the period since 1871. From 1849 to 1871 the fall was down to 7·7; but it has now fallen concurrently with the fall in prices to 2·4. There is severe depression in Great Britain, no doubt, but there are facts also which tell on the other side, and show that the progress of the people in comfort and abundance of food has been continuous.

That shows the condition of the people of England under free trade. Now, I am going to attempt to show that the National Policy has borne extremely hard on the workingmen and farmers of Canada, apart from the reduction in prices that has taken place. The statement I am about to make goes to show that the value of farm lands must have been reduced in Canada 33 per cent from 1880 down to the present time. I am going to read from the Statistical Year-Book for 1893. It gives the census returns of the produce of Canadian farms in the years 1880 and 1890, in barley, oats, rye, pease, buckwheat, beans, corn, potatoes, turnips and other roots, and hay, and says:

Taking these articles, with wheat, and putting them into tons, we find that the total number of tons reported as the product of the farms of Canada in 1890 was 15,092,227 tons, against 11,576,317 tons in 1880, an increase of 30·4 per cent. While, however, there has been this increase in the quantity raised, there has been a decrease of about 11 per cent in the aggregate average price. During the same period there has been a decrease in the number of farmers equal to a little over 1 per cent.

Now, that is something I cannot understand, how there has been a decrease in the number of farmers, in view of the fact that, according to the census, there were some 464,000 resident occupiers of the soil in 1881, and 620,000 in 1891. Then, it says:

This points to an increase in the acreage of the individual holdings. Such increase is in accord with the facts obtained from the census of 1891, according to which there were in the Dominion 1,149 more occupiers of properties of 50 to 100 acres in extent; 28,028 more occupiers of properties ranging from 100 to 200 acres, and 16,477 more occupiers of properties ranging from 100 to 200 acres, and 16,477 more occupiers of properties ranging from 200 acres upwards, than there were in 1881.

How it can be that there were more occupiers of the soil in 1891 than in 1881, and yet a reduction in 1891 of over 7,000 farmers, is something I cannot understand:

In 1891 there were 649,506 farmers to divide among them 15,092,227 tons, and in 1881 there were 656,712 farmers to divide among them 11,576,317 tons. The average for 1891 was 23 tons, and for 1881, 18 tons. Thus, there was an increase of five tons per farmer in the quantity. The total tons, multiplied by the aggregate average price, $18.18 and $20.41, would yield $279,426,686 for 1891 and $236,272,629 for that of 1881. The average farmer, therefore, would receive in 1891, $430 from his crop of the articles enumerated, against $360 in 1881.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Now, I have made a little calculation. I have gone over these figures, having, like some others, had my doubts with reference to their correctness. I took the quantities of grain given in the Statistical Year-Book for 1891, and I took the price that I found recorded in the markets of Ontario, and I found that there was a little discrepancy. I find that while the statistician made it $279,000,000, I only made it $229,000,000, so that I made the farmer of 1891 only receive the sum of $370 a year, while the farmer of 1881 got something like $433. This is reversing the condition of things from what the Statistical Year-Book makes it. That makes the farmer of 1891, $79 better off than he was in 1881. But by the calculation I have made he is $74 worse off than he was in 1891. Just a little difference in our calculation of $144 in the income of a farmer in 1891. But there is another strange calculation made, a very strange one indeed, and one that I can hardly account for. There has been a little blue-book issued, being an appendix to the report of the Minister of Agriculture respecting manufacturing industries. I find on page 8:

It has been calculated that the output of the farmers of Canada, allowing an average of 25 cents per day as the costs of farm products consumed by each person in Canada, plus the exports of the products of the farm, is equal to $500,000,000 a year. The output from the mechanical and manufacturing establishments is valued at $476,260,000. The farmers numbered 408,738 in 1891, and, therefore, the average farmer contribute to the state the sum of $1,223 a year.

But that same year they numbered 649,506 according to the Statistical Year-Book. It is a very convenient way of making a calculation. Let me just examine this calculation. Each individual in the province of Ontario consumes 25 cents worth of farm produce per day. Let us see what that would lead to. If each individual consumed 25 cents worth per day, he would consume $91.25 per year. Therefore a farmer with a family of five would consume $456 worth per year. So that, according to the statements of the statistican himself, when he takes the total amount of agricultural produce raised by each farmer as amounting to $430, each farmer and his family consumes per year $26 worth more than they produced. By this method of calculation, the statistican makes each hand on a farm produce $1,223 worth, taking only 408,736 as the number of farmers, whereas in reality be only produces $436 worth, making the calculation properly—a slight mistake of $737 for each farmer. Now, we come to deal with farm values. It has been stated that there was a large increase in the value of land in Ontario. In 1882 it was $632,342,500; in 1893 it amounted to, $602,664,361, or a reduction of $29,678,139 in farm land alone. Last year the reduction was $13,164,110. Now, there has been since 1882 something like 2,000,000 acres of land cleared in Ontario. Taking that at $20 per

acre which is the lowest calculation, that would give $40,000,000, which added to $29,678,138 would make something like $70,500,000. Yet to my certain knowledge there is not a township in western Ontario but which on Government or municipal and private drains has spent some $5 or $6 per acre. This also ought to be added and let me say, from my own personal knowledge, that I know that land has decreased in value at the lowest calculation $10 an acre all over Ontario. I know of a farm for which some ten years ago $5,500 was offered. There was a comfortable brick house built on it, the contract for building which and furnishing all material except stone, sand and lime, was let for $1,200. That farm was sold last spring at $4,000. There is another farm for which $5,500 was offered ten years ago, and two years ago it was sold for $4,000, although it had a nice bank barn and outhouses added to it. Another farm, with a first class dwelling house on it, for which $6,000 was offered and was sold two years ago for $4,000. At Seaforth a farm for which, five or six years ago, $10,000, was paid, was sold for $7,000 three years ago. These are fair samples of the reduction in the value of land all over Ontario. I have travelled over the province for the last three years from Montreal to Sarnia, and I find that for every farm that can be sold there are ten in the market. I would just say that in this as well as in the old country, the very best of farms have not been reduced quite so much as the poorest farms, but to my certain knowledge the reduction on value is over 30 per cent on an average. How could it be possible that farm lands have not been reduced? The values of all field crops during the last year in Ontario was $101,886,557, which on 285,608 farms gave to each the sum of $357. The total average yearly value of the field crops from 1882 to 1892 was $114,553,844, or an average of $401 to each farmer. Now, when we take the field crops of 1882 we find that they amounted to $155,000,000, giving an average to each farmer of $771. Now, is it possible that land could maintain its value seeing that the farmers' receipts for his field crops had been reduced from $771 in 1882 to $357 in 1893? And I am perfectly certain, Mr. Speaker, that if we had the report for 1894, it would make even a worse showing. If we take the prices of these field crops separately, we see how the farmers' land must have been reduced in value, because I hold that a farm is only worth, in reality, what the products of the farm will bring when placed upon the markets of the world. In 1882, fall wheat, in Ontario, averaged $1.14 per bushel; in 1893, it averaged 59 cents, a fall of 55 cents per bushel. Spring wheat in 1882 averaged $1.19 per bushel; and in 1893, 59 cents, a fall of 60 cents. Barley, in 1882, averaged 71 cents per bushel, and in 1893, 40 cents, a fall of 31 cents. Oats fell from 43 cents, in 1882, to 33 cents in 1893, a reduction of 10 cents. Pease fell from 76 cents to 54 cents, a difference of 22 cents. Rye, in 1882, was 74 cents, and in 1893, 47 cents, a reduction of 27 cents. Beans fell from $2.35 to $1.18, a reduction of $1.17. Hay averaged $12.84 a ton in 1882; and $7.64 in 1893, a reduction of $5.20 per ton. Wool averaged from 20 to 32 cents, according to quality, in 1882; and in 1893 it averaged 18 cents, a fall, on the average, of, say 6 cents. Now, that proves that the farmer's income must have been reduced to a very great extent. The following table will show the reduction in the income of an average farmer, with forty acres under field crops, taking the reduction in prices I have just given:—

——	Per Acre.	No. of Acres.	Total Crop.	Reduction per	Total Reduction.
				$ cts.	$ cts.
Wheat	bush. 20	10	bush. 200	bush. 0 55	110 00
Barley	" 25	5	" 125	" 0 31	38 75
Oats	" 34	10	" 340	" 0 09	30 60
Pease	" 20	5	" 100	" 0 22	22 00
Hay	tons. 1½	10	tons. 15	tons. 5 00	75 00
Total					276 35

And yet hon. gentlemen opposite will tell us that the farmers are in a prosperous condition, that no other class in Canada is so prosperous. Now, I want to show conclusively that wages have not kept up in Canada, but that they have fallen. According to the statement, given in the Statistical Year-Book, the average wage of those working in the manufacturing industries, was $271. I have here a statement of thirty-eight of the principal industries for 1882, showing that the average wage is $322. This would indicate an average reduction of $51.00 in the wages of the hands employed in manufacturing industries from 1882 to 1893. I am convinced that even in

England, with her free trade policy, wages have gone up rather than down. The statistician Mulhall, in his "History of Wages and Prices," says that in 1850 the wage-earners in the United States received 23·3 per cent of the value of the product. In 1860 they received 21·2 per cent, and in 1870 they received 19 per cent; and in 1880, 17·8 per cent—a drop in wages of nearly one-quarter. In the same period, the products of each individual, on the average, increased 83 per cent, while the wages increased only 33 per cent. In Great Britain, operatives received, as wages, from 30 to 33 per cent of the value of the manufactures they produced. In Europe, the proportion was 30 per cent, and in the United States, as stated, 18 per cent. These calculations were made in 1885, and the relative conditions have not changed since. In Canada, the number of hands employed in manufacturing industries in 1890 was 367,865. The amount paid in wages was $99,762,441, which gave an average of $271. According to the report I mentioned before, thirty-eight of the principal industries in Ontario averaged $322 in wages for each operative employed, showing a higher rate of wages in 1882 than in 1893, of $51 per operative. Now, here is a statement relating to the United States, taken from the tables of trade and labour statistics, beginning with 1860. In this table, $100 is taken as a basis and increase or reductions noted accordingly. In agricultural implements, between 1871 and 1891 wages fell 14·2 per cent. In books and newspapers there was a fall of 11·2 per cent from 1881 to 1891; in building trades, there was a fall of 10·2 from 1871 to 1891; in carriages and wagons there was a rise; in city public works, there was a fall of 10·7; in cotton goods, there was a fall of four-fifths of 1 per cent; in dry goods, a rise of 49·3; in ginghams, a fall of 9·2; in illuminating gas, a fall of 21·2. Between the years 1871 to 1881 there was a fall in eight industries in the United States of 22·4 per cent. In six industries, from 1881 to 1891, there was an average rise of 10 per cent, which still left them 12 per cent below what they were in 1871. In three industries, ale, beer and porter, there was a rise of 56·6; in carriage and wagon makers, there was a rise of 22·5; and in groceries, a rise of 47 per cent. Now, I have another statement here with respect to labour in the United States, showing that in that highly protective country wages of labourers have greatly shrunk. From 1840 to 1866 wages rose steadily, but in 1862 the Morrill tariff was imposed, and from that time wages fell steadily. I have here a work entitled "Results of Statistical Investigations from 1866 to 1892, with extensive inquiries concerning wages from 1840 to 1865." This shows that wages with board fell in certain district from $1.74 in 1886 to $1.02 in 1892. Wages without board fell from $2.20 in 1886, to $1.30 in 1892. Wages with board in another locality fell from $17.45 per month in 1886, to $12.54 in 1892. Wages per month by the year or season, fell from $22.87 in 1866, to $18.60 in 1892. So that there has been a steady reduction in wages in the United States from the time they adopted protection down to the present. This is a statement that has just come into the library within the last two days. Now, here is a statement respecting prices in various European countries, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, Russia, France, England and Belgium. I will merely summarize the statement by saying that wages are over 20 per cent higher in England than in any of those protected countries, in all but two or three occupations. In Russia engineers are paid a little higher than in England, and the reason is that the engineers in Russia are mostly Englishmen. Also, glass blowers in Belgium, and female cotton spinners in Germany receive a little higher wages than in England. I have here a statement of a gentleman who travelled all over the continent of Europe, and paid strict attention to the wages given in each country, and at the close of his journey he wrote this book, and gave statements with respect to the wages that I have just quoted. At the end he says:

> Let the protectionist read these tables and say why, if protection protects, if tariffs make high wages, the protected states of Europe are in so impoverished a condition. If free trade causes stagnation and low wages, why is England so far ahead of her protected European competitors? so far ahead of her own condition forty years ago, before she had the sense to adopt a free trade policy? Until these questions are answered, the thoughtful student cannot but ask himself, "Does protection protect?"

Here is another statement I want to give you. The manufacturers of Canada claim to produce $475,475,705 worth of goods, of which only $7,692,755 worth are exported from the country, which leaves $467,776,295 worth of goods to be consumed in Canada upon which no duty is paid. Now, the statement has been made that we pay 30 per cent more upon $265,000,000 of these goods than we would pay if the National Policy did not exist. If we take the $467,766,295 and reckon a duty of 17 per cent upon that sum, it would amount to over $79,000,000 that come out of the pockets of the people and go into the pockets of the manufacturers, because we must admit that the whole amount that the people pay extra does not go into the pockets of the manufacturers. The manufacturers sell to the wholesale merchant, and the wholesale merchant puts his profit upon the cost, and the retailer puts his profits on what he pays. Now, reckoning the population of Canada at five million people, 17 per cent on $467,766,000 gives to each individual in Canada a duty of $16 per head, or $80 per family, as taxes that come out of the pock-

ets of the people. Of the taxes that come out of the pockets of the people not one cent enters the treasury. Then of customs duty, we pay $4.22 per head, or $21.10 per family. Then in excise we pay $1.69 per head, or $8.45 per family of five persons. So that in taxes under this blessed National Policy, each family in Canada pays $129.55. Let me say that these duties fall more heavily upon the agricultural portion of the community than upon any other class, for this reason, that they have got to pay their share of all other duties, and they have got to pay the duty on agricultural implements, besides. Now, we have been frequently told that this tariff is a farmers' tariff; we have been told of the great benefits that this Government have conferred upon the farmers. But let me repeat what I have already repeated, I suppose, half a dozen times in this House, that during the Mackenzie regime there was a clause in the tariff providing that agricultural implements could come into the country free of duty when imported by agricultural societies for the encouragement of agriculture; so that any farmer who paid duties upon implements during the Mackenzie regime, did so through his own fault, and because he did not take advantage of that provision in the tariff. I know whereof I speak, when I say that the farmers of Canada are worse off to-day than they were then. They have only $357 per head worth of farm produce, but out of that they have got to take their seed and to feed their teams. But it is impossible to place the products of animals on the market and, at the same time, feed animals on the farm. There is, moreover, to be paid by the farmer, taxes and statute labour, and other expenses to keep up his farm, and the farmer has only $300 a year on which to do this. Let him hire a man and give him $150 a year, and the farmer has only $150 left to cover his own labour and provide food and clothing for his family. He is, therefore, worse off than workingmen are to-day, in a great many instances. I hope the time is at hand when the Opposition will have an opportunity of doing what hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly asking us to do, to show them the policy we will adopt, and I believe the Opposition, on attaining power, will be able to frame a policy that will reduce the annual expenditure to a much smaller amount that at the present day—when a new Government is fairly organized—and that the country will no longer hear of charges with respect to Curran bridges, Tay canals, and a great many other improvements that have robbed the people of this country of large sums of money.

Mr. COCKBURN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fraser.)

NORTH-WEST RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Minister of Militia is aware that his predecessor in office promised more than a year ago to lend the Rifle Associations of the North-west some of the discarded rifles in store, not in use and not to be put in use by the militia or the North-west Mounted Police? Whether the Minister will redeem this promise of his predecessor?

Mr. DICKEY. There is no record of any such promise in the department, and the Government has no knowledge of it. The subject-matter of the question is now receiving the attention of the Government.

NOVA SCOTIA SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY—CONTRACT.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. Has any contract relating to the construction of a railroad along the south shore of Nova Scotia been entered into between the Government or the Railway Department and the South Shore Railroad Company? 2. If so, when was the said contract entered into and by whom is the same signed?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Yes, a contract was entered into. 2. Contract was entered into on the 28th February, 1895, and it is signed by: Tunis W. Bergin, president, South Shore Railway Company; Frederick B. Bard, secretary, South Shore Railway Company; John Haggart, Minister of Railways and Canals; John H. Balderson, secretary, Department of Railways and Canals.

SUPERANNUATION OF MR. HATCH.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Has the superannuation of Walter Hatch, of the Interior Department, been recommended? If so, from what date? Why was Mr. Hatch re-

commended for superannuation? What is his age? How long has he been in the public service? How long has he contributed to the superannuation fund, and the gross amount paid in by him? What is the amount of annuity granted, and the number of years added to time of service, if any?

Mr. DALY. 1. The superannuation of Mr. Walter Hatch has been recommended, to take effect from the 1st July next. 2. His superannuation has been recommended because, for the purpose of promoting efficiency and economy in the public service, the clerkship held by him will be abolished from and after the 30th of June next. 3. He is thirty-eight years old. 4. At the present date he has been 21 years, 9 months and 5 days in the public service. 5. He has contributed on his monthly salary for 21 years and 10 months. The gross amount contributed is $251.65. 6. The amount of the gratuity to be granted has not been fixed yet. It is not proposed to add any years to his service for the purpose of calculating that amount.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, 1894-95.

Mr. MARTIN asked. What railway subsidies were paid between the 30th June, 1894, and 3rd May, 1895, giving name of railway companies to whom paid, and the amount paid to each company?

Mr. HAGGART. The following railway companies have received the undermentioned subsidies. The statement showing amount of subsidy paid to railway companies from 30th June, 1894, to 13th May, 1895, is as follows:—

Name of Railway.	Amount.
	$ cts.
Ottawa, Arnprior & Parry Sound Ry. Co.	248,280 00
Pontiac & Pacific Junction Ry. Co.	18,750 00
Grand Trunk Railway, Owen Sound Branch	39,744 00
Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.	233,198 95
Parry Sound Colonization Ry. Co.	68,780 00
Philipsburg Junction Ry. and Quarry Co.	2,912 00
Railway Co., Revelstoke to Arrow	28,000 00
Shuswap & Okanagan Ry. Co.	300 00
United Counties Ry. Co.	41,075 00
Great Northern Ry. Co.	32,000 00
Canada Eastern Ry. Co.	30,400 00
Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Ry. Co.	32,000 00
Nakusp & Slocan Ry. Co.	117,760 00
Quebec, Montmorency & Charlevoix Ry. Co.	30,400 00
Lotbinière & Megantic Ry. Co.	38,400 00
Dominion Coal Co.	32,000 00
Drummond County Ry. Co.	92,096 00
Montfort Colonization Ry. Co.	35,200 00
Total	1,122,295 95

DYNAMITE FACTORY—LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) asked. 1. Whether the Government is aware that a dynamite factory has been erected and operated on one of the Lachine Canal banks or dams, within a few feet of the channel of navigation used by hundreds of people every day, and a few acres of the town of Lachine? 2. Was the construction and operation of said factory authorized by the Government? 3. Is the operation of said factory and the storage of said dynamite at the said spot dangerous to the people navigating through said canal in particular and the said population of the town of Lachine? 4. Does the Government consider itself responsible for any damage which might be caused by any explosion of said dynamite? If not, who will be so responsible? 5. Has any protests been sent against the manufacture and storage of said dynamite? If so, by whom?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The Government is aware that dynamite is stored on the pier entrance to Lachine Canal, about 800 feet from the waterworks of the town of Lachine, and about 1,200 feet from any other buildings. 2. Not aware of any factory being erected or in operation. 3. The matter was referred to the superintending engineer, who reports that in his opinion the spot on which the dynamite is stored is not dangerous to either property or life. 4. The Government does not consider itself responsible for any damage which might be caused by explosion of said dynamite. If any trouble would result, it is probable it would be against the contractor who is storing the dynamite. 5. A protest has been sent from the town council of Lachine against the storage of the said dynamite.

APPOINTMENT OF REVISING OFFICERS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked. Under what authority does the Government acquire the right of appointing two revising officers for the same electoral district?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government are entirely guided by the law as laid down in 54-55 Victoria, chap. 18, An Act further to amend "The Electoral Franchise Act," which says:

4. Subsection four of section eleven of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"A revising officer may be appointed for and be required to discharge the said duties in respect of more than one electoral district, and may be appointed for a portion of any electoral district."

And by 57-58 Victoria, chap. 12, An Act further to amend "The Electoral Franchise Act," which reads:

5. The Governor in Council may at any time after the passing of this Act appoint a revising officer for any electoral district for the constitution of which the Redistribution Act provides, or the limits of which are defined by that Act, or for any portion of any such electoral district, or for any such electoral district or portion of an electoral district, and any other electoral district or portion of an electoral district, which he thinks fit to attach thereto ; and upon such appointment, the jurisdiction of any revising officer heretofore appointed shall cease and determine and his commission shall be superseded so far as such jurisdiction and commission extend to any territory included in the jurisdiction of the new appointee.

MAPS OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the Government, or any member of the Government, given directions or made provisions for the preparation of maps showing the boundaries of electoral divisions of the Dominion or any province thereof, or are maps of electoral divisions for the Dominion or any province of the Dominion being prepared under Government supervision, or with the knowledge of the Government, or any of its members ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In response to the hon. gentleman's question, I would say yes, with the knowledge and by the direction of the Government the Queen's Printer has had in charge the preparation of maps of the various electoral districts of Canada. I am sure that the fact that the Queen's Printer, whose reputation for skill and care is so great, is in charge of this work, is a guarantee that it will be well done, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will recognize the utility of the work itself. These maps have been prepared from the postal maps as a basis. The cost of the work will therefore be very light. The plan of distribution is not yet arranged, but I think I am authorized to say that a volume such as the one I hold in my hand, containing maps of all the electoral districts and a number of copies of the map of his electoral district in sheet form, will be presented to each member of the House with the collected sets. Libraries and such like will be supplied also. The work is very nearly finished, and I hope to have it ready for distribution during the present session.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I may be permitted to say so, I would suggest that when that work is published, it might be desirable not to have it distributed, because so far as my district is concerned——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Entirely out of order.

FISHING GUARDIANS ON THE MIRAMICHI.

Mr. COLTER asked, 1. What are the names of the fishing guardians employed by the Dominion Government on the south-west Miramichi, from the Tide head to the Forks during the seasons of 1893 and 1894 ? 2. What was the amount of money paid each ? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to place any guardians from the Forks up the North Branch ? 4. What instructions were given to such guardians ? 5. Is there any unleased waters between Burnt Hill and the Forks ? If so, how much ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I beg to reply as follows :—1. The following guardians were employed on the south-west Miramichi River during 1893 and 1894, at the remuneration set opposite their respective names. The particular locality in which their supervision is from time to time—according to circumstances—required, is arranged by the district inspector and the local fishery overseer, who are responsible for the proper placing of the men :—1893—S. Standish, $100.80 ; Wm. Palmer, $120 ; Alex. McDonald, $150 ; T. Weaver, $183.60 ; Wm. Russell, $183.60 ; R. Hurley, $183.60 ; Jas. Astle, $188.40 ; N. O'Brien, $188.40 ; J. L. A. Bonnell, $159.60. 1894—R. O'Brien, $27.60 ; Wm. Palmer, $135.60 ; S. Standish, $136.80 ; Alex. McDonald, $181.65 ; H. Scott, $91.20 ; Thos. Weaver, $34.80 ; N. O'Brien, $110.40 ; Jas. Astle, $110.40 ; M. Bowes, $110.40 ; S. Holmes, $74.40 ; J. L. O'Donnell, $110.40 ; F. McCormack, $75.60 ; B. H. Jardene, $30. 2. Answered above. 3. Yes ; the Government at present employs guardians there. 4. Their instructions are given them by the inspector of fisheries for the district, and in addition to the general instructions, cover such special directions, from time to time, as the local conditions and requirements demand for the proper protection of the fisheries. The general instructions are : To enforce the fishery laws and regulations ; to report the names of all persons found violating them, and to remove and deliver to the fishery overseer for the district, all appliances being used illegally. 5. The Department of Marine and Fisheries is not in possession of the specific information asked for ; any leases granted for non-tidal waters in this river, are issued by the Provincial Government.

THE CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What are the receipts and expenditures chargeable to Consolidated Fund, from the 1st to the 10th of May, in 1894 and 1895 ?

Mr. FOSTER. The receipts for 1894 and 1895 are respectively $31,098,545 and $28,549,968, and the expenditures respectively $26,926,648 and $27,447,636.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the leader of the House whether, in view of the great public interest taken in the pro-

posal contained in the Government's Order in Council of March last to convert into a cash payment of $2,500,000 the subsidies provided by Parliament for the Winnipeg and Saskatchewan Railway, popularly known as the Hudson Bay Railway, the Government is prepared, since it has had a consultation with its followers, I understand, this morning, to announce to the House its policy with respect to that order, and whether the Government will ask the House to carry it out or withdraw it?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is not prepared to put this matter before the House at this moment.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of the Interior, for the calendar year 1894.—(Mr. Daly.)

THE SEAL FISHERIES.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government whether they have received any intimation as to whether the arrangement for the sealing up of sealing arms and implements, agreed to between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States for 1894, will be renewed for 1895?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government has just received a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, announcing that "Her Majesty's Government have decided not to renew agreement signed with the United States Government, as to sealing up of arms and implements of sealing vessels."

COMMISSION ON THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FLINT. Before the Orders are called, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House what probability there is of our having the printed report of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic placed in our hands shortly. Of course, it is impossible to go on with the discussion that will arise on a resolution of which I have given notice, unless that report is first in our hands.

Mr. FOSTER. The report was laid on the Table, and then, of course, became the property of the House, and was sent to the Printing Committee. It was sent to the Printing Committee in order, of course. The Printing Committee, I believe, has not had its meeting, the Senate division not being present, but I asked the chairman of the House Committee yesterday to send the report to the printer, in order that it might be gone on with in the meantime.

SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. McMULLEN. When does the Minister of Finance expect the return he kindly promised to furnish with regard to superannuation?

Mr. FOSTER. The return is in progress, and will be brought down as soon as possible. I do not think there will be much delay.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. COCKBURN. The truth of the apothegm that "hope springs eternal in the human breast," was never more fully verified than in the extraordinary action taken by hon. gentlemen opposite when they adopted and presented to us for adoption, this new and strange policy of free trade as it is practised in England. I would suggest to these hon. gentlemen the propriety of remembering that it is well to be off with the old love before they are on with the new. Not a few gentlemen who have neglected that precaution have found themselves in a suit for damages heavily mulcted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you speak from experience?

Mr. COCKBURN. Before I am done with some of the figures of the hon. gentleman, I may, perhaps, have enlarged materially his experience. I confess that I did not expect such a display of hope from hon. gentlemen opposite so early in the session. I did think that after the untimely demise of those poor, miserable triplets, commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, and continental union, those gentlemen would have come here showing some signs of the bereavement they had sustained. I did expect that, if not draped in the emblems of woe, to which, as we all know, they are well accustomed, they would have come here somewhat subdued—not showing such callous indifference to the loss of their only offspring, but showing some grief for those poor little departed ones. But I must admit I find some excuse for them when I reflect that when they looked at commercial union, they must have seen it was but a miserable, distorted abortion, which never could survive its birth beyond a week or two. And when the poor little thing was dead and buried, they resurrected and rebaptized it under the name of "continental union," but so feeble was the constitution of the little infant, that the first breath of public opinion blotted out its flickering existence. I must say, however, that I had higher hopes of unrestricted reciprocity. I felt that with it I had something to give and something to take; but when I am asked to

give away all that I have, and still carry out the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, I feel that by some chance or other I must have come into a house from which common sense must have fled. I was, at first blush, deeply attached, I may say, to unrestricted reciprocity, and looked for great things from it. Well do I recollect how the hon. and gallant knight from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he presented his little bantling to the House, hugged it to his arms and depicted to us the enormous advantages that would accrue from our adopting it into the family. Why, the whole wealth of the coral strands of India or all the El Dorados were nothing to what the hon. gentleman offered to this House if we would but accept it. Talk of him as a pessimist, no man in this House has been a greater optimist. He told us the other evening that he was unjustly charged with this quality; he told us that during the short regime in which he held the reins of government, so far as financial matters are concerned, he was accused by his friends of being too sanguine. I may say that he has got over that defect, but well do I recollect, and still hug to my memory the great promises he made us when he ushered in this little babe to take the place of its two deceased little brothers. He told us that hailing, as he did, from Ontario, he considered it his duty carefully to look into this matter, and he stated, not as a matter of opinion on which there could be doubt, but as a matter of certainty, that the moment we accepted this unrestricted babe, that moment every acre —rather every cultivated acre, for I wish to be exact—in the whole of Ontario would increase ten dollars in value. He condescended to inform us at the same time that Ontario had of such land, 22,000,000 acres. Simple man that I was, I took my pen, and I multiplied my 22,000,000 acres by ten, and I found that I had there safe in hand a no smaller sum than $220,000,000. Why, when our gallant friend touches figures, he never does it by halves. Tens of millions and thousands of millions are much the same to him. Our hon. friends opposite, having been so long denied the privilege of rolling the money of the public under their hands, seem to gloat over the enormity of the figures. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. Macdonald) last night, rolled out 200, 400, 500 millions, just as if they were his most familiar friends on earth. I do not grudge them that joy; it is all they are ever going to get. The last chance of redemption they have lost in bringing forward the most absurd policy ever offered for the consideration of the Canadian people. But, not content with offering us $220,000,000, the hon. gentleman said. You have got 1,250,000, horses in Ontario, and I can assure you that the moment you pass this treaty of unrestricted reciprocity, that moment every horse will be worth $30 more. God be thanked, I said, for this new blessing. I added these $37,500,000 to my $220,000,000, and I had $257,500,000, with which I intended to pay off the national debt in a handsome way, and put $7,000,000 in my pocket. As I lay awake sometimes, when I first came to this House, terrorized by the awful pictures of gloom which those gentlemen depicted to us—as I lay awake, unable to indulge in the sleep necessary to us all, visions of this El Dorado floated through my mind, and I could see this $257,000,000 coming in in a long line of cart-loads. I hugged to myself the prospect. It was consoling to me to think that the province from which I hail, the province of which I am so proud, was not only able to pay the national debt; but have $7,000,000 over, but that was not, by any means, all the profit and blessing which was to be brought us by this same wonderful babe of his old age. There are as many horses and acres in Quebec as in Ontario, so that we must add another $257,000,000, making over $500,000,000 which the hon. gentleman could put his hand on at a moments notice. And if he should go away down to the shreds and patches, in our Maritime Provinces he would find there enough to roll up his $500,000,000 to $800,000,000 or $1,000,000, which he assures us is truly the collective present indebtedness of this country. One thousand millions, he said, is the debt owed by this country. And what do we pay for the use of that amount? All that we pay is $25,000,000, or 2½ per cent. Is there any country that can show such a standing as that? We can turn to the dear old mother land and say: Here is the debt that is such a trouble to you; we will take it over at 2½ per cent. We can turn to our cousins on the other side of the line, with their broken banks and bankrupt railways, and say to them: We will save you, we will give you unrestricted reciprocity, and we will pay off your debt. When any man in this House gets up and tells us that one thousand millions is the total indebtedness of this country, and that the people who have loaned us this money are charging us only 2½ per cent on the money, a lower rate than that charged to any other power on earth, by that very statement the hon. gentleman tells us that we occupy the foremost financial position in this world. Now, of course, when we have come to the thousands of millions, what does it matter that he should tell us that during the last twelve years we are hundreds of millions worse off than we were before. Well, Sir, while we are hundreds of millions worse off than we were before, what do we find? We find that the worse off we get the more eagerly do people run after our I. O.U.'s; the worse off we get the lower is the rate charged to us on our debt. We find that in the very last loan we made, which loan was floated at 3⅛ per cent,

though we asked $12,000,000, there was a rush, and over $60,000,000 was offered. And this to a country that has grown hundreds of millions worse off within the last twelve years. Why, Sir, this nonsense, this trash —I must call it so—may be talked in the backwoods, it may be given to illiterate Patrons, if there are any. But to ask us here in this chamber to believe that we have debts of this character, and that in Europe we are able to borrow a thousand millions of dollars and only pay 2½ per cent interest for it, is sheer nonsense; the thing is a contradiction in itself. Not only are we told that, but we are told that there is an adverse balance of trade of $300,000,000. Oh, I like to roll these millions under my tongue; it makes me feel as if I had them. Now, this statement of the hon. gentleman is based upon the old Balance of Trade theory, which has come down to us from the time of the Mercantilists. I did think that a gentleman with the knowledge and experience of the gallant knight would not have so presumed upon the possible ignorance of the House as to re-vamp a theory which political economists have long ago abandoned. It is a popular theory arising from the supposed analogy between the individual income and the individual expenditure on one hand, and the national exports and imports on the other. It was assumed that when the exports exceeded the imports, the country was so much to the good, and that when the imports were more than the exports, the country had so much more to pay. In private life this rule suits fairly well, but when we begin to apply it to the transactions of nations it utterly fails, for an excess of exports does not necessarily indicate a favourable state of affairs. We may take the case of India, whose exports exceed its imports, but they are largely supplemented by the amounts sent abroad for the settlement of debts. Take a country like England. We know that the balance of trade, so far as the figures show, is against that country. And even in the case of Canada itself, from 1879 to 1893, we find the exports exceed the imports by some $250,000,000. We find that in Europe there is an annual excess of imports of $1,200,000,000. So, Mr. Speaker, you will see that the ground taken by my hon. friend is not a fair one. For instance, in England, in counting the large adverse balance of trade, so far as exports and imports are concerned, the important fact that England does not only the loaning but the carrying trade of the world is lost sight of, and so what we may call the "invisible export" of transportation does not appear. The error arises in this way: Imports into this country, for instance, are entered here at the value put upon them. But the same goods, when they left the country from which they started, were valued as exports at so much less, for the imports must carry the cost of transport and handling. Therefore, you will always find this disparity. Of course, the greatest objection to this theory is that it assumes that debits and credits are settled directly between debtor and creditor, whereas we know in the case of nations they are not so settled in the majority of cases, but one nation gives its bill, or pays its debts by setting off the debts due to it by other nations. So, I cannot accept the theory of the adverse balance of trade. If, however, our friends are anxious to take the exports as a test of the value of the high position held by Canada, I would cite the fact that between 1890 and 1894 Canada increased its exports by 22 per cent. But Great Britain, the United States, France, Australia and Germany showed decreases in their exports of 18, 15, 13, 10 and 5 per cent respectively. Now, Sir, our friend also has directed attention to the national debt. I admit that the debt is not a small debt, but at the same time I declare and firmly believe that we are as well able to deal with the national debt now as we were in the time of the Mackenzie Administration. I have some dislike to going back nearly a quarter of a century to deal with such matters, as I think it is better to consider, not what was done or what might have been done in Mr. Mackenzie's time, but what we are able to do at this day. Well, Sir, the gallant knight tells us that the interest in 1878 would have cost us $20,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He never said anything of the kind.

Mr. COCKBURN. It is from fifteen to twenty millions of dollars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Never said anything of the kind.

Mr. COCKBURN. I have here the words and I shall read them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will never find any statement of mine that the federal debt cost fifteen millions of dollars for interest.

Mr. COCKBURN. The interest on the amount of the net debt for 1878 would have cost $15,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that that referred to the federal debt?

Mr. COCKBURN. That was the subject under discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman suppose—is he so supremely ignorant as to suppose—that that referred to the federal debt?

Mr. COCKBURN. Well, suppose I adopt the hon. gentleman's statement it will not affect my argument, which is simply this:

He said at the time that we could have wiped out the debt of $15,000,000 by 15,000,000 bushels of wheat, that is to say, he was putting the wheat at $1 per bushel; and he said that would be the produce of one million acres. He said, in effect, if you were to undertake to pay the interest now, you would require two acres, or so, for every acre you would have taken before; or at any rate, he said, you would require 30,000,000 bushels of wheat now to pay the interest $15,000,000, that is to say, he took wheat at 50 cents per bushel. Now, when I turn up the papers of yesterday's date, I find that our best wheat sold at 90 cents in the city of Toronto, and I consider it most unfair that a representation of this kind should go abroad to the farmers. I know the object of it; of course, it is to make the farmers believe that they have got to pay two bushels of wheat for taxation whereas formerly they only paid one. But, Sir, I say that even if there is this difference of 10 or 12 per cent over what there was in 1874, we are more able to bear it than we were then. I say that wheat, owing to the improvement in the manufacture of agricultural implements and the lessened cost of running a farm, is more easily and cheaply raised now than it was twenty years ago; so that the farmer is able, with less labour and at less expense, to pay his proportion of the interest of the national debt than he was in 1874. Then, Sir, we are told that the $297,000,000 in the savings banks are not a sign of general prosperity. I will admit this much, that if the money that lies in the savings banks cannot be used in any other way, it is a proof, at the time, if you will, of temporary stagnation. But to say that it is a sign of poverty, or that it is not a good sign, to deny that it does in a manner embody the saved labour of past generations, is, I think, a mistake. Perhaps it may be that the savings in those banks now are unduly large, owing to the fact that the interest paid by the Government on savings bank deposits is larger, I think, than it should be. We are now paying 3½ per cent in the savings banks, while the banks of the country, I think, are paying not more than 3, and some less than 3 per cent. The addition of one-half of one per cent naturally attract a large amount of deposits to the savings banks, which, I think, could be more properly put into the ordinary banking of the country. But, Sir, the real point we have to deal with is the new policy that has been evolved by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the question of free trade vs. protection. Now, I read here the definition of what those gentlemen mean by free trade; it is from their own accredited organ. They say:

> Free trade, as it is practiced under the British system, and the British system is this, that duties are to be levied on such articles as cannot be made within the country; and secondly, if by any chance duties are placed on articles that cannot be manufactured in the country, an inland revenue tax is placed upon them so as to absolutely destroy the protective element in these duties.

Now, this is the policy hon. gentlemen opposite wish to adopt; and that there may be no doubt about it, I shall read you the declaration made by the leader of the Opposition himself. He says, in his speech at Winnipeg:

> We shall not give in one whit until we succeed in carrying into effect the British system of tariff.

At St. Thomas he made another declaration:

> We shall not leave a trace of protection; every vestige of protection shall be removed from the soil of Canada.

Now, Sir, I do not say that free trade by itself is bad, but I say that it must depend upon the peculiar circumstances of the country into which it is proposed to transplant it. Free trade, considering the position that England occupied when she adopted it, is one thing; free trade transplanted into Canada at this hour, would be a very different thing. We must not forget that England for 400 years was paving the way to a policy which would enable her to throw down all the barriers of protection. My hon. friend was quite correct the other evening in stating that so far back as the time of Edward IV., in 1643, measures were brought into Parliament with a view of securing the home market. They were rough, rude measures, if you like, but at any rate they showed the early yearnings of the British public for protection to native industries. You will find under Queen Elizabeth the same policy being carried out; and when the Huguenots and the Flemish were driven from France by religious persecution, we find them welcomed in England, and everything was done to give strength and solidity to the various industries. Well, Sir, we must recollect that when England adopted this policy of free trade some 50 years ago, she had full command of the whole commerce of the world, you may say. The protection that she had been giving to her merchants and manufacturers had then become of such little account to them, that Lord Brougham himself presented a petition from those merchants praying that it be swept away; they wanted none of it. Things had come to that point that they were able to command the markets of the world without any protection whatever. All they wanted, as my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) told you, was that bread should be made cheaper, and that the workingman should be able to have his corn free. Hence there was the Anti-Corn Law League, and let us remember that the Anti-Corn Law League was led by Cobden and Bright, themselves manufacturers. There was not

a large body of manufacturers, as we have in this country with some $500,000,000 invested in their machinery and their commerce, crying out against free trade. Men of the very class who in this country are opposed to the introduction of free trade, were the men who, in England, after four centuries of the enjoyment of protection found themselves in a position to demand the perfect freedom of trade. I was indeed astonished to learn from the hon. gentleman who spoke last, that wages in Canada were even lower than wages in Scotland or England. All I can say is that my experience does not corroborate his. While he may ask his friends in Scotland to console themselves with the reflection that they have porridge and milk, while the artisan here has roast beef and pudding, I am afraid that the consolation his friends will draw from his remarks, will be but small. Sir, the most eminent authority on political economy, himself a Liberal, John Stuart Mill, is quoted as saying :

> In the case of a young nation, protective duties were defensible on principles of political economy, when they were imposed "in hopes of naturalizing a foreign industry in itself perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country."

Again, he says :

> The whole question of the applicability in a particular nation of free trade or protection, must be studied out in accordance with the facts of the case.

Well, Sir, what I wish to impress on the House is the utter diversity that exists between the condition of Canada at this hour and the condition of Great Britain when fifty years ago they threw down the barriers and adopted free trade. The conditions are entirely different. We might almost have come to that conclusion from this fact : The last fifty years, during the reign of Queen Victoria, have been years in which there has been extraordinary development in every direction, politics, literature, science and art, and while every matter pertaining to the welfare of the people has been discussed, every nation on the continent of Europe have adopted a policy of protection to its own industries. I call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to show why, in view of all that has been done by such nations as France, Germany, Italy and others, we should abandon the experience which they have acquired and take the single experience of the motherland, especially when we know that the motherland adopted that system after a long preparation which we have not made. I feel assured, Sir, that the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have enunciated, one utterly at variance with unrestricted reciprocity, is one which will be condemned at the polls.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman know about the length of time that will be required to enable us to introduce free trade here ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Five hundred years.

Mr. COCKBURN. I have no doubt that owing to the changes that have taken place, we are able to go ahead faster than our English ancestors. I have already told the hon. gentleman that I regard him as the Rip Van Winkle of the maritime provinces, and I can assure him that the Dominion does not intend to go to sleep for the next four hundred years ; but neither in his time nor in my time, nor in the time of our children, is it likely we will be able to build up such a system of protection in Canada as to so fortify the position of Canadian manufacturers that we will be able safely to follow the example set by England when it adopted the ideas of Cobden and Bright, after it had enjoyed protection for four hundred years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What discount will you allow us off the four hundred years ?

Mr. COCKBURN. As the hon. gentleman is asking me questions, I desire to ask him this question : Now that hon. gentlemen opposite have abandoned the policy of unrestricted reciprocity and adopted that of free trade, in the name of common sense will they tell me what we have to offer to the 60,000,000 of people in the adjoining republic to induce them to come and throw in their lot with us ? We have given away everything we had, there is nothing left, hon. gentlemen opposite are still talking about reciprocity, but we have nothing with which we can reciprocate. We have thrown everything away and we are at their mercy ; and the people of Canada are not so stupid as for one moment to place themselves in the position of being free traders and at the same time try to secure by unrestricted reciprocity the market of the adjacent republic which is the most heavily burdened, most heavily taxed and most protected nation in the whole world.

Mr. DEVLIN. I rise for the purpose of explaining in as few words as possible the vote which I propose recording in favour of the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have much pleasure in following the hon. member for Toronto, Mr. Cockburn, the distinguished representive, as he calls himself, of St. John's ward. The hon. gentleman has made light of the position occupied in the Liberal ranks by the hon. member for South Oxford. I think if the hon. member would consider his own position in his party, he would have material for serious reflection. He is the gentleman who two years ago was spoken of in connection with the high position of Premier of Canada.

Mr. FERGUSON. Nobody ever dreamed that of you.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will speak of my position in our party later on, when it is brought up. I am quite satisfied with it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why do you kick ?

Mr. DEVLIN. What does the hon. gentleman say ?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no need for an apology.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not offering an apology. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say, let him speak out like a man. I am defending the hon. member who is the object of continuous assault by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) and the whole Conservative party, not only in this House, but in the country—I am defending at this moment the hon. member for South Oxford, who is the first authority on financial matters in this country, and since the hon. gentleman has been pleased to attack his character, I say that his character is as irreproachable as that of any hon. member on the other side of the House, and to-day it is as dear to the Reform party of Canada as that of any member in this House. The hon. member for Toronto Centre made an attack upon that hon. gentleman. I would ask the hon. member for Toronto Centre if he occupies a position of sufficient independence to be able to attack any hon. member on this side of the House ? Is he not the gentleman who but two short years ago was content to travel to Chicago, and to accept $4,000 or $5,000 from the treasury of this country ?

Mr. COCKBURN. That is what I would call adding insult to injury. I went to Chicago, spent five and a half months there, and received not one iota of salary. I state now, what I have not stated before, that I spent over $5,000 of my own money, and that the whole expenses of that commission, the expenses of both Mr. Tassé and myself, were less than the personal expenses of the commission from Ontario alone. I am glad the subject has been brought up, Sir, and I shall only be too glad to appear to-morrow or any day before the Committee of Public Accounts. I think I will show that——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, you will have a chance, don't forget.

Mr. COCKBURN. I shall avail of the opportunity with pleasure.

Mr. DEVLIN. If anybody has an apology to offer the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), it should be the Auditor General of the Dominion of Canada, because I find that in his annual report, the sum of $4,425 was paid to Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, M.P., as advances on account of expenses. I find elsewhere that the same Mr. Cockburn has sent a statement of the whole amount of his expenses and that they amounted to $4,425.

Mr. COCKBURN. I don't deny for one moment that they amounted to that. You have a voucher there for every dollar. I did not act as was done by the Commissioner for Ontario, who told the Assembly that he kept no account, that he never kept an account.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is evident that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), is a little bit touchy, Mr. Speaker. I took up only one little item and see the temper he gets into.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But wait till we get at his gas bill.

Mr. DEVLIN. Now, Sir, the hon. member (Mr. Cockburn) found fault with hon. members on this side because they propose to support the amendment which has been brought before the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright.) There are three good reasons why I support that amendment. First, because I look upon the financial policy of the Government as worthy of condemnation : second, because I think the trade policy of the Government an unsound policy for this country ; and third, because I consider that the administrative policy of the Government cannot receive the support or the defence of any hon. member in this House. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) spoke at considerable length in regard to the debt of Canada, and, Sir, he fell into a fit of ecstacy before the proportions of that debt. Does he really know what the debt of Canada is to-day ? He well knows, as he told us, that the population of Canada is yet on this side of 5,000,000, and the gross debt of Canada to-day is, according to the last number of the Canadian official "Gazette," $317,166,393. And, Sir, because we are able to borrow money at a rate of interest that is not too heavy, he takes great glory on account of that. Is it because of the gentlemen who are in power that we are able to borrow this money, or is it because of the people who live within this Dominion and who are obliged to pay the money ? Is Canada the only country in the world able to borrow money at a low rate of interest, or is it not a well-known fact that there are many other countries able to borrow money at terms just as low as those at which we borrow money ? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) say, that we of all people in the world are able to borrow money at the lowest possible rate ? I do not think, Sir, and I know as a matter of fact that recent events will not bear out such a statement.

Mr. COCKBURN. I never said so.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman took great glory from that fact. Let the hon. gentleman keep his seat. He will have some of his friends afterwards to answer me, and I will stand all the answering that

they will give. I am putting some questions that I know are troublesome for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) and so he cannot remain cool two minutes. He condemned the Mackenzie regime with much energy of language, but he could have considered what the debt was when Mr. Mackenzie came into power, and when he went out of power, and what the debt is to-day. I have figures here, Sir, which will show that in 1878, the gross debt was $174,000,000, whereas the debt to-day is over $317,000,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) knows how that increase has been brought about. He knows what has constituted this large increase of debt. It is not only because of the moneys which have been voted for railway subsidies, but it is also because of the money which have been lavished upon works that should never have been undertaken, upon works which have been scandalous in the manner in which they have been executed. I venture to say that if you took note of the small items which make up the reckless expenditure of the Dominion, you will find that it is in great part because of such items as have been voted, even to the hon. gentleman himself, to go and squander in the city of Chicago. If he dwells upon the table which I have just pointed out he will find matters for serious study. He will find that in the years 1878 the total taxes from the source of excise and customs amounted to $18,476,000 ; where as in the year 1894, under the Conservative system and while these godfathers of the National Policy are in power, it amounts to nearly $28,000,000. Mr. Speaker, I bring these figures out for a purpose. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) will find that the total revenue taken from the people of Canada in 1878 amounted to about $22,000,000 ; whereas in the blessed year of 1894, it amounted to $36,000,000 and over. He will find that the expenditure in 1878 did not exceed the sum of $23,000,000, whereas in 1894, it has exceeded the sum of $37,000,000. He will find that in the year 1878 we paid a sum of $7,773,000 for interest, whereas to-day we pay more that $10,000,000. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) further in his remarks boasted that the party with which he is allied never changed their policy, but that the Liberal party invariably change their policy. Is is not a fact that the leader—the hon. gentleman whom it was supposed the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) was to succeed as Premier—is it not a fact, that the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald went to the country at the last election with the cry of reciprocity ? Is it not a fact that the policy was announced by members of the Conservative party on every platform ? Is it not even possible, and probable, that the hon. gentleman's own eloquent voice was oft heard in the city of Toronto speaking of the benefits that might flow from reciprocity ?

Mr. COATSWORTH. It was not your baby ?

Mr. DEVLIN. I see the baby member from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) has something to say. He wants to keep company with his brother member.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Not with your policy, though.

Mr. DEVLIN. To come back to my point, Mr. Speaker, reciprocity has been severely dropped by the Conservative party. It is true that they had to show some pretext of sincerity in regard to this advocacy which they had made of reciprocity, and after the election they did go to Washington. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) in this House well and truly depicted the trip to Washington and back, and especially the negotiations which occurred there ; when he said : They were shown in and shown out ; and we have never heard any more of reciprocity from them since that time. Is it not true that they insisted during years that the National Policy as introduced by them was the only policy that should prevail in this country, that it was a sacred policy which should not be touched, and that we were traitors to our country, because we had the audacity to denounce that policy ? Yet, shortly afterwards, we found the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue despatched from one end of the country to the other to see wherein that tariff was not perfect, to see what amendments might be made in it, what little bits of patching might be done in it ; and they came back here with what they were pleased to term, last session, the reduced or reformed tariff ; yet they say they have not changed their policy. Have we not heard the Finance Minister tell this House of his wonderful feats of remitting to the people millions of dollars of taxes, boasting that he was making them a present of those millions, which he had not yet taken from them, but which, he said, he could take from them ? And the very next session we found him putting those millions on again. Shall I be told that this is not a change in policy ? The Conservative party, in 1878, when the late Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was in power, moved in this House a motion condemning the expenditure of that time as excessive, and alleging that $22,000,000 a year was sufficient to provide for all the needs of the public service. Who have changed their policy ? I ask. Has it not been hon. gentlemen opposite, who got into power by denouncing an expenditure of $22,000,000, and year by year, as soon as they had attained power, exceeded that expenditure, multiplied employees, and became extravagant in every possible shape

and form? Sir, I will quote the resolution which was moved in this House in the year 1877, by the Conservative leaders:

That this House is of opinion that the deficiency in revenue should be met by a diminution of expenditure, aided by such a readjustment of the tariff as would benefit the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of the Dominion.

They demanded, therefore, that the expenditure should be diminished. Is it not fair to put the question, in what year have hon. gentlemen opposite diminished the expenditure of this country? Is the expenditure to-day, or has it been at any time since 1878, less than it was in the days of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie? They are condemned by their own motion. I have here a table which has been carefully prepared, and which I believe to be perfectly correct, showing the amounts obtained by taxation during the twenty years from 1874 to 1893, inclusive, in periods of five years:

TAXATION UNDER LIBERAL GOVERNMENT.

1873 to 1878.....	$ 94,948,000
Average per year.....	18,900,000

TAXATION UNDER CONSERVATIVE GOVT.

1879 to 1883.....	$117,717,000
Average per year.....	23,543,000
1884 to 1888.....	132,960,000
Average per year.....	26,500,000
1889 to 1893.....	150,282,000
Average per year.....	30,000,000

Thus, in the first five years of Conservative government, the taxes increased over the Mackenzie average by $4,500,000 a year; in the second period, by $7,600,000; and in the third period, by $11,067,000 a year; and this, in face of the motion moved by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, to capture public favour, and to drive honest Alexander Mackenzie from power. Sir, I followed the hon. gentleman's description of unrestricted reciprocity, continental union, and all the other vain thoughts which he put before this House, and I venture to say that there has been no change in the policy of the Liberal party.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, which is it now?

Mr. DEVLIN. I will give it as it is now, and as it always has been, since 1878. But there has been a change in the hon. gentleman's policy. He was one of the first who, two years ago, denounced many faults which he found in the protective policy of the Government; but suddenly a change came over him. He shakes his head. He admits, then, that no change came over him, so that he was not serious when he complained.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, give us your policy.

Mr. DEVLIN. Like many others, he insinuates that we have no policy, and never had any. That is one of the charges made against the Liberal party. The second charge is that our policy means nothing. The third charge is that we are always changing our policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. Hon. gentlemen say: "Hear, hear." How can we change a policy if we have none? We all remember, Sir, under what circumstances the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was removed from power. It was because he refused to change his policy—because he refused to adopt the principle of protection. It was because he was in favour of a tariff that would bring a revenue sufficient for the needs of the public service. No hon. member will deny that, and if any hon. member will read the policy which has been laid down by the Liberal party of this country, he will find that it is the same as it was in 1878.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Where can we find it?

Mr. DEVLIN. I will give it to the hon. gentleman if he will give me his kind attention for one moment. It will be found in a resolution that was adopted by the great Liberal convention held in this city two years ago; it will be found in the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) two or three days ago; it will be found in every amendment that has been moved by that hon. gentleman in opposition to the National Policy of the Government. Our policy means this: Freedom, as far as possible, for the people of Canada against those who try to tyrannize over the people for their special benefit, and for the benefit of the few masters who send them here. The policy of the Liberal party will be found in these words:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

Mr. COATSWORTH. But how about free trade as they have it in England?

Mr. DEVLIN. I will come to that point in a moment.

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolists, trusts and combinations.

Defended by the junior member for Toronto.

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;
It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;
It has checked immigration;

It has checked immigration. Will the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. He will deny anything.

It has caused great loss of population ;
It has impeded commerce ;
It has discriminated against Great Britain ;
In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government ;

I would ask the hon. gentleman to take these words into his serious consideration :

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the old world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

We do believe it, and we were ready to test the feeling of the country on that policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite themselves would have tested that feeling were they not afraid of the feeling of the country on this very point.

The issue between the two political parties is now clearly defined. The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy——

Mr. COATSWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. DEVLIN. They do ; they sent a Controller all over the country to find out what was wrong with the fiscal policy.

—and professed their willingness to make some changes.

They did until the monopolists and combinesters came here last session and filled up our hotels and choked the Government off in their professed efforts to make reductions.

The issue between the two political parties on the question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes ; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and most unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Is there any difference between that policy and the amendment which was moved the other day by the hon. member for South Oxford ? I will take the last clause of that amendment, which is our policy to-day. It is the same as the one I have already read. It condemns in its first part the corruption which prevails in the administration of affairs. I will content myself with reading the last portion :

That, inasmuch as enormous sums of money are now exacted from the people of Canada which are not paid into the treasury, and inasmuch as the burthens of the people are thereby greatly and unnecessarily increased, and it is of the utmost importance to the well-being of the community that not only should the present extravagant expendiure be diminished, but that the said burthens should be reduced as largely and speedily as possible,—it is expedient that in making provision to restore "the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure," as recommended in the Speech from the Throne, the existing tariff be so modified that it may be made for a tariff for revenue only.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Is that free trade as they have it in England ?

Mr. DEVLIN. In 1879, when the principle of protection was first announced in this House, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie moved an amendment, which I will read, as it bears out my contention that the policy of the Liberal party has not changed. That amendment was to this effect :

That while this House is prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service, and the maintenance of the public credit, it regards the scheme now under consideration as calculated to distribute unequally and, therefore, unjustly, the burden of taxation ; to divert capital from its natural and most profitable employment ; to benefit special classes at the expense of the whole community ; tends towards rendering futile the costly and persistent efforts of the country to secure a share of the immense and growing carrying trade of this continent, and creates an antagonism between the commercial policy of Great Britain and that of Canada that might lead to consequences deeply to be deplored.

That resolution was voted down. The policy then propounded by the Liberal party was voted down, but nevertheless, after fourteen years' experience, after fourteen years' disappointment, the people have come to appreciate the soundness of that policy, and the Liberal party still adhere to their policy of 1879 as the only sound one for this country, and the only policy which will meet the requirements of the country and reestablish that prosperity which the National Policy has so much tended to destroy. Again in 1884, 1886, 1889 and 1890, we proposed amendments similar, if not in words, certainly in principle and spirit, to those I have read. In 1890, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That, instead of adding to the existing oppressive taxation, the House should apply itself to the reduction of burdens, by abolishing or reducing the taxes now imposed on prime necessities to farmers, miners, fishermen and other producers.

In 1891, we proposed another resolution expressive of the policy of the Liberal party, couched in almost the same words. In 1893, we proposed a resolution which embodies the spirit and the aims of the policy of the Liberal party, and which reads as follows :—

The present customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion and should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of free trade, and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government efficiently and economically administered.

Therefore, taking up all those resolutions which have been moved by the Liberal party and for which the Liberal party struggled, we find that our policy has always remained the same, and whenever we come before the people for their verdict, you will find that our policy will be the one which we formulated in 1879, 1886, 1890, 1891 and 1895. Our policy is known and does not change. It is the same to-day as it was in the days of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, whom hon. gentlemen opposite denounced in every possible way during his lifetime, but whom to-day they laud as one of the grandest figures in Canadian public life. It was the same policy which was afterwards urged by his successor, the Hon. Edward Blake, who to-day is quoted so frequently by hon. gentlemen opposite, but whom they formerly condemned and endeavoured by every means in their power to crush.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Blake left your party because he would not support it.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman will never leave his party because of any deficiency he may find in it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Because their policy is always right.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentlemen opposite claim, and that is a charge which is frequently made, that our policy might possibly discriminate against England. There is but one inference to be drawn from this, and that is that their policy favours the motherland, and promotes trade with England. But is it so ? Will the facts bear out such a statement ? Such a pretension is so wholly unfounded that even the Ottawa "Citizen," the organ of the Government, only a short time ago contained an article proving the contrary. That article was based upon a remark of the Controller of Customs which caused considerable newspaper discussion. The Controller of Customs had stated that it would be the basest of ingratitude for Canada to discriminate against the mother country. In the discussion that followed, the "Citizen" had this to say :

It is not true that Canada discriminates against the United States. On the contrary, we imported from that country last year goods to the value of $58,221,000, of which $29,659,000 were admitted free of duty. From England we imported goods to the value of $45,925,000, of which only $13,226,000 worth were admitted free of duty.

So that if there is discrimination anywhere it comes from the gentlemen who proclaim themselves most loyal to the motherland. Sir, I have shown that there has been extravagance in our public expenditures ; I have shown that hon. gentlemen opposite have not kept their promises to reduce the expenditure, but, on the contrary, they have striven to increase the expenditure, and to increase the burden of taxation upon the people. But this is not the worst feature of the position, as laid before the House by the hon. Finance Minister. We remember how that hon. gentleman, who has been pleased to charge us with something approaching treason, denounced the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) because, in the years during which he was Finance Minister he had a few small deficits. But we find that in two years this Administration have had deficits amounting to ten millions of dollars. In 1885, the Finance Minister had to come before this House with a deficit of $5,000,000. Of course, he told the House and the country that it was no fault of his, or of the Government, but that it was due to the expenditure necessary to suppress the rebellion in the North-west. But, if the truth is to be brought home to the Government in all matters, how was that rebellion caused, if not by the negligence of the Government and their officers ? Who, then, were responsible for the deficit of $5,000,000 in that year, if not the Government ? And, Sir, ten years afterwards, the same Finance Minister comes to this House and says, not that he is sorry that he had charged a previous Finance Minister with having deficits, not that he takes back one word at all of all the insults and reproaches hurled as he alone can hurl them across the floor of this House, but that he has to announce to the House, and through the House and through the press, to the country, that, notwithstanding that he has levied taxes upon the people in every conceivable form, and in every corner of the country, he is short $4,500,000 in his revenues. He is the last man in Canada to speak of a deficit, or to say a word about change of policy. Last year there was over a million of dollars of a deficit, and this year almost $5,000,000 ; and he holds out the consoling promise that next year there will be a deficit of nearly two millions of dollars. And this is the hon. gentleman who denounced deficits. Let him stand up in the House and denounce himself ; let him take back what he has said against the hon. member for South Oxford. Two years of administration under these gentlemen, the only people, according to their own account, who have capacity to govern the country—two years of administration with ten millions of dollars of deficits. Is that the only evidence of

capacity that the hon. gentleman can give? The hon. gentleman says he does not tax enough. Why, he begins taxing at the cradle, and he only leaves off after he has taxed the coffin. When the child comes into the world, the hon. Minister constitutes himself his guardian angel, and at every step, from childhood to manhood, and from manhood to the grave there are taxes, heavy taxes. Not heavy enough taxes? I venture to say, that there is not a man in this country to-day earning a dollar a day but is obliged to pay about 30 cents of that dollar in taxes. It is a hard thing that the man who labours from morning till night to gain a subsistence for his family, when he comes home tired with his day's toil, as he congratulates himself that he has earned a dollar, must recognize that 30 cents goes to this paternal Government, and only 70 cents for the benefit of his family.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Would you have no taxes?

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, but not such taxes as I am speaking of. Why, Sir, in the article of nails alone, the country paid $13,000 into the treasury, and to the friends and masters of the hon. gentlemen they paid $225,000. In cotton, they paid to the treasury $1,250,000, and to the friends and masters of the hon. gentlemen over $2,000,000. In sugar, they paid $125,000 to the treasury, and to the masters and friends of the hon. gentlemen, over $2,000,000. Why, Sir, they ask us why it is we have not attained power——

Mr. COATSWORTH. Would you abolish taxes?

Mr. DEVLIN. Let the hon. gentleman keep quiet, and I will give him a lesson—a lesson in modern history. How is it that the hon. gentleman occupies a seat here?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Because I got a majority of votes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if the people of Toronto were free to exercise their own judgment, were not, to a certain extent, influenced and carried away by the misrepresentations of these manufacturers, that he would ever occupy a seat here, as the representative of one of the greatest cities in the country?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes; every time.

Mr. DEVLIN. Never.——

Mr. COATSWORTH. Would you abolish taxes altogether?

Mr. DEVLIN.—The distillers send the hon. gentleman here to vote for prohibition. And he speaks for it, but votes against it, if I mistake not. And then, in order to give the country some compensation for the trouble of bringing him here, he gives us, now and again, his ideas as to pigeons.

Mr. DEVLIN.

Mr. COATSWORTH. When are you going to abolish taxes?

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman complains that I have not told him enough about the taxes. Why, Sir, if he will look at the official returns he will see how the people of this country are taxed to the very death in order to suit the personal ends of the gentlemen who sent him here—taxed on everything they wear; taxed on everything they use; taxed wherever they go; taxed from head to foot—for the benefit of the men who sent him here. And he would find fault with us because, in the name of the people, we protest against this enforced tribute.

Mr. COATSWORTH. How would you raise the revenue?

Mr. DEVLIN. Let the hon. gentleman follow me, and let him, if he can, disprove one statement I have made. I have given the facts that are contained in the public reports put in our possession by the Government. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that the promises made in the name of the National Policy have been carried out?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, of course, he can pretend anything. We were told that we would have about 15,000,000 people in the North-west by the year of grace, 1895. Where are they? They are in the imagination of the junior member for Toronto, they are not in the North-west. We were told that the exodus which was going on in this country in a small way from 1873 to 1878, would cease, and that we would be able, not only to retain our immigrants, but likewise to retain the natural increase of our population. Sir, the fact is now admitted on all sides, admitted with sorrow, that Canada has lost all the natural increase of her population, and 300,000 immigrants in ten years. The people of Canada have been taxed to pay for bringing out these immigrants. The people of Canada were assured that the vigorous immigration policy inaugurated by the hon. gentlemen on the Government side, would be the means of keeping them here. Why have they not been kept? Why is it that under this National Policy we have lost the whole natural increase of our population, and lost also at least 300,000 immigrants who had come in? This fact is the worst possible condemnation of the National Policy. Has the National Policy, as it was predicted, kept up the price of wheat, kept up the price of farm products? The hon. gentleman seems to know something about grass. Let me ask him, has the National Policy kept up the price of hay? Can he tell me what the price of hay is to-day, without the inspiration of the hon. gentleman behind him? Under the National Policy, every farmer in the land knows

that the price of hay is between $5 and $6 per ton.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Where?

Mr. DEVLIN. In Canada, under the National Policy, in the year of grace, 1895.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It is $11.50 in Toronto.

Mr. SCRIVER. In several cities of the province of Quebec it is less than $6.

Mr. GIBSON. I bought some the other day for $6.

Mr. SMITH. The Toronto "Globe" of yesterday quotes hay at $10 to $11 per ton.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is something that grows in the streets of Toronto.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman knows well that the price of hay in Canada is $5 to $6. I do not know what market the hon. gentleman refers to, but I know the market which he quotes is not the only market in Canada. I am speaking of the great majority of the markets, and I state, with knowledge of what I am saying, that hay can be bought at a price as low as $5 per ton, and that under protection.

An hon. MEMBER. Where?

Mr. DEVLIN. You can buy it in Ottawa, if you like, buy it in Montreal. What, then, has the National Policy done for hay? The hon. gentleman who preceded me also spoke of the effect of the National Policy in keeping up the price of horses. Why, Sir, it is a notorious fact that a horse to-day cannot bring the price it did years ago. The National Policy has not maintained the value of horses and cattle. They are a drug in the market, and can be bought for almost anything. So that, examine it as you will, the principle of protection, otherwise styled the National Policy, has certainly not benefited the farmers of this country. But what has it done for the labourer, who has done so much for it? What has the National Policy done for the labourer, who in large cities, has voted so often for it? Is there a man in this House who can say that the condition of the labouring class in Canada has improved from 1878 to 1895? When we say that the condition of the labourer is improved, we mean that employment is more easily obtained, that employment is abundant, that wages are steady, that the labourer is able to purchase articles as he requires them, and able to pay for them. Is that the state of affairs in this country to-day? Not at all. Why is it that there were in Montreal, only a few months ago, large processions of unemployed labourers? Why is it that we hear so much of the distress that exists in the great city of Toronto? Will it be said that in the large cities of Canada during the last year, labouring men were not in a far worse position than ever they were from 1873 to 1878? Why, Sir, we know as a matter of fact that hundreds and thousands of the unemployed, during the last winter, went to the mayor and went to the aldermen of Montreal and begged him in God's name to give them the bread that they could not obtain for want of employment under the National Policy. No, Sir; there are only two classes in this country who are benefited by the National Policy, the Conservative Government of Canada and their friends the combinesters, the men who have taken millions from the pockets of the farmers, from the pockets of the labourers, the very men who have built up those fortunes, and having built them up, are poorer than when they commenced. That is a fact recognized by all who know something of the condition of affairs in our country to-day. Has protection developed trade? Is it not the first principle of protection to restrict trade? Has it not kept trade within the boundaries of Canada? Why, Sir, look at the exports of manufactured goods in Canada, and what they chiefly consist of. Are those exports large? Are they sent to many countries? We had the evidence only yesterday of what the exports of Canada are in one line to Australia. I remember well that the Premier of Canada went to Australia and opened negotiations with that country, and when he came back he presented to the people of this country a vision of the prosperity they were about to enjoy in carrying on trade with Australia. Well, Sir, we have now learned that last year our farm exports to Australia amounted to $18. Our exports are chiefly in the line of lumber, the products of the forest, lumber that is not protected, and does not require to be protected, by the Government. What were the exports as found in the last number of the Statistical Record? The exports of our mines amounted to $5,000,000; of our fisheries, $8,000,000; of our forests, $5,500,000; of animals and their products, $31,500,000; of agricultural products, $22,000,000; of manufactures, of which lumber constituted over $22,000,000, a total of $28,000,000; leaving a balance of manufactured articles exported from this country of $6,207,000. We have exported the products of our farms, of our mines, of our forests and of almost every source of our great natural wealth; but from the tall chimneys, from factories which we have protected so heavily, what have we exported in one year? The value of $6,000,000. That is what protection has done for Canada. Look at it as you will, call it by any name you choose, examine it as you please, it must be admitted that this policy is robbing the great mass for the benefit of the few. That is its principle, that is its application, and the results flowing from it show that it is robbing and injuring our country. We have been charged by hon.

gentlemen opposite with trying to copy the trade policy of England. But those hon. gentlemen forget that we are the men who have been charged with disloyalty. They copy the trade policy of the United States: they are loyal. We try to follow as nearly as possible the example of the motherland; we are disloyal. We try to introduce in Canada a policy which has made England rich, prosperous and powerful; we are disloyal. We had the Finance Minister of this country only a week ago throwing across the floor the charge of treason—treason was the word he used, a word which he had no right to use against any hon. member on this side of the House. He charged us with treachery; he revived the old charge which he made some years ago and unfurled the flag of misrepresentation. Where is the man on this side of the House who is not as loyal to Canada and Canadian institutions and possesses as honest convictions of heart and soul as the Finance Minister? Will it be said the leader of the Opposition is not at least as loyal to his country as the Finance Minister? Has the leader of the Opposition at any time in his life gone back on any great policy that he has advocated and put before the people of Canada? Never. But the hon. Minister went back on the policy for which he fought in early manhood, and to-day he condemns it on the floor of this House. If there was disloyalty, there was disloyalty on the part of the hon. gentleman in going back on prohibition. It is a strange circumstance that there was a time when the hon. Finance Minister called a certain article liquid distilled damnation, and to-day he places confidence in that distilled damnation to raise the revenues of the country. But there was one thing I was pleased with. When the hon. gentleman made this charge of treason across the floor of the House, he looked very serious, he looked very cross, but he sat down immediately afterwards and smiled and laughed and wondered if the joke would take in the country. Treason! Where is the treason in asking that the people of Canada should be relieved from the heavy taxation which they are called upon to bear for the benefit of the masters of hon. gentlemen opposite? Treason! Where is the treason in demanding that the public service shall be conducted in an honest and economical manner? Treason! Where is the treason in defending the policy which we have been constantly urging on this country for the last fifteen years? Treason! There is treason, perhaps, on the other side of the House. There is treason in the remark made by the Minister of Finance when he brings that charge against his fellow-members. There is treason in making such a charge, but there is no treason on this side of the House. We are true to our country, and we are as anxious for its welfare and prosperity as are hon. gentlemen opposite. We hold our convictions, we stand by our policy, we work for the benefit of the great mass of the people, while hon. gentlemen opposite put before the country a policy designed to carry them into power and achieve success, but a policy that is treasonable to the best interests of Canada. The hon. gentleman spoke of free trade as it is in force in England. If free trade is such a bad policy for England, why is it that you dare not speak of protection in that country? Lord Beaconsfield himself said only a few years ago that protection if adopted in England would bring about civil war; and there is no serious public man to-day, except perhaps the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), who advocates a policy of protection for England. We had the statement made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto that our tariff had been revised. How was it revised? We find that under the old National Policy of 1893, during the months of July, August, September, October, November and December, the value of dutiable imports amounted to $32,845,000, on which duty was paid of $10,198,860. In 1894 under the new tariff the value of dutiable imports for the same month was $28,046,705, and the duty paid, $8,701,000, the average duty being in the first instance 31·03, in the second instance 31·02, being a reduction of one-tenth of 1 per cent. What is the value of such a trifling reduction? Sir, I shall close my remarks——

Mr. McKAY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member for Hamilton says "hear, hear." I am sure he will not have many remarks to bring to a close before the end of the session. It matters not what comes before the House he will complacently bow and say the measure is good. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKay) will find good, every transaction that is done by the Government in the shape of their expenditure, (Mr. McKay) will find good, every was to have cost the country $46,000, and which, in fact, did cost the country $260,000; which was to have developed trade, and which, in fact, did not develop trade; which was to open a great source of navigation, and which, in fact, did not.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Do you object to that lock?

Mr. DEVLIN. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Coatsworth) has brought himself sufficiently into contempt and derision, without continuing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEVLIN. He has lost all sense of shame, evidently.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) will withdraw these last expressions he used.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the rule of the Chair is, that I must withdraw the last words.

Mr. SPEAKER. Those expressions, yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do withdraw, but I hope the Chair will keep the hon. gentleman quiet, too. He is a source of great annoyance. He is continually interrupting and is carrying on a little game that is utterly unworthy of the character of a representative of a great city.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the word out of order now, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Devlin) has stated that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) has pursued a course unworthy of his character, and that is out of order.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not say "his" character. I said, "the character of the representative of a great city."

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. That is out of order.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will take it back, and say "worthy of his character."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to a point of order. Is it right for an hon. member to sit continuously in his seat while a member is speaking in this House, interrupting him, and bringing in matters not pertinent to his speech, for, perhaps, a whole hour, without any attention being called to it ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is certainly not in order for any member to interrupt a member who has the floor, and I have endeavoured by calling "order," to prevent these interruptions since the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) has commenced his speech.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that, in my judgment, the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) has invited comments on his speech as he has gone along. He has, two or three times, put questions to me, and invited comment.

Mr. DEVLIN. The question is, whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Coatsworth) has got any judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am sure that if Mr. Speaker had to rule on that subject he would rule in my favour. With my compliments, too. Mr. Speaker, I have taken up certain matters which have been brought before the House, and I answered the charges that were hurled across the floor, but I would be sorry to resume my seat before, at all events, answering one charge that was made by the Minister of Militia. I see that he is not in his seat. The Minister of Militia, speaking the other day, and forgetting the Augean stable of which he is a resident just now, the one in which are found all the scandals known as the Tay canal, the Little Rapids lock, the Onderdonk scheme, the Langevin block, the post office scandals, and, in fact, all others of that nature ; proceeded to assail the memory of the late Hon. Honoré Mercier. It is not my mission, nor part of my province, to defend the memory of that hon. gentleman. But, Sir, the Minister of Militia said that Mr. Mercier and his regime had been unfortunate for the province of Quebec, that he had violated every principle of honour and of honesty, and that it was a good thing for the happiness of Canada generally that he was dismissed from office. It is well, and I say it fearlessly, that hon. gentlemen opposite would know this : That Honoré Mercier, notwithstanding what his faults were, is one of the great and respected dead of the province of Quebec. If the faults of hon. gentlemen who are in the Government now, were given the same publicity as were given the faults of the Hon. Honoré Mercier, I question very much whether they would be to-day in power ; I question very much whether His Excellency the Governor General would not be called upon to intervene. But, Sir, what are the facts ; facts which are well known ? It is true that the gentleman who, to-day, has his reward in the Senate, who was known as the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, who was at one time judge of the district of Montmagny, who hopes shortly, I believe, to fill the position of Judge of the Supreme Court, who has fared so well and fared so sumptuously at the expense of the country; it is true that gentleman did dismiss the Hon. Honoré Mercier. It is likewise true that the Ministry which he brought into power, and which assumed full responsibility for his acts and for his conduct, declared that they would place the Hon. Honoré Mercier in prison. It is a fact, concealed from nobody, that they proceeded to carry that into execution. Everything seemed favourable to them. They had the reins of power ; they had a Lieutenant-Governor most unscrupulous, ready to serve, in every possible way ; they had at their disposal the judges ; they had the officers of the court ; they had all the documents that could be found in the public service ; they dragged Honoré Mercier before the criminal court of the city of Quebec ; they made their charges ; and they selected judge, and they selected jury. And, Sir, the result of the proceedings was that, after all the facts had been fully exposed, that after the charges had been made, that after those angels of innocence and political purity that had been

brought into power by Lieutenant-Governor Angers had thrown against this man, to use a common expression, all the mud they could, that jury stood up and declared that the charges were false, and that Honoré Mercier was an innocent man. His enemies, however, were not men enough, in this bit of personal persecution and prosecution; they were not men enough to take their own money. Whether it was because they were so long out of power that they had no money, I know not; but at this stage they were not men enough to take their own money to carry out their own little personal spites and persecutions. But, Sir, they took nearly $100,000 out of the people's money to try and wreck and ruin the reputation of Honoré Mercier. Mr. Mercier had a thorough vindication at the hands of the people of his province. It was in the days of his adversity. He was respected, in adversity, as perhaps no politician in Canadian political life ever was respected before. So much, so, Sir, that one of his great opponents, a man with a heart and with soul, different from the heart and soul of the man who had driven him from power; a man with heart and soul, but who was his opponent from beginning to end; that man said: Honoré Mercier was great, was a hero in adversity, and was great and a hero in death. The truth was realized by the people of the province of Quebec, and shown by them when the remains of this man, the great and respected dead of that province, were carried to their last resting-place. It was not a state funeral; it was not a funeral paid for with the money which came from the public treasury; it was not the funeral of a man in power. It was the funeral of a man poor and penniless; a man who had been falsely charged with having a million dollars when he had not one dollar. It was the funeral of a man who, being thus poor, was carried to his last resting-place by those who admired and respected him. It was a funeral in which there was a concourse of a hundred thousand people following the bier. Ah, Sir, after the miserable failure of the efforts of the friends of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to blacken the reputation of Honoré Mercier, it ill becomes him to come and traduce his memory in this House, and I take this occasion of resenting those imputations upon the memory of this great man. There is one point more, Sir to which I will refer, and then I will close my remarks. It is of a personal nature. One hon. gentleman asked me about my own position in this House. I am sorry to say that my own position is, perhaps, a very humble one in this House; it is also a very humble one in the country; but, such as it is, it is just as dear to me as the position or the reputation of any hon. member may be to himself. I wish to correct a statement in regard to my position which was made by the hon. Premier of Canada at Belleville a short time ago. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech said:

> There is a member of the House of Commons named Devlin.

That is true. I know the hon. Premier would be very much pleased if there was no such member. I know, from steps taken by the hon. gentleman recently, that he is bound to try and get rid of such a member. He continued:

> Neither his position in the House nor in the country would justify me in referring to him at any particular length.

That is the position I occupy—a very humble one; but I am quite satisfied with it. The position is one which I have been accorded by the great majority of the electors of the grandest constituency, perhaps, in the Dominion of Canada. I am quite satisfied with it, I am able to take care of it, and I am quite sure to have it again. The hon. gentleman goes on:

> But he is one of those Irishmen who has the gift of the gab; and, whenever he rises to speak, he denounces what he calls "sectarian bigotry."

That is true.

> Speaking recently at Montreal, he said: "I do not for the life of me see how any Irish Catholic can support Bowell, who did not reach his position through any intelligence he possesses, but simply by his hatred of the Catholic people. For my part, this is a matter of conscience, and I cannot support such a man."

That is untrue. I never said such a thing.

> Now, if he has a conscience, and his conscience leads him to that conclusion, he is quite right in saying he cannot support me——

Mr. FOSTER. Question.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which has been given a great deal of publicity. The hon. Premier tried to make political capital out of this matter at a banquet that was non-political in its character. The facts are the following: I spoke at Sohmer Park in Montreal, and I was misrepresented by the "Gazette," of Montreal, which, according not only to Liberal opinion, but even, I believe, to the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice, is not a reliable authority. That paper, which reported me on the following morning, made me say what I never said in my life, no doubt, because the "Gazette" would wish that I had said such a thing. The "Star," of Montreal, which reported my address in full, had no such expression in it, for the simple reason that I did not utter it. On that occasion, I took good care to say that I did not oppose Sir Mackenzie Bowell because he was an Orangeman. Perhaps there would have been some justification for giving way to a little bit of bad temper, in view of the manner in which he deals with some of us, and using some strong language con-

cerning him. I did not, however. It is true —I know it—he has been severe in his dealings with men who do not think as he does. Is it not a fact that only two years ago—and this gives you an idea of the force of mind of this great Senator—he moved a resolution at Sault Ste. Marie, in Ontario, that $500 be sent to Ireland for active aid purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman can find some relevancy in his remarks, for I confess I cannot.

Mr. DEVLIN. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied to follow your ruling. But I have had the opportunity I sought of putting one matter right, at all events—of denying a false and malicious report reflecting upon me, and also of answering a question put to me by an hon. member in regard to my position in this House. Have I not a right to defend my position in the House when it is assailed ? My position is simply that of a humble follower of the Liberal party—a party which has a clean, a good, a sound record ; which has a distinct policy on every question ; which has a straight policy—a policy which is thoroughly understood, and which I am sure will be accepted by the people of this country. I am a humble follower of that party, because I place my faith in the men who are its leaders, who speak not for selfish purposes, but who speak, who think, who act for the benefit of all classes of this country. I propose recording my vote for the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford—an amendment which contains a true and just principle, which is couched in vigorous language, and which is submitted to this House by an hon. gentleman who is an authority on the subject of finance, and who, notwithstanding all the attacks which have been made upon him, is one of the foremost political men of the day.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised to hear the attack made by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) upon the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). This attack was ostensibly made because the hon. member said that the hon. member for Centre Toronto had attacked the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I heard no such attack except on political grounds ; but I consider that the attack of the hon. member for Ottawa County upon the hon. member for Centre Toronto was a personal one, and I do not think the hon. member was justified in making the statement he did. Now, Sir, in regard to that attack, what do we find ? We find that the hon. member for Centre Toronto was sent as a commissioner to Chicago, that he spent five and a half months in Chicago without a salary, that he expended $3,000 of his own money, and now he is charged by an hon. member on the other side with, I don't know what sort of crime, because he has sent in his vouchers for the money spent by him in his official capacity. However, I need not come to the defence of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), because he has already expressed his willingness, or rather his anxiety, to appear before the Committee on Public Accounts and have the whole matter fully ventilated. I would have been glad if the hon. member who has just spoken had given me something to reply to ; but as I listened to his declamation—what I might call his oratorical effort—I found he said very little on the question before the House, but a great deal on other questions. He did make one statement, which was rather remarkable, and that was that the Finance Minister should be ashamed to speak of deficits because he has had to confess to two deficits, one of $5,000,000 caused by the rebellion, and which it is absurd to call a deficit, and the other for the present year, which the hon. gentleman places at the same figure. In that he is just half a million dollars over the mark, and he forgot to mention that the Finance Minister estimates for the next year a surplus ; and I have no doubt that as business revives, and it is reviving rapidly, we will find that the expectations of the Finance Minister will be amply borne out. There is one other statement of the hon. gentleman which I think needs a reply. He stated that hay was worth $5 to $6 a ton. Well, I am credibly informed that hay is worth at least $7 to $8 a ton in Ottawa, and some say $7.50 to $9 a ton. I refer to this simply because it is on a par with other statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they seek to decry the National Policy. They put the question : Has the National Policy raised the price of farm products ? and they answer that on the contrary it has decreased the prices, and refer to hay selling at $5 to $6 a ton as an illustration.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not desire to enter into this discussion, and I do not know that this question of hay is material, but I wish simply to say that I am in a position to know, as well as any one can, what the price of hay has averaged throughout Canada during the past year. I have known of purchases of many thousands of tons, and the average price to the farmer has not been $5 a ton. I do not desire to enter into this matter at all, but simply wish to correct what I know to be an incorrect statement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If my hon. friend behind me will permit me, I would ask the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) how the price of hay compares this year with last ?

Mr. EDWARDS. Hay is much cheaper this year than last.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Half the duty was taken off hay last year.

Mr. EDWARDS. I may be allowed to answer that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CRAIG. I hope that everything I say will not provoke a speech from a member of the Opposition, or I shall have to continue my remarks until a very late hour, which I have no desire to do. I have stated that hay in Ottawa to-day was sold at a certain figure, and I do not think that statement was contradicted. No doubt what the hon. member for Russell says is true, and he possibly may have bought very poor hay. I wish to say a few words on the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in criticising the census returns. If it had not been for this statement, I do not think I should have spoken at all. Speaking about the small industries, he said that in Port Hope there were a great many industries that employed only one man and some only two, and that 116 industries employed only 219 people. I do not know whether that statement is correct or not, because I have not verified it; but I do know that we have five industries in Port Hope employing 200 people, or an average of about 40 each; and I merely mention this in justification of the town of Port Hope, as I do not wish the statement to go uncontradicted that all our industries are small ones. While there are some small industries, there are some pretty large ones as well. I wish to say further that the National Policy has not hurt Port Hope. It is stated that the population of that town to-day is five hundred less than it was ten years ago. But the explanation of this is that the Grand Trunk, which had large works there, removed them to Lindsay, thus causing a reduction in the population. Without this explanation, people might believe that the reduction was caused by the National Policy. I may add that all the business men in Port Hope are doing very well, and that we have had no failures. To come to the subject before us, because I intend to adhere closely to it, and not talk about matters foreign to this debate altogether, I wish to say that the Reform party, in discussing our fiscal policy, find themselves in a very awkward position. They find it absolutely necessary to show that this country is going to the dogs. I am very sorry for any party which is reduced to taking that line of argument. When they make these blue ruin speeches the consciences of hon. gentlemen opposite must give a remorseful twinge, because they must feel that they are not dealing with facts but fancies. But possibly, by looking so long at the condition of our country through blue glasses, they begin really to believe that it is in the depressed condition they depict. We must all admit that this country has passed through a world-wide financial crisis in a very creditable way indeed. I remember the depression that came over this country when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, and which was far more severe than the one through which we have just passed. Hon. gentlemen opposite themselves admit that while they held office there was a very serious depression, and they give that as the excuse for their deficits. It is true, they say, that we had deficits, but no wonder because the country was passing through a very serious crisis. But the deficit, they argue, was caused by the world-wide depression from which Canada could not hope to escape. Well, Mr. Speaker, although they contend that the policy of their party was not responsible for the severe depression that then existed, they blame the National Policy for the crisis through which we have passed. I do not say that the depression from 1874 to 1878 was caused by the policy of the Mackenzie Government, but I say that it was aggravated by that policy. I say it was aggravated, because they did not take steps to lessen the evil. I am going to consider for a few moments the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford. That amendment calls for a tariff for revenue only. I intend considering the purport of this word "only." That is the emphatic word in his amendment. If the amendment had simply called for a tariff for revenue, I could have taken no objection to that, because I believe in a tariff for revenue; but when the statement is made that we shall have a tariff for revenue only, I think it is worth while trying to find out the meaning of this phrase. First of all, I take for granted that it means the absolute abolition of all protection. There is not to be a vestige of protection left. If we needed any confirmation of that statement, we could find it in the speech of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me. He said, in a very loud voice, that the principle of protection is to be left out in the Reform tariff. How will they frame that tariff? The first thing they must do is to exclude protection. The hon. member for South Oxford sets to work at framing his tariff, and he says, first of all, there must be no protection, this tariff must be for revenue only. Well, what then? I say that under this system there must be no duty on any articles manufactured in this country. If there is any duty at all, even if there is a duty of only 10 per cent, I hold that is an acknowledgment of the principle of protection and that cannot be allowed; I will not allow them to put that in at all. So there must be no duty on cheese, for cheese is a manufactured article. Then on what shall we levy the duties? They must be levied on articles not produced in this country. We must not have a duty upon a single article we grow in this country, because we are going to do away with every vestige of protection. We must put

a duty on tea, we must put a duty on coffee, on rice, on sugar and other goods that we cannot produce here at all. These things must be heavily taxed, because we are not levying a tariff for revenue only, without one particle of protection. There must be no duty on beef, no duty on pork, on wheat, on butter, on apples or on fruit of any kind. All these things must come into this country free of duty, because there must be no vestige of protection, as we are levying a tariff for revenue only. I might dwell longer upon this question, but, generally, what would be the result? One result would be that our beef would come from Chicago, being supplied in the same way as beef is supplied in the Eastern States by Armour & Co., and other large Chicago firms. Would our farmers like that? How would they like the beef supplied to our large hotels and local trade to come from abroad and no cattle bought from them, or bought from them at very low prices? Some may say that it would not work out in that way. I contend that it would. These multi-millionaires would compel our butchers to buy their beef, or open shops, as they have done in the United States, and retail this beef at prices so low as to defy competition. We should find our cheese trade utterly demoralized. American cheese would be sent in here, would be branded as Canadian cheese and sent to the old country as of Canadian manufacture. Then as to our cotton mills and woollen mills and our shoe factories, what would happen to them? They would be compelled to do one of two things, either to reduce the wages of their men one-half or else close up and go to the United States. There they would have the United States market as well as the Canadian market, for the American and English manufacturer would have free access to this market. These manufactured goods would come here from England, from Germany and from other parts of the world, and this would verily be a slaughter market, and our manufacturers would find they would have to go to the United States. Over there they would have a protected market and free access to the market on this side. We have had the changes rung upon the exodus. It has been told over and over again how many have left this country every year. Under a tariff for revenue only we should not need statistics to tell us about the exodus, we should see it with our own eyes going on in every part of this country. I hold that this is no caricature but a fair picture of what this country would be under a tariff for revenue only. If the amendment does not mean this it means nothing, and, if they do not mean this, all the speeches we have heard against protection mean nothing. We might characterize this tariff as it has already been characterized:—Free trade as they have it in England. What do we find as to free trade in England? I have been for some years taking a leather journal published in England; and in that I find constant lamentations over the tanners of that country, who are forced to compete with leather brought in from the United States with no duty put upon it. A little while ago there was a great strike in the shoe trade over there, but it was brought to a sudden end, because it was found that the Americans were putting in their goods and taking the market away from the English producers. So the masters and men were obliged to meet and come to terms as a matter of self-defence. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that no man to-day mentions protection in England. Why, it is constantly talked about. This paper I refer to constantly advocates protection to tanners. It points out that it is absurd that their tanners should be there helping to support the country and maintain its institutions while leather is coming in from all over the world and taking the market away from their men. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that they would put a duty on goods produced in this country, but only for the purpose of revenue. But I cannot accept any such excuse as that from them, for I hold that if they impose such a tax it would take the ground from under their feet in this argument. I hold that this is exactly what we are doing, and if they impose such a duty they would be doing only what we are doing, and their policy would not differ from that of the Conservative party. Is not our tariff so arranged as just to collect sufficient revenue? Hon. gentlemen tell the people that they are being oppressed, that they are being robbed by the Conservative party, and that this tariff takes millions of money from the people of this country. Why, Sir, in arranging the tariff the object is to produce sufficient revenue, and, further, to give incidental but moderate protection to our manufacturers. I cannot conceive of a tariff being arranged upon any more common-sense plan. I cannot conceive of men deliberately so discarding protection. I can only come to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite feel that they must have some cry, they must have some excuse to offer why they should ask to take the places of those who are in power to-day, and they can find nothing else to say. They indulge in scandals, but these fall to the ground. They indulge in tirades against the Government, but these do not accomplish the purpose and so they have been for years talking about protection as legalized robbery, calling the manufacturers of this country, as they were called by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), "plunderers." And this hon. gentleman, even while he speaks thus says he does not intend to do injustice to the manufacturers. Is it no injustice to these men to call them plunderers, to say they are robbing the people of this country, assisted by the Government through the tariff? I think the manufacturers of this country know how to resent such attacks, they know how to

value the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford, that he does not intend to do them injustice. The hon. gentleman says that he and his friends know no class. But we know that he does know one class. We know that the votes he is after are the votes of the farmers. But I think that the intelligent farmers of Canada, when they consider this question fully and calmly, will find that their true friends are not the men who would eliminate every vestige of protection to our native industries, but those who mean to give those industries moderate protection. I believe in moderate protection; I do not believe in high protection. I believe that high protection would produce the evils which hon. gentlemen say have been produced under the present tariff. High protection would produce monopolies; it has done so in the United States. But moderate protection prevents monopolies, because men can only go so far. It insures the production in the country of a good quality of goods, for the manufacturers know that the duty will not stand in the way of bringing goods to the country if the home manufactured goods are of poor quality. After all, what is chiefly protected by this tariff which is decried so earnestly by hon. gentlemen opposite? First and foremost wages are protected. That is sometimes forgotten. But wages are protected, and why? As I said before, if the duty was taken off manufactured articles, the manufacturers would be compelled, in self-defence, in order to make anything at all, to reduce their wages one-half. What do we find the wages are in a country like Germany? They pay 50 cents a day to a man working in a tannery, and 25 cents a day to a woman working alongside of him. The hon. members on the other side of the House want our workingmen to compete with men who are working for wages like that, with men who are living as those German labourers are living from day to day, living from hand to mouth, not able to save a dollar, in fact, not able to live in any way as our labourers are living. I believe there is no country in the world where the artisans live as well as they do in this country. I know that in the factory with which I am connected, in Port Hope, a great many of our men who have been working for years, not only live well every day, not only dress well, as well as I dress myself, but many of them live in houses of their own, which they have bought with their own earnings; and I say that is a creditable showing for this country. Sir, I will not advocate any policy that will reduce the wages of these men one-half; I will not advocate any policy that will compel them after a while to mortgage those houses which they have acquired with so much labour and so much saving; but I will stand by the policy which protects the wages of every workingman in this country. I ask the Reform party, Do they object to protection for the wages of the workingmen of this country? If they do, let them tell them so, when they go out into the country before the next election; let them say plainly that they object to this; because I hold, and it cannot be disproved, that protection protects the workingmen more than it does the employers themselves. Why, Sir, how is that? Suppose that I cannot carry on business in this country, what can I do? I can go somewhere else. But what about these men who have their houses in the towns and villages scattered all over the country? What are they going to do? They cannot sell their houses, because everybody is going away, and nobody has got any work. What can they do? They are left destitute, I do not know what will become of them. So I say that the men themselves reap more benefit from protection than their employers do in this country. We heard something this afternoon about free trade in England. Well, Sir, I think hon. members can find a statement made by Mr. Kier Hardie, one of the labour leaders in England, who said that at the present time there were one million men out of employment in free trade England. Why, Sir, if we had anything like that state of things in this country, we would never hear the end of it, there would be a constant cry going up all over the country against the National Policy. But I believe that in this country, while times have been hard—and I am glad to know they are reviving—I believe that most men have been able to earn something and have been able to keep their families in some way, although not as well as they do when times are prosperous; and I believe we have to thank the National Policy for that in a great measure. Now, Sir, what classes are protected? I answer that the National Policy protects the farmers of this country. I ask hon. members on the other side of the House, Do they object to protect the farmers? Will they go to the country before the electors and say, We object to give you protection? I am afraid not. What will they do? Why, Sir, they will do just as they do to-day; they will go and talk about monopolists and the bloated manufacturers who are bleeding them all the time. But when they go to Montreal, they will say to the manufacturers, You need not be afraid, we will do this very gradually. You need not be afraid we are going to hurt you; we will do it very gradually indeed. We may have to do something, but you can trust us, we won't hurt you very much, it will be very gradual and very slow. Now, Sir, I think it is not fair for hon. members to sing two songs. I think they should have the same song everywhere. Are they going to the country and tell the farmers that they object to the duty on farm products? Will they say they think the farmers of this country do not deserve any protection, and, if they get into power, they are not going to give them any protection? But I am afraid

we will never see them do that. Well, Sir, I would ask another question. It is said by some that this duty does not raise the price of farm products in this country. I am not going to discuss this question, but I am going to answer it by asking another question: Do the farmers themselves object to protection on their own products? They may object to protection on manufactured goods, and I am not surprised at that. People will always look out for themselves. But do they object to protection on their own products? Do you find the farmers objecting to protection on wheat, to protection on apples, to protection on pork, to protection on beef, or on butter or cheese? I do not think any one will say that they find farmers objecting to that. There may be some who call themselves farmers, men who do not live by farming, men who have enough land to call themselves farmers, who may say that they do not need any protection at all. But I think, if we travel through the country, from one end to the other, we shall find that the farmers themselves want protection on the things they produce, and I say they are the best judges themselves of whether protection benefits them. I do not think hon. members in this House need to get up and argue whether protection raises the price of wheat, or raises the price of beef, or anything of that sort. The real question is this: Do the farmers think so themselves? Do the farmers know that protection does enhance the value of their articles? When I hear speeches in this House delivered by members who do not know anything about farming, giving the farmers advice, I think of a certain farmer who came home one day and said to his wife: "Things are getting pretty well mixed up." "How is that?" she says. "Well," he answered, "politicians are teaching the farmers how to farm, and the farmers are teaching the politicians how to conduct politics." I think we find a little of that sometimes in this House.

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

After Recess

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) to revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

Bill (No. 77) to amend the Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Permanent Reserve Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate "Gilmour and Hughson, Limited."—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Metcalfe.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was answering the question: Who, after all, are protected, or what is protected? I answered, first, wages, or the workingmen of this country. Then I said that farm products are protected. In discussing that point I said it is often stated by hon. members on the other side of the House that the protection of farm products did not raise the price. I said, whether that was so or not, it was not for us to discuss here; but the question for us to settle was, do the farmers want protection? They know their own business better than we do, and although we have some farmers here, I believe that the farmers in this House, if we obtained their disinterested opinions, would say that it is an advantage for the farmers to have protection for their products. I find, however, that the farmers never object to protection, that is protection afforded to themselves. I said they might object, naturally, to protection placed on manufactured goods, believing that in some cases they had to pay more on account of that protection, because, after all, we are inclined to look after ourselves; but I think we would have to travel a long way in this country before we found any farmers to object to the protection of articles produced by themselves. I might say in reply to the assertion that protection does never raise the price of the products of the farmers, that we have, at this moment, a striking instance of the benefit of protection to farmers. What do we find with respect to wheat in this country? We find that in the United States wheat, to-day, is 15 cents less than it is in this market, I suppose owing to the scarcity of wheat here, and, no doubt, the farmers, and I hope many of them, will reap the benefit of that increased price. I now go on to mention another class who received benefit from protection. This class is the employer of labour. I know that for him no sympathy is expressed by members of the Reform party. I mentioned in a former part of my speech that manufacturers in this country had been called by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in a speech in this debate, legalized plunderers, men who were authorized by law to plunder the people. Well, Sir, I think the manufacturers are not plunderers, but, on the other hand, I consider they are benefactors. When you go into a town, you find men there who are worth $50,000 or $100,000, and they are living on the interest

of their money, and doing nothing else. You find the people saying those men are no good to the community, that they have money, but no enterprise, that they will not use their money to advance the interests of the town or the country. But we find there are men scattered all over the Dominion who possess $20,000 or $30,000, or $60,000. or $100,000, or more, and they are enterprising men, not men who can sit down and do nothing, but men who will put their money in some factory or business which will employ a large number of workmen, and they are a direct benefit to the country. It is felt so by every one ; in fact, instead of such manufacturers being called plunderers by the people of the town in which they live, they are looked upon as benefactors, and there is hardly a town in the country that is not willing, not only to encourage manufacturers to settle among them, but to give large bonuses to induce manufacturers to come into their midst. I remember a circumstance that took place not very long ago in the good city of Brantford, represented by a member (Mr. Paterson) opposed to us in political faith. There was a by-law before the people to give a bonus to a manufacturing concern, and that by-law was carried in a town in which, on other occasions they vote the Reform doctrine. That proves to me, that if people would lay aside their prejudices and their early convictions on political matters, they would admit that in every case manufactories are a benefit to the country. I think that they would go even further, and admit that these manufactories are entitled to some protection against the competition of manufacturers in other countries. Let me ask, why should farmers, workingmen, and employers in this country be protected ? The answer that occurs to my mind is this : These men, living in this country, contribute to pay the expenses of government, whether they are protected or not. If we have a tariff for revenue only, as is proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), they would then be taxed heavily to pay our expenses. I contend, Sir, that if we have men living in this country who are helping to pay the expenses of government, and the expenditure on our public works, they should not be placed on the same footing as men who live in a foreign country, and who are not contributing a single cent towards our national expenditure. To bring it down to a very local affair, we find, Sir, that in towns where men have stores, it is considered by councils that the shop-keepers should have protection, and if pedlars and hawkers come around to compete with the citizens, they make them pay a license. Is not that done because it is felt that the residents are paying taxes and should not be placed in unfair competition with men who contribute nothing at all to the maintenance of the town ? That, in itself, is a sort of protection. So I think that the manufacturers of this country, the farmers of this country, and the workingmen of this country who contribute out of their resources to develop the country, should not be subject to an unfair competition from foreigners, who are rather helping to build up a rival country. It is objected to by some that prices are raised by protection, and that is an argument adduced very often. I do not suppose that hon. gentlemen of the Opposition object to the amount of duty that is paid, but they say, that on account of the duty, another tax is imposed on consumers, on account of the prices being largely raised. Now, I admit that in some cases prices are raised. I think every man will admit that who looks at the subject from a fair standpoint; but I contend that even where these prices are raised, the buyer has compensation. If a farmer lives near a manufacturing town, and gets a very good price for his produce, he will be willing to pay a little more for his goods, and he can afford to do so. If all the manufacturers in this country were blotted out, and the farmers had to sell their produce to middlemen who would ship it to England or the United States, it is quite clear that they could not receive as good prices for their produce, and, although they might get their goods a little cheaper, yet, in the end, they would be no better off. I believe that if the question were put before the farmers they would say : We prefer to pay a trifle more for the goods we need so as to have the privilege of taking our produce to the home market and selling it to the working-people who produce the goods that we want. That argument might be turned in the other way. Workingmen in a city like Toronto or Montreal might object to pay more for farm produce than they would under certain circumstances, but if you say to them : These men that you are buying these products from are the very men who wear your boots and shoes, would not they say : Well, we are quite satisfied at that. People believe in reciprocity, and not in any one-sided arrangement. Now, I maintain that in a great many cases, prices are not raised by protection, and I may ask, how is it that they are not raised by protection ? It is because of the competition among manufacturers in our own country. I might illustrate that by a great many instances, but I know this : That in some cases, the competition in Canada has been so great that men in some lines of business have not only not made money, but have lost money by selling their goods so low on account of competition. I believe that while it may be, when an industry is first started in this country under the fostering care of the National Policy ; while it may be that the consumers will have to pay more for their

goods, yet, after a while, other factories will spring up in the same line. and the prices will be reduced, so that the consumer would have to pay no more than if there were no protection at all. I may give an illustration of this in reference to the clothing industry. I think, Sir, we must all admit in this House that clothing in this country is not dear. I was rather amused the other day, when, in wandering along the streets in Ottawa, I saw a suit of clothes hanging outside a store, marked $2.75. I could hardly believe my eyes, for they did not look very bad, either. They were a very decent looking suit, and I asked the man how he was able to do that. He said: We are able to do it, it is all right, that is the price, $2.75. Well, I said, nobody need complain that clothing is dear here. Again, I saw, in a window, a decent looking pair of boots marked $1. I could not imagine how they could be sold for that, but there they were. That does away with the argument that clothing, and boots and shoes are rendered dear by the National Policy. I might say right here, what I had no intention of referring to, that I do not think that there is in this country a better illustration of the benefit of the National Policy than is afforded by that same industry of boots and shoes. The growth of that trade in the city of Quebec and the city of Montreal during the last few years has been simply marvellous, and not only have many factories been established. and the number of operators increased, but the quality and the style of goods now compare favourably with those produced in the United States. But, Sir, if gentlemen on the other side of the House think that cheapness is the greatest recommendation for anything in this world, I might advise them to live in China, or in India, or in Japan, and surely things are cheap enough there. There is no trouble to find countries where everything is cheap, but I do not believe that it is the greatest desideratum in the world to have cheapness. I hardly think that farmers want to live in a country where everything is cheap. I do not think that if wheat were 25 cents a bushel, that the farmers of Canada would think that we had reached perfection. It is utterly unreasonable to say that because things are cheap in a country, that, therefore, the country is in an excellent condition. On the contrary, when the price of everything is low, then business is extremely dull, and when prices are advancing and reasonably fair, then I find that everything is in a healthy condition. Now, Sir, I come to speak on a question that has been talked about so often that it is almost threadbare. However, these discussions have to be repeated over and over again. People forget, and I know sometimes members of the Opposition forget, and I suppose they will thank me for reminding them, of some of the facts that I am about to mention. The question of reciprocity, for instance, has been discussed over and over again. Let me say that I have always spoken in favour of reciprocity with the United States whenever I have had the pleasure of addressing this House. I have done so because I would like to see a fair reciprocity treaty myself, and because my constituents are strongly in favour of it, living, as they do, directly opposite the United States, and having a steamboat running across every day. But, Sir, I say "a fair reciprocity treaty." Now, Sir, the Reform party often twit us, that our Government have not really endeavoured to obtain reciprocity, and they say that our negotiations in that regard were only humbug, and done to deceive the people. I take exception to any such statement as that. I believe that our Government was in earnest in this matter. I believe that when they went to Washington, they went there determined, if possible, to secure a reciprocity treaty; but, Sir, they also went there determined to protect the interests of Canada. They were not looking after the interests of the United States; they were not anxious that the United States should get the best of the bargain; but they were anxious that Canada should get fair treatment. I believe that our Government did everything in their power on that occasion; I believe they did everything that this House would back them up in doing, and I am glad that they were not willing to sacrifice the interests of Canada, and that they were not willing to discriminate against Great Britain in order to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Now, after all the anxiety displayed by the Reform party for reciprocity, what did they ever do to obtain it when they were in power themselves? I remember reading that on one occasion the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was asked in this House what his Government were going to do about reciprocity, and he replied: We are going to do nothing more. If the United States want reciprocity they can ask for it. Mr. Mackenzie said that his Government had done all that they were going to do, and that they had gone as far as they were going to go; and I admire him for the manly stand he took then. But how, in the face of that, hon. members can get up and twit us on this side with not trying to do more, I cannot understand. I remember also reading about another hon. gentleman who sometimes talks about reciprocity in these days. What did he say at that time? Why, Sir, he made a most patriotic speech—I wish he would make one to-day—I believe, at Charlottetown, P.E.I., in which he said: "We have men and we have ships, and we will carry the war into the enemy's country." In that remark, Sir, he foreshadowed the very

course of the Conservative party. That is what they have done; they have men and ships, and they are carrying the war into the enemy's country. When they are refused reciprocity by the United States, they do not sit down and say, "We can do nothing"; but they endeavour to open up new markets; and, while I myself think there is a good deal of force in the saying, "Why go off to Australia and not to the United States?" there would be force in that saying if we could get the markets of the United States; but there is no force in it when we have done all we can to get the United States market and cannot get it. Now, there may be some people in the country, even on the Conservative side, who, hearing so much about the iniquity of the National Policy, wonder if, after all, it is as bad as represented. Well, Sir, I do not pretend that it is perfect. I do not know that it could not be improved; but that is not the question. We are not asking whether the National Policy is perfect; but we are asked to make a choice. We have to choose between the two policies; that is the position we stand in. On the one hand, we have the policy of the Reform party. That policy, I think, may be characterized very fairly as indefinite. I do not think you could find three or four members on the opposite side of the House who would give the same definition of it, or who could tell exactly what it is. So I say it is indefinite. In one place it means one thing, and in another place it means another thing. In Winnipeg it may mean free trade; in Montreal it may mean incidental and moderate protection. It is not only indefinite, but it is unsettling, because up and down through the country their policy unsettles people. People wonder what they do mean, what they are going to do. They have promised so many things that some good, honest souls are unsettled, and do not know what may turn up. Their policy is also variable; it changes very rapidly. If we studied their policy of three or four years ago, we would not know anything about their policy of to-day. It was said by the speaker who preceded me that their policy was the same now as it was years ago. If it is, I do not know the meaning of words. If it is, they ought to get some one to write it out for them, or find some other way of expressing it, because I cannot find that it is the same, but that it varies and varies frequently, just to catch the popular wave. Now, I do not feel inclined to choose that policy; so I turn to the policy of the Conservative party. I find, in the first place, that the Conservative policy is definite. I think everybody in this country knows what it is. Even the Opposition know what it is. What is that policy? It is a policy for revenue, with moderate protection to our manufactures. I do not think that is indefinite; we all understand that. The people of this country understand it, and I believe that when they study it, they will endorse it. Then, in the second place, I find that this policy is not only definite, but that it is endorsed by all the great countries of the world except Great Britain. It is endorsed emphatically by the United States—I say emphatically, because of the elections held there very recently. It was thought that a wave of free trade was sweeping over that country, although what they call free trade there is what we would call high protection here. But, Sir, what do we find? We find that very little of that satisfied the people of the United States, and when they got the chance to turn out the men who had given them what they called free trade, they elected a Congress which will in time give them a higher protection than they have now; because, I repeat, their low tariff is higher than our tariff. Then, it is not only a definite policy and a policy endorsed by the United States, Germany and France, but it is a Canadian policy. Now, I believe in making a policy for Canada. I do not believe that when we sit down to make a tariff, we should make one for the United States, or one for Great Britain. We are thinking about ourselves; we are making a tariff to suit this country. We are not studying those other countries. It is our business to make a Canadian tariff, and I hold that the policy of the Conservative party is a Canadian policy. I mean by that not only that it is made for Canada, but that it is a policy that has faith in the future of Canada, that looks to the development of this country, and believes that it will be a great country. Sir, I make my choice for the Conservative policy. I do not see how any man who looks at the question calmly can do otherwise. I pity those men on the other side of the House who have their eyes so blinded that they cannot see the difference between these two policies. Sir, I advocate this policy. At the same time I believe in economy with efficiency. I think the affairs of this country should be, I believe they generally are, managed with economy; and I advocate economy and shall always advocate economy in managing the finances of the country. Now, I wish to say two words more before closing. This country has great advantages; I am sure I need not tell any member of this House that, although sometimes, when we hear speeches from the other side of the House, we fancy that this country has nothing but disadvantages. We have in this country an equable climate, we have great stores of minerals, we have magnificent lakes and rivers, we have a great railway system, we have farming lands not excelled in the world, we have a hardy population, we have civil and religious liberty, and in the great North-west we have homes for all who may come. Now, Sir, I appeal to the people of Canada to throw aside their prejudices, to examine

the policies of the two parties, and judge which is the best for building up this country; and if this is done, I for one do not fear the verdict.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if the few observations which I shall address to the House to-night have no greater quality, they will at least be brief. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat as to the magnificence of our country and the immensity of its natural resources, and if those resources were properly developed, we would have a very great country, indeed. The hon. gentleman opened his remarks by referring to what I consider the most important question in a debate of this kind, that is, the labour question. That, I think, is the fundamental question underlying this whole subject. He stated, however, that the labourers of this country were benefited by protection. I deny that statement most emphatically. Neither the labourers of this country or those of any other country under the sun are benefited by protection. In his closing remarks the hon. gentleman referred to China, and he advised the people of this country to go there if they were not satisfied here. That is the most highly protected country in the world, and the country in which the people receive the least compensation for their labour. I deny emphatically that protection can, in any measure, enhance the value of labour. On the contrary, there is no class in the world that is so injured by protection as the labouring class. All the exports from this and every country are the product of labour. And I would like to ask the question, how can labour be benefited by imposing a tariff on the articles it produces? Such a proposition cannot be sustained for a moment. Commerce is nothing more nor less than the exchange of the surplus products of labour, and any instrumentality that prevents the free exchange of the products of labour places an embargo on labour which is an injustice and the greatest possible injury to it. Supply and demand regulate the price of labour as they regulate the prices of all other things where protection does not come into play. You may protect cotton, sugar, iron, or any other product you like, but what instrumentality is there to hinder the people of one country going to another and engaging in the labour of that country? The truth is just this. If there is one man seeking employment and there are two employers, that man has something to say in the price he has to get for his labour, but if there are two labourers seeking employment and only one employer, the employer makes the price. I have already stated that in my humble opinion no other class in the world is so injured by protection as the labouring class, and I have given my reasons. I am very glad indeed that this question has been raised, because there is none to-day in the whole civilized world of such importance as this question of labour. In too many instances labour does not receive its just reward, and particularly in countries where high protection exists. Two of the greatest enemies of labour are protection and the standing armies of Europe. And why? Because protection, in the first instance, robs the labourer of a large share of his just reward. In the second instance, because the people of this world are simply a community on the face of the earth. In every country where men who should be labouring are soldiering, the result is that the men who do labour in these countries have to maintain those armies. There is nothing on the face of the globe that labour does not pay for; and not only are those countries injured, but the purchasing power of those countries is so impaired that the commercial countries of the world, which do not maintain standing armies, are also injured. Why is this? It is because the purchasing power of those countries is so reduced that they are not able to buy to the extent they would from commercial countries which do not maintain standing armies This is the great question of the world to-day, and one that must be settled in the interest of the wealth-producers of the world. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat referred to the fact that there are a million unemployed men in Great Britain to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Some hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." That may possibly be true, but why are they idle? Is it because of the conditions regulating trade and commerce in England? Not at all. It is because of the high tariffs in other countries of the world. That is the reason, and there is no other reason. In making a comparison between the value of labour in one country and its value in another country, it is not fair to take a European country and compare it with the United States, and for this reason, that in every new and undeveloped country, wages, as a rule, are higher than in the older and more settled countries. With the United States in its normal condition, you could not make a comparison between the east and west, because wages are uniformly higher, as a rule, in the west. But a fair comparison would be between Germany and Great Britain. Are the wages in highly protected Germany as high as in free trade Great Britain? Nothing of the kind. The wages in Great Britain are 50 per cent higher than in Germany. There is no country in the world, in my humble opinion, that does the justice to its consuming masses which Great Britain does. A second statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is that our farmers are protected. I deny that proposition most emphatically. They are not protected at all.

They may have a small protection or a pretended protection, in the one article of pork, but even the protection on that is more a packer's protection than a farmer's protection. Now, let me enumerate some of the articles. Does this country, or does it not, produce a surplus of wheat? Does it, or does it not, produce a surplus of cheese, of butter, of beef, of barley, and articles of that kind? Can it be possible, when we are exporting all these articles to a foreign country, that the products of the United States passing through this country could possibly injure the farmers of this country? The only result, from the admission of United States products, would be greater activity in our carrying trade and greater benefit to the country as a whole. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to prove in any degree whatever that the farmers of this country are protected, except possibly to a very small extent, in the article of pork. Who are the producers of the wealth of this country? They are, above all others, our farmers! If any class should be protected, it is the farmers and the labourers; but I defy any hon. gentleman to prove that either of these classes is protected in anything whatever, except as I have said. Now, some hon. hon. gentlemen may say: Oh, yes, at this moment the farmers are receiving a benefit from the tariff on wheat.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Some hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Well, the real truth is that a few speculators, who have cornered the wheat market in Canada are deriving some benefit from the tariff thereon, but the farmers are not deriving any benefit. This is just one of the exemplifications of the operations of this system and it exemplifies it in a better manner than any other that I can think of. The position is simply this: We raise a very considerable surplus of wheat, which finds its market in Liverpool, just where the surplus grown in the United States finds its market. The prices are maintained low until the speculators have bought up the entire crop of wheat. Then they ship just sufficient to keep up the price, and they sell a good deal of wheat in the shape of flour back to the farmers themselves. Let me refer to another item—that of beef. I might, perhaps, better deal with it in connection with the short reference I shall have to make to the question of reciprocity; but I will refer to it now as I think of it. Now, the farmer of Canada is a very considerable seller of beef. The conditions of to-day are such that it would pay far better to sell this beef in the United States than to sell it in England, because the price is relatively higher in the United States than in England. But there are two reasons why we cannot sell it there; one is the tariff, and the other is the embargo upon the sale of animals from Canada in the United States and upon the sale of animals from the United States to Canada. Now, as I understand it, if the embargo were removed, we could sell our beef to better advantage in the United States than we can in England, even though there is a duty upon it. And I would just make the suggestion that it might be worth while for the Government to endeavour to remove the embargo from cattle coming from the United States to Canada, and to get the embargo removed from our cattle going into the United States. Now, I am not finding fault in this; I only wish to make the suggestion. Some hon. gentlemen may say that that would be unwise, because if it were done the embargo would be continued in Great Britain, preventing the sale of our cattle there alive and making it necessary to slaughter them on arrival. Well, my information about the matter is this: That as long as the embargo exists between Canada and the United States, so long we proclaim to England that there is disease in this country which there is not, nor do I believe there is to any considerable extent in the United States. But, so long as this impression is continued by the embargo between Canada and the United States, so long it is impossible to get the embargo removed from our cattle going to Great Britain. This afternoon, the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), in the course of his speech, referred to the price of hay, and he mentioned what he believed to be the average price in Canada. Some hon. gentleman on the other side seemed to think that hay was much higher than the price stated by my hon. friend from Ottawa. Having a very considerable knowledge of that matter I simply endeavoured to correct the statement, taking no part whatever in the arguments, either on one side or the other. The Secretary of State asked me what the relative price of hay was this year and last. I stated that it was a little less this year, and he seemed to think he was saying a very clever thing when he said that the removal of $2 per ton duty on hay going into the United States could not have affected the price in this country. The hon. gentleman was quite right—so long as there is a surplus of hay in the United States. There was an abnormal crop there last year, and when our hay was offered there, the reduction of duty could not affect the price here. The hon. gentleman seemed to think his was a wonderfully clever remark and it was received with great favour by hon. gentlemen on the other side who seem never to have studied any question of political economy at all. Now, I listened with a great deal of interest indeed to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia on this subject. But he did exactly what a large number of gentlemen on the other side

of the House do. He failed to deal with the question of protection versus free trade, or with the question of protection versus a revenue tariff. He simply read from different individuals' opinions, and he dealt with the condition of the country from 1874 to 1878, and since. Every advance the country has made within recent years he claimed as due to the acts of the Government. I deny that proposition entirely, and I hold that, just so long as the people of this country are industrious and economical they can stand a great deal of robbery, even under a high protective system, and yet thrive to some extent. But the real question is: Are the people of this country thriving as they ought to thrive? The hon. gentleman said he would not deal with the abstract principle; he acknowledged that he did not understand the abstract principle very well. I think that that is quite true, or he would not have made the speech he did. But, Mr. Speaker, the abstract principle is the question we ought to discuss in this House. And why? Because it is the only question that can be intelligently discussed. Suppose that this country existed for twenty years under a high protective system, but during that whole time we were borrowing very largely from foreign countries and expending the money on public works. Would not that very much stimulate the trade of this country? And if after we got through this period of twenty years, we lived for another twenty years under free trade, during which time we were paying the penalty for our previous borrowings—could you make a fair comparison between these periods? No, Mr. Speaker, you could not. And I hold that the only question that can be discussed intelligently is the abstract question of protection versus a revenue tariff. Sir, let me say here that I am a free trader—I am a free trader in principle, out and out, and I have never been afraid to say so. In the first election that I ran, in 1882, I declared myself in principle a free trader, in my address I sent to every elector in the county; and if every individual in this country held my views, we would be prepared to adopt free trade as soon as we judged it expedient to do so. Let us remember that we have had certain industries built up in this country dependent upon banks and financial institutions, and knowing what I do of trade and commerce, I would not bring a crisis upon this country by introducing a great change at once. I would bring about this fiscal change by degrees, but I would bring it about far more speedily than would hon. gentlemen opposite. And why, Mr. Speaker? Simply because, as has been stated to-day, their masters would not allow them to do it. But, Sir, I am a free man, and I would bring about this change just as rapidly as I think would be expedient in the interests of this country, and that would be very rapidly indeed. But this country may not yet be sufficiently advanced for that proposition, and the best that we can do to-day is to adopt a revenue tariff. Now, let me say here, that every man who is in favour of a revenue tariff as against a protective tariff, is in principle a free trader, every man who advocates a revenue tariff is a free trader. The Minister of Militia the other day thought he asked a very clever question, when he asked an hon. gentleman on this side, who is a free trader, if he would be prepared to rob the people to the extent of 25 per cent, and he said, No. Then he asked, Would you be willing to do it to the extent of 15 per cent? I do not know what the answer was, but the question suggests this well-known fact, that under a protective system there is a large amount of revenue that does not go into the treasury, but goes into the pocket of certain manufacturers, and there is where the robbery comes in. Now, I hold that even under a revenue tariff, taxation is not distributed in the most equitable way, and I am not afraid to say that, although I am a very large land-owner, I would like to see the tax upon land only.

An hon. MEMBER. Talk saw-logs.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman knows very little about saw-logs, or about anything else; and I would advise the hon. gentleman to study this very important question of a revenue tariff, because it is very important indeed to the people of Canada. But, Sir, I do not expect to see in my time such an advance in public opinion on this question as I would like to see; I do not expect that for some time to come we shall go beyond a revenue tariff. But a revenue tariff I am prepared to support, as I believe, considering all the conditions of this country, that it would be the very best system for the people of Canada to-day. Now, the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), in the course of his address yesterday, referred to the condition of the farmers of England, saying that they were in the most deplorable condition imaginable, and that they considered their only remedy was protection. Well, I suppose, Sir, if you were to go to England and travel over that country, you would find a certain number of farmers who advocate protection, perhaps a large number. But the difficulty in England to-day is simply this, that transit has become so cheap, and agricultural products are so plentiful the world over, that the tenant-farmers of England, who pay a very high rent for their land, are undoubtedly suffering. But that is a difficulty that will adjust itself in time, and the farmers of England will yet be in as good a position as ever they were, not because protection will be introduced into England, because protection will never be introduced into England. If England became a protective country, what would be the condition of the farmers of Canada? Their con-

dition would be this: That they would be taxed at both ends, they would be taxed on everything they bought, and taxed on everything they sold. England's legislation considers the welfare of her entire people. Supposing that England did adopt a high protective policy for her agricultural products, would England be the manufacturing country that she is to-day, and would the farmers of England even be as prosperous as they are to-day? The fact is, Sir, that England, notwithstanding all that may be said to the contrary, is the greatest example of the benefits of free trade that we have in the world. England lends to almost every nation in the world. When other countries fail as did the Argentine Republic, and when the banks of Australia, and of other countries, failed, were those failures an injury to the countries I have named? Not at all. They were a great injury to Great Britain, who had loaned them money, but the countries themselves gained thereby, because they unloaded a very large amount of their indebtedness. This drain is going on continually; England is a continual loser in this respect; but, notwithstading all that, she is the greatest commercial country the world has ever known, and will remain, as long as she maintains her present commercial system, the wonder of the entire world. The very fact that the farmers of Great Britain desire protection, taken in connection with this other fact that the manufacturers of Canada also desire protection is one of the strongest arguments possible against the system. The very class who desire it in England is the very class who do not wish for it here. In the course of this debate a good deal has been said about the depression that existed from 1874 to 1878. That certainly was a very severe depression and a world-wide depression. It was a depression that was intensified as the result of the American war. At that time the Liberals of this country denied that it was their policy that brought about that result. To-day hon. gentlemen opposite denied in the same way that the present depression has been brought about by their acts. So far as that is concerned I hold this, that a country can be fairly prosperous either under a protective or a revenue tariff, but I hold most firmly that any country will be more uniformly prosperous under a revenue tariff. Nothing is so conducive to unsteadiness in trade as a system of protection; it is the most dangerous system that can possibly be introduced. I am not one of those who hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for the prices at which our products are sold in foreign markets. During the contest of 1892 a circular was sent into the county I represent, and no doubt into other counties, comparing the prices of farm products under the Mackenzie Administration and under the Conservative Administration during the four succeeding years. I then denied, as I now deny, that the Government has anything whatever to do with the prices of our products sent abroad. Those prices are regulated by the law of supply and demand and not by any act of government. Irrespective of the question of free trade and protection, what is the commercial and financial condition of Canada to-day? For years past we have heard in each Budget speech that the country was in a flourishing condition. Being engaged in the lumber trade, I discovered last year that the country was not in a flourishing condition, but those not so familiar with that trade only discovered this year that a depression existed. The depression appeared in this country in a very marked degree last year, and while I sincerely hope that the state of trade will soon improve, I am afraid such will not be the case. Conditions may temporarily improve, because this is not a financial depression from which we are suffering but a commercial depression. I have heard hon. members speak as if finances had something to do with it. So far as this country is concerned finances have nothing to do with it, it is a commercial depression, and while I hope we may soon recover from this commercial depression, I fear for the future of this country. I hold that this country is loaded with indebtedness beyond its capacity to bear; I hold that we have reason to fear, sooner or later, financial difficulty as a result of the administration of public affairs during the past number of years. The system pursued is simply one of bridging over, and what I fear is that when the bridging over ceases, there will be a bad day for Canada. When we cease to be borrowers abroad, for we borrow in order to pay interest on our indebtedness, I shall be afraid of our financial foundation. I perhaps should not make this statement, but I say it in all sincerity, and while I hope for better things in this country, I regret most sincerely as a Canadian the administration of public affairs which has marked recent years. We are loaded, I say, beyond our capacity. We cover too much territory; the cost of transportation, considering our population, is too great; I regret that we cover so much territory, and having considered this question, I fear for our population, considering the conditions that exist. I will say this in all frankness, that there is an evil day coming to Canada, and while so far as I am individually concerned, I would always besire to be in Opposition, because I have no desire to be on the treasury benches, yet I desire the Liberal party to come into power and the principles of that party to prevail, but I believe the present time would be a very bad one for the Liberals to take office because there is no question but that the odium which properly belongs to hon. gentlemen opposite would be placed upon the shoulders of the Liberal party. In the course of this debate it has been made to appear by hon. gentle-

men opposite that hon. members on this side of the House are entirely opposed to manufactures in this country. That is not the case. Hon. members on this side of the House are perfectly in accord with the large proportion of the manufacturing industries carried on here. We desire that manufacturing shall be carried on to the fullest extent possible. We also consider that a very large proportion of the manufactures can be carried on without any protection whatever, and what we find fault with is that manufactures are promoted which require high protection in order that they may be continued. Under that system how do those who develop the natural resources of this country benefit? Who are the producers of our natural resources? The farmers, the lumbermen, the fishermen and the miners. These are the men who are engaged in developing our natural resources and thereby enriching our people, and yet they are called upon to pay tribute to certain manufactures in order to obtain the articles they require. Those producing classes are injured thereby, and that is what we find fault with, and why the Liberal party desires that we should live under a system of revenue tariff instead of under a system of high protection. It is sometimes said also, that under the policy of the Liberal party we would not obtain sufficient revenue. I deny that proposition entirely. Under our system the revenue would be more easily obtainable, for the reason that a large amount of material is now imported into this country under the protective policy from which the treasury of the nation derives no benefit at all. A highly protective system is a system that is the very opposite of being productive of revenue. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Craig) said that the prices of materials were not raised by protection. Well, if that be the case, and if nobody is injured by protection, then according to his idea it would be better to pile on still more protection. But I deny his contention, and I say that it all depends upon the conditions. In some instances the importer pays the duty and in other instances the exporter pays the duty. It depends entirely on circumstances, and under our condition of things in Canada the people know too well who pays the duty in a general way, in so far as these highly protected industries are concerned. Let me refer, Mr. Speaker, to the question of reciprocity. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Reform party have departed entirely from any idea of reciprocity, and that we have changed our base in that respect. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, we have never changed our position on that question. We have always been low tariff men, we judge of our climatic and geographical conditions, and bordering as we do for four thousand miles along the great republic to the south, we believe, and properly believe, that freer trade with that country would be desirable in the interests of the producers of Canada. But Sir, we want that reciprocity on fair grounds, and on fair grounds only. Having covered so much territory as we have in this country with our sparse population, I, as a Canadian, understanding something of commerce and viewing the question in all its aspects, say frankly, that something must be done in the direction of reciprocity with the United States. I admit at once that a free trader cannot be an out-and-out reciprocity man, and I make the statement without fear. I am not, and never was, one of those who would make reciprocity a fundamental principle, but I believe that the difficulty surrounding the situation is so great that freer trade with the United States has got to be obtained in some way in order that the people of this country may prosper as they should. While I regard the English market as a great market indeed, yet I say that it is simply preposterous, it is insane, to say that we will seek trade with the antipodes, while we have to the immediate south of us such a great country as the United States. We on this side of the House are accused of being annexationists because we advocate these views. I say, Mr. Speaker, that any Canadian who regards with appreciation our system of government, our banking system, and our institutions, cannot be an annexationist. We have in this country responsible government. It may have its faults, but it has its advantages. I am a lover of our system of government, and I always hope to live under it, and not for one moment would I exchange it. I may say here, that for the development of a new country, I believe we have the very best banking system in the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the farmers of Canada are satisfied and that they do not desire that the policy of the Reform party shall prevail. That, I believe, is not a correct statement. You know very well, Mr. Speaker, that many men are so wedded to party that they cannot be convinced that they are wrong in principle, some were born Tories, their fathers were Tories, and no reasoning whatever could change them. However, we have now in existence in Canada a body known as the Patrons of Industry. Would any sane man believe for a moment that we would have such an organization if it were not for the fact that a large number of men wished to withdraw from the Conservative party because of its high protection, and that they do not want to go into the Liberal party because they would not exchange their colours. And so the dissatisfied Conservatives and some Liberals have joined together and formed the party of the Patrons of Industry. Their platform is almost identical with the Liberal platform, and for that reason, I believe, they are to some extent making a mistake. I say that, because this third party

has been organized, advocating almost precisely the same principles, so far as trade and commerce are concerned, as are advocated by the Liberal party. There could be no stronger argument than the existence of the Patron organization to show that our farmers generally are not satisfied with the protective policy. But, say hon. gentlemen on the other side: Oh, we carried the country so many times and we will carry it again. Well, Sir, I state here, that at the general elections in 1882, 1887 and 1891, this country was not carried by the policy of protection. If it were carried on the protective policy, why was it necessary for the Government to pass the Franchise Act and the Gerrymander Act to maintain themselves in power? I say that if hon. gentlemen opposite will only be manly enough to contest the country on fair and equitable grounds, and to have a fair and square fight on their fiscal policy without the instrumentality of any other issue, the ministerialists will not come back with a corporal's guard. Before I resume my seat, Sir, there is just one statement that I wish to make, and I do not wish to make it in any manner reflecting on my political opponents, because I believe that in a general way the gentlemen on the other side of the House are honest. I do not for one moment think, that because a man calls himself a Tory or a Conservative that he is dishonest. I have the greatest admiration for a narrow-minded, bigoted, ignorant old Tory, because I believe that he is generally an honest and square man. But what do we see to-day? Are there men in this ministry who have had great commercial experience; are there men who have had any commercial experience at all? In order that this country should be governed in the interests of the people, we should have a ministry composed of men who have some ideas on commercial questions, and who would not find it necessary to send agents around the country to make inquiries upon the subject. It is high time that we should have sitting on the treasury benches men who have some knowledge of trade and commerce. I wish to make no reflection on any gentleman on the other side; but I hold that there is not to-day in the Cabinet one single hon. gentleman to whom a large commercial concern in this country would entrust the care of his business—not because of any inferiority in them, for they may be very clever men in their own callings. A gentleman who has been a lecturer and a professor may be highly qualified for the position which properly belongs to him, but he never should be Finance Minister of this country. It is high time that we should have on the treasury benches hon. gentlemen who have commercial knowledge, and who would put their commercial knowledge to practical use in the country's affairs. The Budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance was a very good campaign speech——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, it was a very good campaign speech for the ignorant, but not a speech that any gentleman having a knowledge of commerce could endorse. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say. I, myself, have no desire, as I have said, for a seat on the treasury benches. It is just possible that when the Liberal party come into power I may cross the House just for the purpose of being in Opposition; but I do not think I shall, because much as I love, personally, to be in Opposition I could not do that, because I could not endorse the principles of the Conservative party.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just sat down should be so hard on his financial leader. He said he was making no reflections on this side of the House, but he held that the Finance Minister should have practical business experience. I wonder how he would like to entrust the finances of this country to the late Finance Minister, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have listened with a good deal of attention to the hon. member's speech. I tried to make out what his definition was of a revenue tariff, or a tariff for revenue only. He told us that free trade was impracticable—that as a theory it was very good, but that it could not be attained now. He told us that he was opposed to protection, and was in favour of a tariff for revenue only. Several times he was about to tell us what a tariff for revenue only was, but each time he backed down again; he came up again, and again backed down; so that we are still in ignorance of what a tariff for revenue only is. I must say that in that respect the hon. gentleman is on a par with all the other members of the Opposition who have spoken in this debate. I was very much touched to-night by his references to the necessity of protecting the workingmen. That was his great solicitude—to see the workingmen of this country protected, as they were not sufficiently protected to-day. Suppose he found a man in this country engaged in a most lucrative business, and employing a large number of men, and paying them in store pay instead of in cash; suppose he found that man paying them in a currency that was depreciated in the neighbourhood. I am sure that his bosom would rise in righteous indignation against such a man, and he would do all he could to prevent such a practice.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if he knows of a case of that kind in the country?

Mr. WALLACE. I have been told of one —that of a man engaged in a large lumber business not very far from the county of Russell.

Mr. EDWARDS. I deny the statement entirely. Such was never the case, and is not the case to-day. It is an entire fabrication.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the hon. gentleman denying—that there was a gentleman in Russell employing a large number of labourers, and so very solicitous about them that he paid them in store pay, and used a species of script? What is he denying?

Mr. EDWARDS. If the hon. gentleman refers to me, I say I never did it, and do not do it to-day.

Mr. WALLACE. Very well. I am saying what has been told me on the best authority, that this has been done in the county of Russell, and done to the knowledge of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only on a par with the position of other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Last session we were regaled with a speech from a gentleman who brought in a Bill to preserve the sanctity of the Lord's day, and who, it was proved in this House, chartered his tug for service on the Lord's day. There were other gentlemen who clamoured for free trade as the only desirable thing for this country; but we were told by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that though free trade was the great desideratum for the country, we must have a protective duty of at least 100 per cent on coal oil. We were asked by the hon. member for [illegible] (Mr. Featherston) to put an enormous protective duty on glucose, because there was a glucose factory in his riding. Three or four other members of the Opposition—if I mistake not, the members for Lincoln, Welland, and Essex—went as a delegation to the Government to ask for what? To ask for free trade in wines? No, Sir; to protest against the duty of 65 per cent on wines being reduced to 35 per cent.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. What we did say to the hon. Minister of Finance and to the hon. First Minister was that if there was anything that would stand protection, it was wine.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we might be protected from interruptions of such a character as that. It is no contradiction at all; it is simply an admission of what I said. The present duty on wines is 65 per cent, and the hon. member for Welland protested against 30 per cent being taken off by the French treaty, in return for corresponding advantages, because it would injure the industry of some of his constituents; and his denial is simply no denial at all, like the denial of the hon. member for Russell. We had other members of the Opposition advocating protection for other articles. I need not give their names or mention the particular articles, because they are familiar to every member of this House, and they show the hypocrisy of those hon. gentlemen. Now, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen always profess to be great advocates of economy. Our expenditures during the year 1894 amounted to $37,585,000. Of this, there were fixed charges as follows:—Interest on the debt, $10,393,000; subsidies, $4,250,000; sinking fund, a little over $2,000,000; making a total of $16,750,000 in round numbers, and leaving a balance of $20,853,000 to be expended in other ways. This $16,750,000 consisted of fixed charges which the Government must pay in order to fulfil pldeges made to the people of this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Did the Government create any of those fixed charges?

Mr. WALLACE. Certainly they did. At confederation they created a fixed charge of bonuses to the provinces to the extent of $4,250,000; they assumed the debts of the provinces, amounting to over $100,000,000; and they promoted great enterprises which could not be built for nothing. There were fixed charges amounting to $16,750,000, and there were controllable expenditures amounting to more than $20,000,000. Upon what items of those $20,000,000 do the Liberals say they propose to economize? We have gone over the whole range of the expenditure of this country, and have pared down that expenditure of controllable items to the extent of $2,250,000. I would like to ask those hon. gentlemen upon what items they would still further propose to economize.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will point you out that when we go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman made a very long speech yesterday and was unable to point it out to them. In the Committees of Supply, in other years, as the records of Parliament show, they have not put upon the pages of "Hansard" very many objections to the expenditures that were made. Why, we remember that when they were in opposition before 1874, they had the same cry that they use to-day. They professed then a great anxiety for economy. They urged that the expenditures of every kind had been largely increased by the Conservative party of that day, and that these could be reduced? What did they do? The total expenditure of 1872-73 was $19,174,000. When the Reform party came into power in 1873, that expenditure jumped up to $24,488,000 in 1875-6 or an increase of $5,318,000. despite their many professions of economy. And I think it

would require no prophet to assure us that if they should come into power to-morrow, we would find history repeating itself. We would find that instead of reducing the expenditure as we have done, instead of bringing down the expenditure, in times of stringency, to the lowest possible basis, they would, as in 1875-76, increase the expenditure in two years to the extent of $5,250,000. I intend to refer to another feature of their expenditure as compared with ours, and that is the cost of collection of revenue. I mean the collection of revenue from the post office and the public works, including railways and canals, and all the other public services of the Dominion. In 1872-73, we expended $2,564,051; in 1877-78, after five years of Grit rule, we expended $4,196,375, or an increase of $1,632,324. That was the expenditure during those years. What revenue did we receive in that period? From these same services we received, in 1872-73, $2,150,292, and in 1877-78, our revenue had increased to $3,243,273, being an increase in revenue of $1,091,981, against an increase of expenditure of $1,632,000. That is to say, it cost the country, under Liberal rule, $1.50 to collect every dollar of additional revenue from those two services during those five years. Now, we will take the corresponding period when the Conservative party were in power—or take the whole period from 1877-78 until 1894. The expenditure on post offices and public works, including just the same services, railways and canals and the other sources of revenue, in 1877-78, was $4,196,375. In 1893-94 it had increased to $7,432,068, being an increase of $3,235,693. The revenue derived from these sources in 1877-78 was $3,242,273, and in 1893-94 it was $6,512,086, making an increase in that period of $3,269,813 revenue, against an increase of expenditure in the same period of $3,235,000. This shows that every dollar of increased expenditure, under Conservative rule, has been met by an equal increase from the revenue of these services, without the imposition of a single cent of new taxation. That is a fair comparison between the two political parties during the years that they were respectively in power. A good deal has been said by the various speakers opposite as to the financial standing of this country. They all have to admit two things, namely, that the credit of this country has increased, and that we made an excellent loan the other day; but they qualify that statement by saying that the rate of interest has gone down everywhere, and that all the other countries have floated loans at correspondingly low rates of interest. It is not so. I have in my hand a statement here of the values of four per cents in 1879 of the various countries and of the values of those in January, 1895. I will not read the whole statement, but it shows this, that four per cents in Canada, which were worth, in 1879, 89 to 91 per cent, are to-day quoted 110 to 112. That is that they have increased 21 per cent in those years. New South Wales 4 per cents have increased 13 per cent; the colony of Victoria, 10 per cent; the United States, 13 per cent; South Australia, 17 per cent; Queensland, 17 per cent. This shows that the credit of Canada has risen more than the credit of any of those countries named—than that of any other country in the world. Our 4 per cents have risen 20 per cent in that period, while the United States 4 per cents have only risen 13 per cent; and in no other country with which we are acquainted has the value of their securities risen in the same proportion as ours. Our Canadian 3 per cents are quoted to-day at par in the markets of the world. That shows that not only have we participated in the advantages of cheap money with other countries, but that under the judicious and wise administration of the Conservative party during those seventeen years, our securities have a greater value in proportion than those of any other country. With reference to the loan, some hon. gentlemen opposite have made a comparison between the loan floated by the Finance Minister last November and that made in February last by the United States. What are the facts? Our loan was made at a net cost of 3⅛ per cent. That was the net cost of our loan at that time. The loan made by the United States, bearing 4 per cent interest, in thirty year coin bonds, for which $65,000,000 were obtained——

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). That is not the United States loan.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I did not mean to be disrespectful, but some one has made a mistake.

Mr. WALLACE. The one to which I allude is $62,400,000, 4 per cent, thirty years coin bond, for which $65,000,000 were obtained.

Mr. GIBSON. It was a $50,000,000 loan at ten years.

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking of the loan of last February—the last loan they made—and on which they paid the rate of 3¾ per cent, but it was said that they may pay that loan in silver, and that is the reason it did not sell so high as the Canadian loan. Not so. I have here a paragraph from President Cleveland's message, in which he says:

> Of course, there should never be any doubt in any quarter regarding the redemption in gold coin of the Government bonds which are made payable in coin.

Mr. CHARLTON. President Cleveland asked for legislation from Congress to make that point clear, and Congress refused, and consequently the bonds were put on the market subject to that doubt as to how they would be redeemed.

Mr. WALLACE. There is the statement of the President of the United States with regard to the loan.

Mr. CHARLTON. That made no difference.

Mr. WALLACE. And the same pledge was given by Senator John Sherman, who was the leader of the opposite party in the United States Senate.

Mr. CHARLTON. At the time severe criticisms were indulged in by the press of the United States against Congress which refused to take action which would have enabled the Administration to place this loan on much more favourable terms and save to the treasury of the United States some millions of dollars.

Mr. WALLACE. I am aware of that, but the fact remains that these are the terms of the loan, and it is payable in gold.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all, payable in coin. Those are the terms upon which the loan is made.

Mr. FOSTER. The United States Government could not stand five minutes if it did not pay in gold. It intends to do so, and it must do so.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with my statement of the case, he can make his speech afterwards. These gentlemen have stated that this Conservative Government of Canada is an extravagant Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. "Hear, hear," some of them say. Now, I propose to compare the expenditures of the Dominion Government for the last five years with the expenditures of the various provinces for five years up to the latest period we have been able to obtain particulars of their expenditures. During the last six years our expenditure on consolidated fund account increased from $36,500,000 to $37,393,000, or less than 2 per cent during the whole of these five years. Sir, what is the history of these provincial governments controlled almost wholly during that period by the Reform party, by the allies of hon. gentlemen opposite, by men working hand in glove with them? I will not give the details of the various provinces, though I have the figures here. The expenditure of the provinces in 1887 was $9,614,000. In 1892, the expenditure of these provinces was $12,704,000, an increase of 32 per cent in five years, as compared with 2 per cent increase by this extravagant Administration.

Mr. CHARLTON. That would be more satisfactory if we had details as to the separate provinces.

Mr. WALLACE. I can give the hon. gentleman that if it is more satisfactory. These are the figures:

Ontario	$3,454,372	$4,068,257
Quebec	3,288,798	4,446,640
Nova Scotia	664,103	822,462
New Brunswick	667,647	676,483
Manitoba	520,190	1,000,345
British Columbia	731,307	1,430,920
Prince Edward Island	288,052	259,012
Total	$9,614,496	$12,704,119

You will notice that half the New Brunswick Government, or little more, is Conservative and their expenditure was nearly at a standstill. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, these provinces have largely increased their indebtedness. I find I have not the increases, but I can give the amount of the indebtedness of each province:—Quebec, $14,672,169; Nova Scotia, $1,673,511; New Brunswick, $2,183,564; Manitoba, $4,398,258—the assets are not given—British Columbia, $1,694,722; Prince Edward Island, $185,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. These are net debts, excepting the case of Manitoba?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. Now, there is another point, namely the increase of the federal debt under the two governments. The Reform party, during the time they were in power, increased the public debt from $99,500,000 to $140,000,000, or at the rate of $8,000,000 per annum. The Conservative party during the last five years increased the indebtedness from $237,500,000 to $246,000,000, a total increase of $8,500,000, or less than $2,000,000 a year.

Mr. GIBSON. There are a hundred millions which you have not accounted for.

Mr. WALLACE. But which I can easily account for. That would be extended over a very long period, and besides it represents expenditures which were endorsed, and are endorsed to-day by almost the entire population of Canada. And even the Reform party themselves, though they opposed the expenditure at the time with all the vehemence and hostility they could command, were obliged to cease their hostility, because they found the people of Canada were against them—and it is one of the reasons why they are where they are to-day. Though we increased the expenditure only eight and a half millions, we have much to show for the expenditure. I need not read the whole of the items, but I have here a statement showing more than $16,500,000 spent on capital account for the benefit of the people of the whole Dominion during those five years. For instance, we have expenditures for our canals, the Welland Canal, $417,000; the Williamsburg Canal, $429,000; the St. Lawrence River Canal, $154,000; Port Arthur Harbour and Kaministiqua River, $340,000; the Lachine Canal, $600,000; Cornwall Canal, $1,120,000——

Mr. GIBSON. There is nothing about the Tay Canal there.

Mr. WALLACE. I think if the Tay Canal did not exist the hon gentleman for Lincoln could not exist either. It seems to be his whole stock in trade. We have an expenditure of $1,500,000 for the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch, and a large number of other expenditures, every one of which can be justified as being in the interest of the people of this Dominion, expenditures intended for the promotion of trade, for the opening up of facilities of communication, for the benefit of the whole Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal to-night and we have heard on a good many other occasions from the Reform party about their various policies. Their policy of unrestricted reciprocity has been criticised by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) who spoke to-day, and it was also alluded to by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). Sir, the policy of the Conservative party has always been favourable to a fair and equitable reciprocity treaty with the United States. Our statute-books to-day show that we have been willing, that we are willing to-day, to do what is fair to promote trade between those two countries. But, we have not been willing to hand over to a foreign country the control of the finances of Canada. We have not been willing in our trade policy to discriminate in favour of a foreign country as against Great Britain, we have not been in favour of adopting a policy of reciprocity which would involve a much higher taxation than we have to-day in the Dominion, and which would inevitably lead to direct taxation. Those gentlemen had a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, but there are some little doubts about that policy, which have been referred to in this House, and which I will refer to again. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in a speech he made in Toronto, and portions of which have been quoted in this debate, but which I will refer to again, spoke as follows :—

> The conditions are not equal upon which you can form a closer commercial alliance between Canada and Great Britain, but there is alongside of us a kindred nation, economically situated as we are, the United States, and we claim that commercial union, which at this moment is not possible with England, is possible with the United States ; and the policy which we have advocated, which we still continue to advocate, is the removal of all commercial barriers between this country and the great favoured nation to the south of us.

I do not hear any "hear, hears" from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is not my speech.

Mr. WALLACE. And I am glad to see that he does not endorse it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say so.

Mr. WALLACE. Only by manner. The leader of the Opposition said still further :

> If Sir John A. Macdonald will adopt our programme, and give us unrestricted reciprocity, with all my heart, in this matter, I will pledge him that he will have my most emphatic support.

He was very enthusiastic. He said still further :

> I have read history in this way, that every reform has cost to the reformers years of labour ; and those years of labour I am, for one, prepared to give ; and though the Democrats may be defeated in the United States, and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until that cause is successful. I will not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until the cause has triumphed. But some think that, although unrestricted reciprocity is possible, it is not probable. We are on the eve of triumph, the triumph is in our hands, if we only know how to play our cards.

Apparently they did not know how to play their cards.

Mr. CHARLTON. You had two aces up your sleeves.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know what the hon. member for North Norfolk means by having two aces up his sleeves. The aces they had up their sleeves did not work.

Mr. CHARLTON. I mean that was the course of the Government.

Mr. WALLACE. He said, still further :

> We will take fresh courage and look for more, because I tell you the Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they triumph and obtain continental free trade.

But they did cease, they stopped their agitation, they grew tired, notwithstanding that their leader had pledged himself, had pledged the party, and other members of the party had pledged themselves, that they would never rest until they had obtained continental free trade, or unrestricted reciprocity, or some other of those names of their policy, because it is all the one policy. But, Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen who have been leaders of the Reform party, have not hesitated to change their policy. I say that commercial union, continental union, and unrestricted reciprocity, are all the one policy. But that was not their only policy. The Conservative party, within the present Parliament, has had four leaders, but they have had only one policy during the last seventeen years. The Reform party have had, during recent years, one leader, but they have had four different policies, and we do not know how soon they may have another. A few years ago,

it was a tariff for revenue, and that is what they are apparently coming to to-day. After that, we had the Hon. Edward Blake preaching all over the country, in 1886 and 1887, in favour of a modified form of protection. He told the manufacturers, You need not fear me at all, I am a better friend to you than the Conservative party. I am your real, true friend, put your confidence in me and all will be well. We won't disturb the protective tariff. It would be impossible to do so, and we do not intend to do it. That was their second policy, and then we had this changeful bantling, unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union. Still later, we had another policy, free trade as they have it in England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where did you see that ?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, in various places. You have not read your leader's speeches. I will read you one :

We shall give you free trade, and although it will be a hard fight,——

Something like his language on unrestricted reciprocity.

—we shall not give in one inch, or retrace our steps, until we have reached the goal, and that goal is the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day.

Is that satisfactory ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. WALLACE. Then I will read a little more. I will give you another speech made by his leader. In Montreal, on the 22nd January, 1895, he spoke as follows :—

The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines, such as exist in Great Britain.

Is that pretty definite ?

A very important object is a revenue tariff, a tariff to be derived from customs, which will levy no duties except for the purposes of revenue for the means of government. For all economical principles I go to the land of sound government and sound common sense, old England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, free trade as they have it in England. Again :

It is from that land I take my theories, and upon that platform, exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party of Canada will fight the next battle.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A customs tariff for revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member is not in accord with his leader to-day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Thoroughly.

Mr. WALLACE. He is not in accord with the other leaders of the party, as I shall endeavour to show in a few moments, and they are not in accord with one another at any one time. Then, there was a resolution proposed at the great Ottawa convention. Their leader became disgusted, he tried to explain its meaning, and he failed Then he adopted the theory of free trade as they have it in England. Even the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., tried to explain its meaning, and he failed, and he blamed the failure on the Conservative newspapers because, he said, they had misreported what he intended to say. Then he made his explanation, carefully revised it himself, and that explanation, I may say, he will have to explain away when he gets up to make his speech in this House. I have a copy of it here, and it is a beauty. If it does not mean that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to put forward a horizontal tariff, as indicated by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who said a little while ago that there were lots of articles coming in free from which a revenue might be obtained—and that is departing from the Conservative policy of bringing in free raw material whenever possible so as to produce cheap goods and place the necessaries of life as far as possible at low prices, by admitting free those necessaries of life that are not produced in this country, this being the policy of the Conservative party—it means nothing, but it is evident that hon. gentlemen are going to impose duties on everything that comes along.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where are you quoting from ?

Mr. WALLACE. From the "Woodstock Despatch," which gives a full report. This is what Mr. Davies said :

The political party now in power challenges your votes, and holds that the proper way to apply Customs taxes is to have two purposes ; one to raise the revenue the country requires, the other purpose to do what they call developing and encouraging, which means enriching a certain manufacturing class in the community. We attack the last proposition as unjust to the great mass of people. That is simply the difference between the two policies ; but they say to us all over the Dominion : "Why, that means two things unjust in themselves ! It means the tariff must be a uniform tariff all over, so that the poor man will pay a great deal larger amount than the rich man, and it means there will be no free list at all." Now, nobody but a lunatic escaped from an asylum could be guilty of making such a mistake as that.

Now, the hon. gentleman says that nobody but a lunatic would make such an assertion. That is about what the hon. gentleman for Russell said.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is clear enough.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. gentleman should apologise to the hon. member for Russell. The report continues :

A revenue tariff would not be under 15 per cent, on an average ; it would not be 15 per cent on everything. Some articles would pay more,

some less. Whether the average tariff be 15 or 15 or 17½ per cent,——

17½ per cent is not robbery, but 20 per cent is regular pillage :

—somewhere in that neighbourhood, it will be a tariff sufficiently high to enable us to derive a revenue sufficient for the purpose of carrying on the Government. We simply say that every dollar put on in addition is so much taken out of the pockets of those compelled to pay it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems all right.

Mr. WALLACE. If it means anything sensible, it means the present tariff policy of the Conservative party ; if it does not mean that it does not mean anything, or else it means uniform tariff on all goods, but calling the hon. member for Russell, who holds a different view, a lunatic, will not mend matters. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) alluded this afternoon to a speech made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this Parliament in 1891, when he said, we are going in for unrestricted reciprocity, just as his leader had said. He said they would never rest until they got it. He said the benefit to the farmers of Ontario—as was quoted by the hon. member for Centre Toronto—would amount to $10 per cultivated acre the very moment unrestricted reciprocity was given, which would mean $220,000,000 increase in the farm lands in one day, an increase of $30 upon each horse, which would be $37,000,000 increase in the value of horses, and in the same ratio about $30,000,000 increase in cattle and $15,000,000 in sheep, making a good deal more than $300,000,000 for Ontario. The hon. gentleman said further there would be a benefit equal to that amount probably derived by the other provinces. If $300,000,000 of benefit would accrue to Ontario, that system should certainly have been secured. But, Mr. Speaker, the question we should like to ask to-day is this : Those hon. gentlemen having stated that the farmers were going to have $600,000,000 placed in their hands by securing unrestricted reciprocity, and the hon. member for South Oxford, having stated that he knew what he was talking about when he made that statement, why have hon. gentlemen opposite abandoned that policy ? Why are the farmers not going to receive $600,000,000, as promised by those hon. gentlemen before the last elections ? Their leader stated that he would never weary of the fight until unrestricted reciprocity was obtained. Yet the party met two years afterwards in convention at Ottawa, 3,000 of them, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said, about 1,600 or 1,700 according to their own report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Two thousand five hundred.

Mr. CHARLTON. Two thousand five hundred by actual count.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I have the report here and the list of names. I cannot get more than 1,636 names, and hon. gentlemen opposite called the number 3,000, but that is not much exaggeration for them. This statement is according to their own report. Of course they will deny their own report if they want to use figures. But $600,000,000 were promised the farmers, who received the declaration of the hon. member for South Oxford that he would never rest day and night until they obtained it. The party, as I have said, held a convention less than two years afterwards. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) submitted a long resolution, covering about fifteen clauses, but there was not one line in it about unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, or continental free trade. Yet they have solemnly pledged themselves to unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union and continental free trade, just as solemnly as they have pledged themselves to a revenue tariff, which they do not understand, which the member for Queen's does not understand, and which no living man can understand. That was the policy of the Reform party at that time. I should like to know, and I think we are bound to ask them to explain why they have abandoned it. Was it because the general elections at that time, and more particularly the bye-elections which followed next year, when the subject was thoroughly discussed and the people had full opportunities to examine the question, and when in fact it was debated in the constituencies from one end of the country to the other, and the people investigated it as thoroughly as they ever did any subject that came before them, were decided against the party ? Was it because at the bye-elections almost every candidate the party put up was defeated that they abandoned the policy of unrestricted reciprocity and looked round for some new policy, a policy which they called tariff for revenue or some such name ? It was fortunate for the Dominion of Canada that they were not successful in 1891. It was fortunate for us——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. It was fortunate for us, I say—I speak as a Canadian loyal to our country, and perhaps this does not include the hon. gentleman who is interrupting—that the policy was not successful then. If it had been successful, we would have been in the same condition as the people of the United States have been since that period, with their hundreds of broken banks, and with their thousands of destroyed manufacturing establishments, and with their hundreds of thousands of people walking the streets without employment. We would have been experiencing all these evils if the party opposite had been successful in 1891, and were still further successful, if it may be called success, in obtaining an unrestrict-

ed reciprocity treaty with our neighbours to the south of us.

Mr. GILLMOR. Have they not got protection over there in the United States ?

Mr. WALLACE. They have not the judicious protection that we have here in Canada. Now, after the Liberal party passed that resolution, and after the leader of the Opposition had stated in Toronto and in Montreal that he is going to have free trade as they have it in England, what becomes of the happy family. I take a speech delivered by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and what does he say ? He says : We take no stock in this free trade as they have it in England ; I am not a free trader ; I believe in a policy of incidental protection. That is the doctrine of the member for South Brant. In his own words :

Protection was a policy of the Tory party, while with the Liberal party it was merely an incident.

According to him they were to have incidental protection, and while some of his political friends say, that they are to have a tariff for revenue, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), the ablest financial critic of them all, says : Oh, it is to be incidental protection ; the policy of the Liberal party is not free trade. He says still further :

The policy of the Liberal party was not free trade.

But, Sir, the leader of his party says "it is free trade, and free trade as they have it in England." The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), said still further :

He was amused at the efforts made to fasten free trade upon the Liberal party.

Well, who was trying to fasten free trade upon the Liberal party ? Was it not the leader of that party, and, therefore, is not this a criticism by the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) on his own leader. He says :

He was amused at the efforts made to fasten free trade upon the Liberal party. It was no part of the Liberal platform. The great Ottawa convention made no mention of free trade. It might be that in the Conservative party those high in authority may change the party policy at will. It was not so in the Liberal ranks. The convention at Ottawa had framed the Liberal party policy, and it was composed of 3,000 delegates.

Three thousand delegates ! That was a whopper, just like some of the other remarks. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) further says :

No leader in the Liberal party had ever attempted to set aside that platform, and no leader could, if he so desired.

What a nice time these gentlemen would have in their caucus, when one of their chief men states publicly that his leader dare not change the policy, and when that leader after changing it had to get up and defend his change of front.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What sort of a time had you in the caucus to-day ?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think we had such disturbing questions as these, and questions in which the policy of the party was interpreted in directly opposite ways by two of the leading lights of the party. Then, Sir, what does the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) say about the policy of the Liberal party. He says :

We do propose free trade with all the world.

But the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) says, that is not correct, and the hon. member appears to have the argument in his favour, for there was nothing said about free trade at the Ottawa convention. I have the convention resolution here, and although there are about twenty different clauses in it, it is like their resolution on reciprocity : it says pretty nearly nothing. "We do propose free trade with all the world," says the member for South Oxford. Let me ask, how do hon. gentlemen opposite account for the discrepancy between these two great men ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that all you are going to read from that ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have the whole speech here, but I do not think I will read it to-night.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are you reading from "La Minerve ?"

Mr. WALLACE. No ; I am reading from the "Globe" newspaper report of a speech delivered by the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there not something in that speech a little further on that qualifies that expression somewhat ?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, perhaps, I had better read what follows for the hon. gentleman, and before I read what follows, a little explanation might be interesting. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) had gathered a number of Liberal members of Parliament around Mr. Laurier and they went to the North-west together. There were about half a dozen of them, the member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) and some others, and they comprised a nice little troupe. The member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the leader of the Opposition, and a number of others, a different troupe ; but with the same leader had travelled through the province of Ontario. They had gone to these counties together, and Sir Richard Cartwright was making some comments on them, and he says—and this is what follows, and what qualifies the extract I have read from Sir Richard Cart-

wright's speech, and which the hon. member for North Norfolk wants to hear :

You may have observed also that several of these gentlemen are exceedingly anxious about my welfare, and apparently very much exercised over my doings. They cannot understand why I have not spoken here and why I have not spoken there, and, above all, why I am not always to be found within a yard of Mr. Laurier's elbow. Sir, it is very nice of them, I am sure, to take so much trouble on my behalf, and you may be sure I appreciate their disinterested kindness very thoroughly. Perhaps, were I to adopt King Solomon's advice as to dealing with a certain description of persons, I might remark that it is a well-established fact in natural history that wolves hunt in packs, but that lions most generally go alone.

Now, that is a fine expression for the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to use with regard to his own leader and his own colleagues who sit around him. He calls them wolves. What does the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) say to being called one of those ravenous wolves ? What has the member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) got to say about it ? What has the member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) to say ; and he is the hon. gentleman who planned these meetings, and these campaigns, and these nice little troupes, which Sir Richard Cartwright calls a menagerie. But, continues the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) :

I won't do that ; I will only observe that this entire minstrel troupe and Jamaica car combination.

Now, what do hon. gentlemen on the opposite side think about Sir Richard Cartwright calling his colleagues, not only a minstrel troupe and a menagerie, but "a Jamaica car combination" as well. I wonder whether in the Liberal caucus they made the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) apologize, or whether he refused to apologize ? Perhaps the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) could explain that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I shall be most happy to give any explanation the hon. gentleman asks for, and, perhaps, when I get through the Controller of Customs will give an explanation about his trip to Washington.

Mr. WALLACE. When I went to Washington, I did not go to sell our country to the Yankees, as some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House did.

An hon. MEMBER. Did you go to raise troops ?

Mr. WALLACE. I did not go there to get them to pass resolutions inimical and injurious to Canada, as the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did. I did not fraternize with men of the Farrar stamp, who were plotting and scheming to hand this country over to the United States. I was not one of those, like some members of the Reform party, who were assisting him in that traitorous act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you not go to Haldimand, it would look more loyal ?

Mr. WALLACE. Why did not the hon. gentleman go to South Grey during the last local election ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, but they told the hon. gentleman to stay away or the county would be lost. But he would not stay away, and he went surreptitiously to his riding, and the county was lost to the Grit party by 300 votes. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) had come out openly against the other candidate instead of surreptitiously, his political friend would have been beaten by 500 or 600.

An hon. MEMBER. He was beaten by 600.

Mr. WALLACE. Worse still. Any more remarks from the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) ?

Mr. GIBSON. Give us some more about the menagerie. I like to hear that.

Mr. WALLACE. I will hand the hon. gentleman the paper and he can read for himself the very interesting story that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells about him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to this new theory of the Opposition : "free trade as they have it in England." That is the latest. That is the key note of the speech delivered in Toronto, and in Montreal, and in Winnipeg, by the leader of the Opposition. He says they must have "free trade as they have it in England," and he is speaking principally for the benefit of the farmers. The leader of the Opposition knows that he has no chance among the artisans and the residents of the cities and towns of Canada, and so he is trying to make the farmers believe that it would be well for them to have free trade. Why, Mr. Speaker, free trade was agitated for and adopted in England, not because it was to be of benefit to the farmers, for it was runious to the farmers of England, but because it was to be a benefit to the manufacturers by providing them with cheap raw material, cheap food for their workmen. That was the great argument of the advocates of free trade in England. Now, let us see how it has worked ? I have here a speech of Lord Salisbury delivered last year at Trowbridge, and he says :

But because free trade is inevitable, I do not think on that account it is our duty to conceal from ourselves the harm and injury it has done, in addition to the advantages it has conferred, and it has undoubtedly been the ruin of a great part of this country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The landlords.

Mr. WALLACE. Before I sit down, I will show that it has gone beyond the landlords, and I may say that a policy that will ruin landlords will ruin their tenants as well. Now, I have in my hand a resolution which was moved in the British House of Commons on the 6th of February, 1895, by Mr. Jeffreys, and I will read that resolution to the House:

That we humbly represent to Your Majesty, that we view with the greatest apprehension the disastrous condition of the agricultural interest, and the prolonged depression of the textile and other industries, and the consequent increase in the number of the unemployed; and we humbly express our regret that Your Majesty's Ministers have shown no appreciation of the extreme gravity of the present situation.

That resolution was defeated, it is true, by 12 majority, but it was defeated because the leader of the Government, Sir William Harcourt, moved an amendment, in which he pledged the Government to appoint a select committee to make the investigation asked for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And your friends the Redmondites all voted for it.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman means; I do not suppose he knows himself; but if they voted for that resolution, I think they were about right. Mr. Chaplin, who has devoted himself more than any other leading statesman in England to that question, and who was chairman of the Board of Agriculture in the Conservative Government, spoke as follows:

What did seem strange to him was that, when they remembered what a deplorable condition the agricultural interest was in, when they knew that so many other interests were greatly depressed, and that vast numbers of people were being every day put out of employment, Her Majesty's Government showed no adequate sense of the urgency and gravity of the situation. It was quite impossible to exaggerate the gravity of the agricultural situation. It was reported that in almost every district of the country it was steadily and rapidly growing worse. The whole mass of the evidence taken before the Agricultural Commission, from witness after witness, teemed with statements to the effect that reductions in rent varying from 20 to 50 and to 80 per cent, and even up to 100 per cent, had been made throughout the country. And, further, it should be remembered that agriculture was not the only industry that was suffering at the present time. On the contrary, the great difficulty at the present day, unhappily, was to find one industry that was flourishing in any degree.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Harcourt, spoke as follows:

It declares, and it is unhappily too true, the deplorable depression of the agricultural interest. It is imputing to us not only want of heart, but want of sense, to suppose that we do not share with hon. gentlemen opposite their feeling of distress at the depression of the agricultural industry, and that, of course, is equally true of the textile and other industries of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to impute to us that we do not feel as strongly as they do the terrible condition of suffering, which we know at this moment is being endured by many thousands of our countrymen.

Mr. Fellowes said:

In Norfolk, between 1874 and 1894, the fall in the corn crop had involved a loss of three millions, and the loss of stock had been £384,000. The owners in that period had lost about £25 an acre, or £30,000,000: the farmers had lost £5 or £6 an acre, or £6,500,000. The yeoman farmer was almost extinct; and if the present state of affairs continued, the labourers would be thrown out of employment in hundreds. In Norfolk, between 1874 and 1894, the rent of best lands had fallen between 25 and 35 per cent; of the medium lands, between 40 and 60 per cent; while for light and poorer lands there was no rent at all, and many farms had been abandoned altogether.

That is the state of agriculture in England; that is the state to which hon. gentlemen opposite, if they had their way, would reduce the agricultural interest of this country.

Mr. GIBSON. Is that general throughout the British Islands?

Mr. WALLACE. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that it was general.

Mr. GIBSON. He said in England; he did not refer to Scotland at all, because it is not in that condition.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I am very glad to hear it. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose that we should have free trade in Canada as near as possible as it is in England, that is, that we should have the English tariff. They wish to convey the impression that there are no taxes in England. Why, the amount raised by taxes in England last year was $285,000,000. That was the amount of revenue collected.

Mr. GILLMOR. From trade.

Mr. WALLACE. From everything for the purposes of the general Government; it does not include local taxation at all. They raise 17¼ million dollars on tea and coffee, which in Canada are free, and 1¾ million dollars on fruits. Their total taxation amounted to $7.38 per head, at least $2 per head more than ours, and we have a great many important public works which we have found it necessary to construct to open up the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do they tax in England? I have an article here from an English magazine, "Temple Bar," which says:

Birth is taxed, marriage is taxed, death is taxed; the carriage we keep is taxed; the omnibus we ride in is taxed; the railway train we travel by is taxed; the house dog is taxed; everything we drink, wine, tea, coffee, is taxed; light is taxed; the linen we sleep on is taxed; the tobacco we smoke is taxed; the Christmas plum-pudding is taxed; our anti-bilious pills

are taxed; we have local rates, poor rates, county council rates, water rates, vestry rates; householders, lodgers, married and single men, women and children are all taxed in some form or other. "One-ninth of what everybody earns in this country," Lord Sherbrooke said, "goes in taxes; but the proportion is more now and is growing all the time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman wish the House to believe that that is correct? Has he verified its correctness? if not, why does he quote it?

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman deny its correctness?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, I do, so far as it alleges that they put a tax on linen.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has no information of the fact he is stating.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have in my hand the Statistical Abstract of the Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom for the year 1894.

Mr. WALLACE. Just read it where it says they do not tax linen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear

Mr. WALLACE. I have said that I am quoting what is in "Temple Bar." Now, I am going to quote what I will be responsible for myself. They impose a railway duty of nearly $1,500,000, so that if we had such a tax in Canada that amount would have to be obtained by an increase either of passengers' fares or of freight rates.

Mr. GILLMOR. That is good; the poor people do not have to pay them.

Mr. WALLACE. Men who carry guns have to pay half a million dollars, and if they kill game with them they have to pay $1,000,000. If a man keeps a carriage with four wheels, he has to pay £2 2s., on one horse he has to pay 1s. 1d. On a cart there is a tax of fifteen shillings—$3.75 to be paid by a man driving a cart along the road.

An hon. MEMBER. Good.

Mr. WALLACE. Our friend says, "good." Every man who keeps a dog has to pay, notwithstanding the local rate, 7s. 6d. to the British Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is better still.

Mr. WALLACE. Every dealer in almost every kind of article has to pay duty to the British Government. A probate duty of £4,823,000 is collected in England. If a man sells a piece of land he has to pay a tax to the Government, besides the conveyancing fees. That amounts to a total of £2,290,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Everything is all right. In addition to the lawyer's fees for conveyancing——

Mr. LISTER. Do you object to the lawyer's fee?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

An hon. MEMBER. The best system in the world.

Mr. WALLACE. It prevents real estate passing freely from hand to hand; it puts restrictions upon such transfers, it taxes every man owning a piece of land, of building his own house. Receipts and drafts pay a tax of £1,173,000, or more than $5,500,000. If you buy or sell goods of any description, and have to receive or give a receipt for over two pounds, that receipt must be stamped, and the revenue from that source in England is over $5,500,000. Trade is restricted in every direction. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite will say, good, again. When they were in power they put a duty on every promissory note and bill of exchange. It was a most annoying tax, not only for the tax itself, but because of its interference with trade, and the annoyance it caused. When the Conservatives came into power, they abolished that tax, and we have never heard any one ask for its reimposition. But hon. gentlemen say good again, that is all right. On inhabited houses—farm, lodging, and dwelling-houses—a further tax of £1,441,000 is levied, or $7,000,000. Every farmer has to pay, not only the local taxes, but a Government tax, for the privilege of living in a house. And this tax amounts, in the aggregate, to $7,000,000. Then, $17,250,000 are levied on tea and coffee, which here are absolutely free. All those other taxes amount to more than $2 a head higher than in Canada. That is the kind of taxation which the leader of the Opposition proposed, without any authority whatever, as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) said, because no one ever authorized him to enunciate any such policy.

Mr. LISTER. They have free sugar, though.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, we had free sugar until a few days ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. gentlemen say no. I was going to answer that these gentlemen do not know what they are talking about, but that would be adopting their own style of argument, and I will not do so. As soon as we abolished this duty on sugar, sugar dropped that amount exactly. We reduced the duty on granulated, and we abolished the duty on raw sugar, and the price fell to that extent.

Mr. LISTER. You said it was free, but it was not.

Mr. WALLACE. It was free. It was practically free in this country. There was not—I will not say a pound brought in, because that would not be correct. But last year there were 3,000,000 pounds brought in under a condition of trade which did not exist before, and about 1 per cent of

the sugar brought to this country paid the duty.

Mr. LISTER. The manufacturers got the duty.

Mr. WALLACE. No, they could not. If they had got the whole of the duty, there would have been as much brought in as was refined here, and there was only 1 per cent brought in in the most favourable year, and not a quarter of 1 per cent in other years. But these gentlemen may disavow free trade as they have it in England just as they have disavowed all their other policies. The resolution before the House appears to have that object in view, and there is no doubt that the leader of the Opposition has been hauled over the coals for enunciating such an absurd policy, not ratified or approved by the convention at all. Therefore, they are hedging, and now they call it a tariff for revenue. We have had the benefit of this tariff for revenue during the five years the Reform party were in power, and it did not produce revenue, as we all know. I will tell you what it did produce. It encouraged trade with the United States as against Great Britain, and against our own country. I will quote one article. In 1874 the amount of tea imported from the United States was $49,000 worth. In 1878, after they had been four years in power, they imported from the United States, $1,250,000 worth, and only Great Britain to the value of $1,700,000, and $117,000 worth was imported direct by Canadians. In 1874 tea was imported from Great Britain to the value of $1,700,000 and in 1878 there was just a million dollars worth imported. Now, the result was this, that the trade in tea was almost entirely being transferred to the United States, and away from our own country. That was the case with many other articles of which I have a list here. Hats, caps, manufactures of iron, rubber, paper, wool, cotton. Let me refer specially to cotton. We imported from the United States, in 1874, manufactured cottons to the extent of $906,894, and in 1878, notwithstanding the hard times and shrinkage of business, we imported from the United States, $2,488,235 worth, so that the imports increased almost three-fold during those years. In 1894, the importations of those goods from the United States had gone back to $889,676, or nearly the figures of 1874. What was the case as regards Great Britain. In 1874 our importations of cotton goods from Great Britain amounted to $10,264,273, and in 1878 to $4,401,994, or the imports had shrunk more than one-half, while from the United States they had increased three-fold. The effect of that was that the direct importations were going away from Canada to the United States, the manufacturing business was being transferred from Great Britain to the United States, and the United States were getting the benefit. That was the result of the hon. gentleman's policy of tariff for revenue. Take all these articles I have mentioned, and the imports entered for consumption from the United States amounted, in 1874, to $5,291,418; in 1878, to $8,695,279; and in 1894, to $7,589,568. From Great Britain the amount entered for consumption in 1874 was $27,729,357. In 1878 this had shrunk to $15,733,277, or a srinkage of $12,000,000. And in 1894 it increased to $17,958,497. That is the general result of this policy of tariff for revenue purposes. Comparing 1874 with 1878, we find that the imports from the United States increased 63 per cent, and from Great Britain they decreased 44 per cent; whereas, in 1894 the imports from the United States decreased 13 per cent, and from Great Britain they increased 14 per cent.

	Entered for Consumption.					
	From United States.			From Great Britain.		
	1874.	1878.	1894.	1874.	1878.	1894.
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Hats and caps	315,273	674,942	331,938	613,125	368,422	856,034
Manufactures of iron	2,797,741	2,437,032	4,709,503	2,478,827	837,295	3,528,164
do rubber	120,891	188,420	214,109	73,502	55,924	273,506
do paper	358,477	534,209	647,835	800,552	501,319	361,520
do wool	205,398	402,401	168,825	10,999,450	8,007,368	8,032,111
do cotton	906,894	2,488,235	889,676	10,264,273	4,401,994	3,184,970
Boots and shoes	146,131	207,969	194,836	84,240	29,364	13,995
Furniture	311,476	386,924	223,618	13,111	12,083	39,003
Oil cloths	49,712	69,383	33,974	117,193	62,339	176,224
China and crockery	29,994	55,494	58,241	568,201	412,999	477,554
Tea	49,431	1,250,180	117,013	1,716,793	1,044,160	1,075,416
Totals	5,291,418	8,695,279	7,589,568	27,729,357	15,733,277	17,958,497

Comparing 1874 and 1879—
Imports from United States increased 63 p. c.
do Great Britain decreased 44 p. c.

Comparing 1878 and 1894—
Imports from United States decreased 13 p. c.
do Great Britain increased 14 p. c.

An hon. MEMBER. What did that ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Conservative policy which was more favourable to Great Britain, whereas the Grit policy was more favourable to the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have discriminated against Great Britain.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has not been listening to the figures.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman's tariff discriminates practically against Great Britain, and he denies that.

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose we had had a Grit tariff in force to-day ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. We would not have had a deficit.

Mr. WALLACE. I will tell you what you would have had. On tea and coffee and sugar we would have had a revenue of $8,557,000. I have the figures here, but will not trouble the House with reading them. And, if we took that tariff to-day, there would not be a deficit of $4,500,000, but there would be a surplus of $4,000,000. But, Mr. Speaker, that would be a tax upon the people. A tariff levied upon any article that cannot be produced in this country is a burden upon the people.

Mr. GILLMOR. Are not all taxes a burden upon the people ?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. What, taxation not a burden ?

Mr. WALLACE. No. The tax on tea was over $1,000,000, on coffee, $60,000, on sugar, $7,440,000. These are taxes upon articles that cannot be produced in this country and would necessarily be a burden upon the people.

Mr. LISTER. But the country gets the whole of the tax ; it all goes into the treasury.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. Hon. gentlemen say that we have not reduced taxation. Why we have made free 189 articles that formerly were dutiable.

Mr. GIBSON. Name them.

Mr. WALLACE. I will furnish the hon. gentleman the list, but I may name a few :—Coal tar and coal pitch and coke, formerly dutiable are now free ; copper in pigs, bars, rods and bolts ; copper ingots ; copper sheating, not planished or coated ; drugs, crude, such as barks, beans, berries, and a long list, formerly dutiable at 20 per cent are now free ; logwood and fustic ; patent prepared dyes ; flax fibre, scutched or hackled ; steel masts for ships ; flax or hemp yarn for manufacture of carpets, etc. ; olive oil for manufacturing purposes ; platinum sheets ; plumbago crucibles ; salt from the United Kingdon or British possessions ; saltpetre and a number of raw materials for manufactures ; timber and woods of various descriptions ; zinc, seamless drawn tubing, and a hundred other articles.

Mr. LISTER. Are diamonds free ?

Mr. WALLACE. Diamonds were free before. They were free when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. They are free only under certain conditions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did you get any revenue from these articles ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. Hundreds of thousands of dollars. What was the opinion of these hon. gentlemen when they were in power. I have a report here, Mr. Speaker, made when the Hon. Isaac Burpee was Minister of Customs in 1875. These were his views, and evidently the views of the Reform party of that day. He says :

> It will be observed that the per capita taxation has steadily increased every year, ranging from $2.62 in 1868 to $3.93 in 1874. This circumstance, however, only proves that the increase in the commerce of the country has exceeded, in proportion, the increase of population, and is really one striking evidence of steadily increasing general prosperity.

I have just referred to the list of goods free to-day that were dutiable last year. There is even a larger list, Mr. Speaker, upon which the duties have been materially reduced. And more than that, I make this statement, that in last year's revision of the tariff, except, perhaps, incidentally no articles were made dutiable at a higher rate than before. But there is no article I can recollect the duty on which has been increased over what it was, while hundreds of articles have been decreased. Among them the following :—Wall paper shows a reduction of about 40 per cent ; illuminating oil, 16⅔ per cent——

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the average duty on wall paper ?

Mr. WALLACE. It is now 40 per cent less than it was before.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was it before ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not going into more details. I submit these statements, and I challenge contradiction. Barrels containing oil are reduced 50 per cent. Linseed oil is reduced 33⅓ per cent ; school slates 53⅓ per cent ; harness and saddlery are reduced from 35 to 30 per cent duty ; iron slabs, blooms, loops and puddled bars, being the raw materials of manufacture, are reduced from $9 to $5 per ton. Bar iron is reduced from $13 to $10 per ton ; iron sheets from $13 to $5 per ton, which is a reduction of from 75 to 80 per cent in the duty. Chains of certain dimensions are reduced from 30 per cent to 5 per cent ad valorem ; clothes wringers are reduced by about 20 or 30 per cent ; and, as hon. gentlemen know the re-

duction on agricultural implements is from 35 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem. The reduction on shovels and spades is about 30 per cent; on hay knives about 30 per cent; pronged forks, 27½ per cent and garden rakes 30 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the aggregate amount of these reductions? Will they reduce the revenue?

Mr. WALLACE. It will be impossible to state exactly in figures to what extent they will reduce the revenue. On buggies and carriages we have reduced the duty by 50 per cent; on farm and freight wagons, 50 per cent; on cotton seamless bags, 25 per cent. On woollen clothes we have reduced the rate very materially. With reference to cotton goods it was stated, I think, by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who had made elaborate calculations that the duty on cotton goods under the old tariff was 41½ per cent. The duty on cotton goods now is 22½ per cent 25 per cent or 30 per cent, the average being perhaps 25 or 26 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. The average is 29 per cent.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman cannot tell what the average will be under the new tariff, because the year is not up and the returns are not in. Hon. gentlemen say, what about the taxation? We have gone into enormous enterprises; we have built railways, we have dug canals, we have opened up this country; and yet we have not increased the taxes or the percentage of taxes very materially. Now, Sir, in 1850, forty-five years ago, when this country had invested in canals to a very limited extent, and had spent very little money in public enterprises, what was the average rate of taxation in that year? First, let me say that in 1894, the average rate of taxation was 15·69 per cent: in 1878, 13·75. That was a taxation that did not produce revenue, it did not produce nearly enough revenue to enable the country to pay its way. This year the rate for the first six months was 15 per cent. But I am not going to quote that 15 per cent, because an incomplete year may give an incomplete idea, therefore, I will not quote that as bearing upon the case. But last year the average rate of taxation was 15·69 per cent upon importations made into Canada; whereas in 1878, when the Government did not nearly pay their way, the rate was 13·75. In 1850, when, as I say, there was little money invested in public enterprises, the average rate of taxation was 14·5. To-day more than 40 per cent of our importations are free goods; then there were only 7 per cent free. The imports in that year amounted to 17 million dollars, the duty to $2,462,000, and the ad valorem rate was 14·5 per cent upon all the goods. There were $1,176,000 of free goods, and $15,705,000 of dutiable goods. So, Sir, in forty-five years, during which Canada has done more, perhaps, than any other five millions of people in opening up and developing their immense empire, we have increased the taxable rate upon the people of Canada, that is to say, upon the imports of Canada, only about 1 per cent. Yet those hon. gentlemen tell us we are rushing the country into debt, that we are increasing the burdens of the people. The people to-day are more able to pay 15½ per cent than they were forty-five years ago to pay the half of that, or 7¾ per cent, yet at that time they paid 14·5 per cent. I say that is proof that we have not imposed a great burden upon the people of Canada. But we have put higher duties upon luxuries. I have a statement here, showing that in 1878, for instance, the average rate of duty on luxuries was 30¼ per cent: the average rate of duty on luxuries to-day is 50 per cent. The duties upon those luxuries amounted then to $2,400,000; to-day they amount to more than double that sum, or $5,00,000, showing that we have judiciously imposed those taxes so as to make the heaviest burdens fall upon those articles of luxury on which people can well afford to pay the higher impost. Those articles are of various kinds—fancy goods, manufactures of gold and silver, jewellery, musical instruments, paintings, engravings, spirits, wines, tobaccos, toys, silks, velvets, perfumes, fancy soaps, tobacco pipes, and so on, amounting to nearly 10 millions altogether, in 1893, whereas they amounted to only $7,400,000 in 1878.

Mr. GIBSON. Valuable paintings, considered as works of art, come in free.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Just the same as they did in 1878.

Mr. WALLACE. Canada is the only country on the face of the earth to-day whose foreign trade has increased in the last five years. Great Britain's trade has decreased £66,277,000, or $325,000,000. The trade of the United States has decreased from $1,647,000,000 to $1,547,000,000, or exactly one million dollars. The trade of Canada has increased from $218,000,000 to $241,000,000, or an increase of $22,390,000. You cannot find any other country in the world whose foreign trade has increased during those five years. Another test of trade and commerce is the clearing house returns. I think it is almost an infallible test as it represents exactly the business of a country. The city of New York does 74 per cent of the Customs and import business of the whole United States, and the clearing house business decreased 22 per cent; whereas in the city of Montreal it decreased only 4 per cent. That is a fair test of the business as between the two countries during the last year. It has been made a reproach against us that our policy has discriminated against foreign shipping. Well, what are the facts? In 1882 the foreign shipping in

the port of Montreal amounted to 554,000 tons; in 1894 it amounted to 1,096,000 tons, or almost twice as much as in 1882. The imports of raw material are about as good a test of the progress of manufacturing industries as you can find. I have a list of those imports, as follows:—Logs and lumber, raw furs, hides, wool, grease, raw silk, broom corn, hemp, raw tobacco, raw cotton, gutta percha, jute cloth, crude rubber, rags, coal, tin blocks and sheets. These amounted to $8,947,000 in 1878, and in 1894 to $23,219,000 or an increase of 259 per cent. The details are as follows:—

IMPORTS OF RAW MATERIALS TO ILLUSTRATE GROWTH OF MANUFACTURES.

	1878.	1894.
Logs and Lumber	$ 634,568	$1,407,389
Raw furs	142,899	627,678
Hides	1,207,300	1,866,333
Wool	1,106,210	1,085,254
Grease	89,275	228,564
Raw silk	32,004	203,040
Broom corn	89,954	121,279
Hemp	278,299	482,289
Raw tobacco	711,129	1,753,992
Raw cotton	817,559	2,902,993
Gutta percha	187,234	199,331
Jute cloth	.....	298,813
Crude rubber	.....	718,254
Rags	92,179	191,660
Coal	3,054,846	9,895,640
Tin, blocks and sheets	504,125	1,236,901
Totals	$8,947,581	$23,219,410

Increase, 259 per cent.

This does not represent the whole of the increase of the trade of the country and work of the country, because raw materials are cheaper now than they were in 1878, and, therefore, to that extent the increase does not represent the additional work given to the Canadian artisan. Now, Sir, let me say that the farmer of this country is the one who requires, and who receives, the most protection. I have here a partial list of the imports of farm products in 1894, amounting to $3,200,000, the duty on which amounted to $690,000, or 23 per cent. In the year 1878 the imports of those same farm products amounted to $15,773,000, but the most of those articles paid no duty. I think I am correct in saying that on not one of them——

Mr. CHARLTON. Were they grains entirely?

Mr. WALLACE. Eggs, flax, undressed flax seeds, barley, oats, pease, beans, rye, indian corn, wheat, other grains, flour of wheat, flour of rye, indian meal, oatmeal, all other meal, hides, horns, pelts and wool, all duty free. In 1878 these articles, the importations of these articles, as I say, amounted to $15,773,000. Most of them are dutiable to-day, and the imports, leaving out hides and wool, would amount to less han $1,500,000. If the duties were not payable on those articles, we would be overwhelmed with the product of the United States.

FREE FARM PRODUCTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION IN 1878 IN CANADA.

		Imports, 1878.		Imports, 1894.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			$		$
Eggs	Doz.	32,322	7,283	83,312	14,029
Flax, undressed	Cwt.	76	407	.....	.....
Flax seed	Bush.	14	39	.....	.....
Barley	"	302,147	137,243	3,320	1,567
Oats	"	2,162,292	651,441	177,113	59,428
Pease and beans	"	9,589	18,729	7,657	11,328
Rye	"	146,823	77,398	327	229
Indian corn	"	7,387,507	3,535,619	990,069	683,877
Wheat	"	5,635,411	6,510,148	60,773	25,329
Other grain	"	730	611	84	81
Flour of wheat	Brls.	314,520	1,866,101	32,506	97,150
do rye	"	1,883	8,655	328	1,071
Indian meal	"	226,050	619,380	137,828	296,766
Oatmeal	"	2,949	22,226	157,001	4,296
Meal, all other	"	1,615	4,909	.....	1,444
Hides, horns and pelts	$	.....	1,207,300	.....	1,976,132
Wool	Lbs.	6,230,084	1,106,210	7,165,986	1,085,319
Total		.....	15,773,699	.....	4,258,046

I have heard hon. gentlemen make statements in this House during the last two or three days, which show that they have not been reading their daily "Globe" very diligently. I have an extract from the "Globe." The hon. member for Russell said to-night, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said the other night, and the statement has been repeated by several members of the Opposition, that no duty imposed is of

any benefit to Canadian farmers, and I think the hon. member for Huron quoted Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, and quoted him approvingly, when he said that "you could not raise the price of grain in this country a quarter of a cent a bushel by any system of protection." In the "Globe" of May 11th, I find the following :—

There has been a good demand for wheat for milling, and, owing to the small stocks of Ontario wheat, the market is very firm. There have been sales of winter wheat as high as 86 cents at Ontario points, and now there is no talk of bringing in United States red winter wheat, which, it is said, has been offered, laid down at an Ontario mill, duty paid at 85 cents.

So they pay 15 cents per bushel duty, and lay it down here and undersell Canadian wheat by one cent per bushel.

Mr. McMULLEN. Owing to a corner in wheat.

Mr. LISTER. What wheat is there to sell in Ontario ?

Mr. WALLACE. No one can tell. A farmer had his barn burned last night, and he had 500 bushels of wheat in it. There is sufficient wheat, however, to keep our mills going and to feed the Canadian people. The "Globe" gives the quotations :

	Toronto.	Buffalo.	Detroit.	Chicago.
Spring wheat...	85c.	70c.	67¼c.	62⅞-63

Mr. CHARLTON. How is the market for barley ?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman can quote the figures when he speaks.

Mr. LISTER. How did the markets compare six months ago, or even three months ago ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not speaking of the markets at that time. The "Globe" continues :

	Toronto.	Buffalo.	Detroit.	Chicago.
No. 2 hard....	88	71½	71	
Oats	35-35½	....	....	28⅛-28⅜

Mr. CHARLTON. The price is 39 cents in Oswego.

Mr. WALLACE. But it was 28 cents in Chicago, and it costs less than two cents to bring it from Chicago to Oswego.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Chicago quotation is wrong.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quoting from the "Globe" newspaper. It continues :

	Toronto.		Chicago.
Heavy mess pork	$15.75	....	$12.02-$12-12

It will cost 40 cents per barrel to bring it to Toronto from Chicago. The duty is $4. and so the Canadian farmer gets $3.25 of the $4 duty on the article of mess pork.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the price of live hogs ?

Mr. WALLACE. We have hogs here, I am afraid.

Mr. McMULLEN. They are all on that side.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not say that on every article on which we impose a duty we enhance the price to the full extent of the duty ; but hon. gentlemen opposite cannot mention any time that the Canadian farmers do not get the benefit of the protective policy on their farm products. The "Globe" says we do not use an umbrella unless it rains ; that we do not need to use an umbrella unless there is need for it. But a man, because he has an umbrella and it does not happen to rain, does not sell it or dispose of it, but he keeps it for the day when it will be required. We keep the National Policy for the time it is required. To-day there is a large amount of protection on articles raised by the Canadian farmer. To-morrow there may not be so much, but there may be a large protection on other articles. Therefore, the National Policy protects the Canadian farmer, and no men know it better than hon. gentlemen opposite, because last year when we were readjusting the tariff, and in many cases increasing it, not a word of protest was uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) urged that a much larger increase be made in the duty on certain articles.

Mr. CHARLTON. On what goods ?

Mr. WALLACE. On canned goods : on tomatoes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Tomatoes were never spoken of. Peaches were referred to.

Mr. WALLACE. Canned fruits and vegetables are all in the one list and have the same rate of duty, and on those goods the hon. gentleman urged there should be a much larger duty imposed, although we had a very high duty. There is no part of the community who have received a greater advantage from the National Policy and the policy of protection than the farmers of Canada ; and nobody knows it better than hon. gentlemen opposite, because they dare not move a resolution to remove the protection given to Canadian farmers. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) will have an opportunity to move a resolution to carry out the prayer of the petition which, it is understood, he is about to present, which will be the only way which he can give effect to it. Let him move such a resolution, if he dare. Neither he nor the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who is the only free trader on that side of the House, would dare to move such a resolution, and they would not vote for it even if they were

moved. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told this House that there was not a single article of farm product which had been increased since 1878, except cheese. Cheese has decreased in price since that time.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the face of the National Policy ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, cheese has decreased. The export price of cheese in 1878 was 10½ cents, and in 1894 it was 10 cents, a pretty good price still. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns which, are a fair criterion of value, horses have increased from $89.80 in 1878, to $108 in 1894, an increase of 20 per cent. Cattle increased from $38.50 in 1878, to $75.50 in 1894, an increase of 99 per cent. Sheep had increased from $2.87 in 1878, to $3.56 in 1894, an increase of 24 per cent. Butter has increased from 18⅓ cents per pound in 1878, to 19¾ cents per pound in 1894, an increase of 7¾ per cent. Eggs have increased 15 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Eggs.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, eggs have increased in value and in export quantity. In 1878 they were 12 cents a dozen, and now they are worth 13·08 cents per dozen, an increase of 15 per cent. Bacon increased 27 per cent.; hams increased 16 per cent; pork decreased 23 per cent; barley decreased 25 per cent; oats decreased 7 per cent; peas decreased 15 per cent; wheat decreased 46 per cent; potatoes increased 6 per cent. Hay was $9.47 a ton in 1878, and is now $9.54, so that it has remained about stationary. We exported more eggs in the last two years than we did in the years 1877 and 1878, and we exported a great deal more of nearly all the agricultural products. Our exports last year to the United States amounted to less than $7,000,000, while to Great Britain our exports were more than six times greater, or over $40,000,000, and the year before that they were $42,500,000. The policy of the Conservative Government has been to cultivate the British market. The policy of the Reform party is to try and cultivate the United States market. They are to-day advocating trade with the United States, notwithstanding the fact that every farmer in this country knows that the farmers of the United States are producing in larger quantities than they require for their home consumption, and that they are exporting enormous quantities of the very product that the Canadian farmers have to export.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many potatoes did they export ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) have a little manners ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. All this is not Parliamentary at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) does not know any better, you must excuse him.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I did not know more than you, I would get outside.

Mr. WALLACE. These gentlemen opposite have been telling us in the past that we are discredited, defeated, frightened, out-of-our-lives- party. Well, I remember a speech delivered by the Hon. Edward Blake, at Malvern, in 1887.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a rest, we have had that often enough.

Mr. COCHRANE. Take your medicine.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) did not read that I am quite sure. Mr. Blake, speaking of the Conservative party, said :

> We want to win in our struggle for the preservation of our national life. We shall win, any way.

Well, they did not win, and then they had another election and they did not win then, and they had an election before that and they did not win, and they have had an election since and they did not win then. The party of hon. gentlemen opposite are desperate now. They are more desperate than ever before, more hungry for office, more ravenous, more unscrupulous——

Mr. LISTER. If you were not hungry for office you should have got out when you made that speech to the Orangemen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen must not address one another like that. They must address themselves to the Chair first, and any member making a remark, I think, should take off his hat.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, Sir, you will not succeed in your efforts to make these gentlemen respect the rules of the House. They have never done it yet, and they never will. I say, Sir, that members of the Liberal party have become more desperate year by year. They are more unscrupulous in their attacks on the Government, but, Sir, I venture to say that as the predictions they made in the past were not successful, neither will the predictions they are making to-day be successful, and when we go to the country——

Mr. McMULLEN. When will that be ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Time enough for you.

Mr. WALLACE. I say, Sir, that when we go to the country, and when we discuss these questions before the electors, the Conservative party will return to power stronger than ever in the confidence of the people of Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I desire to rise to a personal explanation. I am very glad to say that I am able to enumerate on the other side of the House a very large number indeed of personal friends, and so far as I am concerned, I have the enmity of none. On no account would I drag a personal matter into this House as applying to any member of it, and more especially would I refrain from doing so if the personal insinuation were perfectly untrue. There can be no question at all but that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), who has just taken his seat, cast a very serious reflection upon me in this House to-night. I now state upon my honour as a member of this House, that ever since I employed labour I never paid a man in scrip, nor ever paid a man in anything else but cash. I never bought a product that I did not pay for in cash, and my men are paid regularly in cash, and paid in nothing else. The statement that the Controller (Mr. Wallace) made to-night results entirely from a campaign that has been going on in Russel for the past four years by my opponent. Now, I do not wish to make challenges, but I will say this: If any gentleman will make that statement outside of this House, above his name, in a newspaper, or otherwise, I will take action against him, and prove that the statement is entirely untrue.

Mr. WALLACE. As I understand the hon. member for Russel (Mr. Edwards), he says that the same statement is being made in the county of Russell.

Mr. LAURIER. And what of that?

Mr. WALLACE. He says himself that it is made by his political opponents in the county of Russell. It is made through the newspaper press, and, as far as I have heard, he has not taken any action. He has not contradicted the statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. When I take an action I will take an action against a responsible party, and I will not take an action against an irresponsible and unworthy newspaper.

Mr. WALLACE. I can only say, that a man's reputation does not depend upon whether a newspaper is worth money or not. This statement has been made in the public press, and it has gone uncontradicted. I have no desire to do an injustice to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. CARGILL. Mr. Speaker, being somewhat conversant with the lumbering industry in this country, having been engaged for some years in that line myself, and being somewhat familiar with the way in which the manufacturers of this country conduct their business, I must say that if, as I understand, Mr. Edwards has an extensive store in connection with his lumbering and agricultural industries at Rockland; if he does pay his hands all in cash instead of giving goods out of the store monthly and settling up with them at the end of each month, and paying them the balance of wages due for each month's labour; he is conducting his business in a very exceptional manner to that in which other lumbering industries are carried on in this country.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no objection, but I understood that the question was settled.

Mr. LISTER. No; the Controller has not withdrawn the charge.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I made no charge.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman made an insinuation, which is just as bad.

Mr. WALLACE. I have said that statements have been made in the papers. The hon. member for Russell says that the statements are being circulated in his own county, where those mills are, and where their operations are known. I have no desire to do an injustice of any kind to the hon. member for Russell, or to any other hon. member of this House. I heard of those statements, I knew they were uncontradicted, and I think that if statements of that kind are permitted to go uncontradicted, it is justifiable to use them.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there is no place where an hon. gentleman's statement should be taken more freely than in the Dominion House of Commons.

Mr. WALLACE. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, but he has made a further statement. I do not wish to contradict a statement made by a member of this House with reference to himself.

Mr. EDWARDS. The insinuation is still there. As the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) has stated, we have a store at Rockland. I came there in 1868, when there was no population there above perhaps twelve people, and I was obliged to establish a store. But at no time since our business has been carried on there has that store been conducted on any other than a cash basis. In the store we keep no accounts whatever, and we have never bought for barter or for anything but cash. I saw the statement in an Ottawa paper, but I did not think it worth consideration, because the people who know best, the people who reside in Rockland, know that that statement is perfectly untrue. When the statement is made in this House I think it is perfectly right for me to deny it, and my denial should be accepted at once.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. Controller of Customs will admit, and everybody will admit, that if a member of Parliament were to take notice of everything published against him in the newspapers, the life of a member of Parliament would not be worth living. It is just as well to ignore all those things which appear in the newspapers against any member. But when such statements have the endorsement of a man occupying the position of Controller of Customs, they acquire an importance which gives my hon. friend the right to resent it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, there is now nothing before the House but the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood that the hon. Controller of Customs wanted to withdraw the statement after the denial of the hon. member for Russell.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the hon. gentleman stated that he accepted unreservedly the statements made by the hon. member for Russell; that is all he can do.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. MASSON moved:

That the time for presenting private Bills be extended to Tuesday, 28th May instant.

Mr. TISDALE. Before that motion is adopted, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that only two sessions ago, on a recommendation from the Committee on Railways and Canals, the time for the reception of private Bills was doubled; and a special direction was given to the Clerk of the House to give notice of that change in the advertisement with regard to the standing orders of the House, and also to send a circular to every solicitor or other person advertising a private Bill, calling attention to the change, with the view that there should be a definite period in the session when the committees would know what business was coming before them. This is the last day for the reception of private Bills, and, while I do not object to any Bill being introduced after this date on its own merits, I certainly do object to extending the time for the reception of all private Bills for two weeks. At the present time I understand that there are only a few Bills which have exceeded the time limit. By refusing to pass this motion, the House would be making a beginning of the enforcement of its rules with reference to private Bills legislation, which it is necessary to adhere to if the committees are not to be congested with business, as they were last session. Last session the Railway Committee had to meet three times a week or else neglect the business coming before it, although early in the session there would have been ample time to attend to it if hon. gentlemen had observed the rules. I therefore object to this motion being passed. Let each Bill that comes before us stand on its own merits as to whether we should set aside the rules in its favour or not.

Mr. MASSON. I undersand that there are six or eight Bills not yet introduced, and they are not such as will congest the business of the Railway Committee or any other committee. While it was suggested that an enlargement might be made for a week only, next week will be a broken one in consequence of the Queen's Birthday and another holiday, and it was considered better to make one enlargement to the 28th, it being understood that at that time all the Bills now in sight would be introduced.

Mr. AMYOT. Moreover, the Senate is not sitting at present, so that we cannot present the Bills there.

Mr. LAURIER. I, for my part, quite endorse the remarks of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). It seems to me that it is not only lowering the dignity of the House, but largely discounting the utility of the private legislation of this Parliament if we allow the rules to be broken as soon as they are made. There should be a closer adherence to the rules that we have laid down. It might perhaps be too much to expect an absolute adherence to those rules under all circumstances; but I submit that after the time which Parliament has decreed for the introduction of private legislation has expired, no legislation should be introduced unless good reason is shown. In most cases these Bills are presented without any reason being given why they have not been presented before. If Parliament adhered to its rules more strictly in this respect, there would be greater diligence on the part of the

public in having private Bills introduced in time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would add that in my experience a good many of these Bills are delayed purposely, and from motives which are not very respectable. Over and over again I have known Bills to be brought forward at a late period and hurried through the House without due notice being given to parties whose interests are affected by them. I think the practice of extending the time, particularly when the House sits late, is very objectionable indeed, and for my part I would be disposed to refuse at this time, which is about the time Parliament usually rises, any extension unless good cause be shown.

Mr. SCRIVER. I may say, as a member of the Committee on Standing Orders, that in every instance in which the right to present a preliminary petition has been granted, the committee took great pains to inquire into the cause of the delay. And in every instance coming within my knowledge, plausible reasons, if not insuperable ones, were given for the delay. I can assure my hon. friend that the committee is not wanting in care in regard to this matter, and in due regard for its own dignity and for the rules of the House ; and I think the committee can be trusted not to set aside any rule without reasonable cause.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that by granting these long delays we certainly minimize the rule of the House which is intended for a certain and well defined purpose. I do not want to enter into a debate upon this matter, but I have simply this suggestion to make : That, as the committee have looked into the matter and have made their report, we might allow it to go, but with the condition that it shall be understood that hereafter these long general delays shall not be granted ; and, if the business is not here according to the rules, each special case must stand upon its own merits ; if it has strong merits the House will take them into account. It really is dallying with the rules of the House, and with the other business of the House, to have these constant delays and postponements in the items of private Bills. I think that, under the circumstances, we might allow the committee's report to be adopted for this time.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES.

Mr. McALISTER moved that that portion of rule 49 which limits the time for presenting petitions for private Bills be suspended in reference to the petition of the Grand Falls Water-Power and Boom Company for an act of incorporation, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object specially to the hon. gentleman's motion, for I do not know much about the merits of the Bill. But I may take occasion to remind the leader of the House that we have time and time and time again heard excellent declarations from the treasury benches that this thing should not be repeated, and time and time and time again we have seen these good resolutions broken. I would recommend the hon. Minister, if he wants peace in future, to make an example this time at any rate and to refuse point-blank to extend the time that he has at present fixed upon. Were that done once, I make no doubt whatever you would find the promoters of private Bills would take the hint and we should not have any more of these delays.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. member what is the special reason why this particular request for delay is made ?

Mr. McALISTER. The reason in this case is that one of the promoters——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Excuse me, what is the name of the company, and where is its headquarters ?

Mr. McALISTER. The name of the company is the Grand Falls Water-Power and Boom Company, with headquarters at Grand Falls, in Victoria County, N.B. The reason for asking for the delay is that one of the petitioners, and promoters of the Bill, Mr. Proctor, an American, has been delayed by illness and was unable to attend in time to getting the petition forwarded. The cause of delay is given in the petition asking for an extension of time.

Mr. SCRIVER. I believe that in this case all the forms have been complied with, but that the delay was simply in the presentation of the petition.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. AMYOT moved that that portion of rule 49 which limits the time for presenting petitions for private Bills be suspended in reference to the petition of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company for amendments to their act of incorporation, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman as to the special reason for delay in this case.

Mr. AMYOT. The reason is that the president of the company, which is already incorporated by local charter, after preparing all the papers and signing them, went to New York to make some financial arrangements, trusting his secretary, in his absence, to send the papers forward. But the secretary fell sick and the president, on his return

from New York, found that nothing had been done.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Act to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Northrup.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Canada Insurance Promotion Association.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act 57-58 Victoria, chap. 51, intituled an Act to further amend the Fisheries Act. He said: The Act passed last year requires every case of lobster to be painted with the name of the packer and the date. This has been found impracticable, and we now provide, by this measure, that every case of lobster shall instead have attached to it a label, signed by the Commissioner of Fisheries, certifying that the lobsters are Canadian and have been packed in the proper season. This label can be attached at the close of the fishing season to all packages remaining in stock.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POST OFFICE, LENKLETTER, P. E. I.

Mr. YEO asked, Has a petition been received from the people of Lenkletter Road, township seventeen, Prince Edward Island, asking that a post office be established at that place? If so, has the petition been referred to the inspector for his report? Has he reported, and is it the intention to comply with the prayer of the petitioners?

Mr. FOSTER. Such petition has not been received.

MR. HENRY LOW.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether Mr. Henry Low is employed by the Government? If so, in what department, at what duties, and what salary?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not employed by the Government.

LOUIS ZENOPHILE MALLETTE.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Monet) asked, Whether the Government were officially notified that Louis Zenophile Mallette was associated in the building of the Langevin block?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract for the construction of the new departmental buildings on Wellington street was signed by A. Charlebois alone. On the 17th August last, Messrs. McIntyre, Code & Orde transmitted a letter from Messrs. Robidoux, Geoffrion & Chenevert, notifying the Government not to pay any money to A. Charlebois without the written consent of his partner, L. Z. Mallette, and, on the 2nd September following, Messrs. Robidoux, Geoffrion & Chenevert, have sent to the department a document, purporting to be a copy of a declaration of partnership between Charlebois and Mallette. These are all the documents in this matter in the department.

OFFER OF CANADIAN TROOPS TO ENGLAND.

Mr. RIDER asked, Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government that the Canadian High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, did, during the past year, publicly announce that the Canadian Government had offered to send troops to England in case of a war with France, or with any other foreign power? Did the Government ever offer to send Canadian troops out of the country for war purposes?

Mr. DICKEY. In answer to the first question, no. In answer to the second, the Government did on one occasion offer to the Imperial authorities a portion of the permanent corps for garrison duty.

SHIPMENTS OF BUTTER ON GOVERNMENT ACCOUNT.

Mr. RIDER asked, How many packages of butter were shipped to Great Britain for sale on Government account during the present year? To whom was the butter consigned, and how many packages to each? Have the consignees completed sales, and sent in their reports? If so, what are they? Were the twenty-seven packages of butter purchased from Hodgson Brothers (April 6th, 1895) made by them, and where? Does the Government intend to continue similar business ventures?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Nine hundred and fifteen packages of butter were shipped from Montreal. The particulars of two small

shipments from Prince Edward Island have not been received. 2. On February 16th, 175 packages were consigned to A. Clement & Son, at Manchester; on March 4th, 79 packages were consigned to Hodgson Bros., at Liverpool; on March 26th, 271 packages were consigned to A. Clement & Son, at Manchester; on April 5th, 215 packages were consigned to A. Clement & Son, at Manchester; on April 21st, 175 packages were consigned to A. Clement & Son, at Manchester; total, 915 packages. 3. The account sales of the first two consignments only have been received. The 175 packages were sold at prices from 78 shillings to 96 shillings per cwt., and realized 16·3 cents at Montreal. The 79 packages were sold at prices from 76 shillings to 85 shillings per cwt., and realized 16·04 cents at Montreal. 4. On April 3rd, 27 packages of butter were received from Hodgson Brothers, Montreal, and were reported as from the creamery of E. J. Madden, Newburg, Ont.; 80 packages of butter were received from Park, Blackwll & Co., Toronto, and were reported as from the Black Creek creamery, of Thos. Ballantyne & Sons, Stratford, Ont.; 14 packages of butter were received from Park, Blackwell & Co., Toronto, and were reported as from the Avonbank creamery, St. Mary's, Ont.; the remainder of the butter was received direct from the creameries where it was made. It is the intention of the Government to encourage the butter industry by assisting the placing of the same upon the British market in the best possible shape. This assistance will be given in the shape of providing cold storage.

AUZIAS TURENNE.

Mr. RIDER asked, Is Auzias Turenne in the service of the Government? (a.) When was he engaged? (b.) What position does he occupy, and what is his salary?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not in the employ of the Government.

DOMINION LOAN.

Mr. RIDER asked, 1. By whom, or through what financial institution was the Dominion loan of October, 1894, negotiated? 2. What is the total amount of the bonds issued, and what was the net amount received thereon, stated in decimal currency? 3. What will be the total expense incurred in its negotiation for cost of management, discount, &c.?

Mr. FOSTER. Most of this information has already been given, but I have no objection to repeating it. The financial agents of the Government are, of course, the Bank of Montreal. The total amount of bonds issued was £2,250,000. The net amount received was £2,192,854. Total expense, $335,933.

INDUSTRIES OF BRAMPTON.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked, What is the description of each of the industries established in the town of Brampton, county of Peel, Ont.? What are the names of the several manufacturers in the said town, and what is the number of employees in each of said industries?

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend, I am sure, knows that it takes some little time to prepare these figures from the statistics, and such being the case, the question would have to stand for some time on the Notice paper. I would be glad if my hon. friend would drop the question, and put a notice of motion on the paper, and we will bring down the information.

Mr. LAURIER. That will take a still longer time.

MAILS BETWEEN WEST KOOTENAY AND SPOKANE.

Mr. COATSWORTH (for Mr. Mara) asked, Have the Government taken any steps towards arranging for a direct exchange of registered mail matter between the towns in West Kootenay and Spokane, Washington?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes. On the 26th April, 1895, a communication was addressed from my department to the Postmaster General at Washington, proposing an exchange of registered matter between Nelson, B.C., and Spokane, Wash., via Nelson, Port Shepherd, Spokane Falls and Northern railways, this exchange to include registered matter posted at the Ainsworth, Balfour, Kalso, Nelson, Pilot Bay, Robson, Rossland, Trail Creek, and Waneta post offices. No reply has been received to this communication from the Washington office.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a promise made over a fortnight ago, that he would give the Estimates for the current year on the occasion of making his budget speech. Now, a delay of a day or so, in view of the extreme difficulty the hon. gentleman had in delivering himself of his budget, might have been pardonable, but it is really trifling with the House, and trifling with his own promise, to have allowed very nearly a fortnight to elapse without redeeming his word. More than that, it is a matter which we ought to have before us in discussing the financial situation of the country. Surely the hon. gentleman, having now allowed thirteen days to elapse, cannot possibly plead that he has not had time enough to prepare supplemental estimates for a year which terminates in six weeks, or thereabouts, from the present

date. The hon. gentleman ought certainly to have brought down these estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the delay has occurred. It was not from any difficulty I found in delivering the budget that the delay occurred; it may have been somewhat from the exhaustion after the delivery. But really the only excuse I can plead is lack of time. With the many things that I had to try to do, I found it difficult to get one or two small items disposed of by Council. I will try and have them down to-morrow, if possible. I may say, however, that it is not so large a matter, because in the budget speech I have made allowance for all that are to be brought down, and the supplemental estimates will not be large. I will try to expedite them as much as possible.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was another promise which the hon. gentleman made to me across the House some time ago, to which I desire to call his attention, namely, with reference to the negotiations between the Dominion and Newfoundland. That promise was that the House would be treated with proper respect and regard, and that simultaneously with the report of the Newfoundland commissioners being laid upon the Table of the Newfoundland legislature, a report would be laid upon the Table of this House, so that information would be in the possession of members here as soon, at least, as it was in possession of members there. Now, telegrams were sent from Newfoundland, dated yesterday, and published in the newspapers of Toronto and Montreal, to the effect, positively, that the leader of the Government had pledged himself to lay the report of the commissioners before the Newfoundland legislature to-day. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he is prepared to carry out his promise, and lay it before this House, so that we may be in possession of the information as quickly as they are? I see by the papers that one of the commissioners from Newfoundland, about whose mission here the hon. gentleman stated the other day he had no information, has reached here, and I would like to ask the Minister of Finance at the same time, whether that commissioner has reported himself, or whether the hon. gentleman has had the honour of meeting him; also whether any new negotiations have been opened, or the old negotion have been re-opened?

Mr. FOSTER. I did make a promise much in the terms my hon. friend has stated, and if to-day the Premier of Newfoundland lays those terms before his legislature, I have them under my hand, and they will be placed upon the Table of the House. When that is done, this House will be treated, as I said, in the very same manner as the legislature has been treated in Newfoundland.

Mr. LAURIER. So this House is subordinate to the Newfoundland legislature?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so. That is an inference of my hon. friend for which I do not care to be responsible.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that if the papers were laid before the legislature of Newfoundland to-day, they would be laid before this House to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. My interpretation of that would be that we are quite within our right to keep faith with the Government of Newfoundland. As I stated before to this House, what we proposed to do was to lay the terms before Parliament and the legislature of Newfoundland simultaneously, that is, upon the same day. My hon. friend can make what inference he pleases from that arrangement. Certainly I shall not be responsible for anything but the facts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman say whether Newfoundland has the right to take the initiative?—because the hon. gentleman makes his act dependent upon theirs. Their act does not seem to be dependent upon ours. Is it so that Newfoundland has a right to decide whether the terms shall be laid upon the Table of their legislature or not, but the hon. gentleman has no right to decide, only in the event of Newfoundland so acting, whether they shall be laid on the Table of the Canadian Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. That is so metaphysical a question that I do not care to enter upon a discussion of it. With reference to the second question concerning the departure of Mr. Bond, when I came into this House, the Government had no knowledge of his arrival.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask whether the hon. gentleman has had any information that it was the intention of the Newfoundland Government to take the legislature into their confidence to-day?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman had notice to that effect, why does he not lay it upon the Table of the House now?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will do just what the hon. gentleman said he would do, and what he is pledged to do: he will lay the papers on the Table of this House simultaneously with their being laid on the Table of the House in the Newfoundland legislature.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has just told us that is not what he is going to do. He promised us that he would lay them sim-

ultaneously on the Table of this House, and he says he has been informed that they will be laid before the legislature of Newfoundland to-day.

BEHRING SEA CONFERENCE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question on another matter. I see it is stated in the telegraphic correspondence from Washington that Great Britain and the United States have come to an agreement to hold a conference on the Behring Sea question in that city, in October, and delegates are to be sent thither from Canada. I would ask whether that report is true?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say definitely as to the dates, but I know we have intimated our willingness, and I think negotiations have gone so far, that it is pretty well understood the conference will take place. I read the correspondence referred to, but I am not able to say whether the exact date has been fixed. I did not ask the Premier.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the points of the conference?

Mr. FOSTER. The conference is to take into consideration some means of arriving at the amounts that are to be paid. The conference takes place owing to the failure of the United States Congress to carry out the recommendation that was made by the President for the payment of the sum of $425,000 odd as reparation to the sealers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that is the only matter which will come under the consideration of such a conference?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the negotiations have gone, that is to be the subject-matter of the conference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that to be the only matter?

Mr. FOSTER. I say, so far as the negotiations have gone, that is the only matter which is to be taken into consideration.

RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it right at this stage of the proceedings, that we should bring before the notice of the House the action of the Government in refusing to give an answer to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) to the question he put. Those questions were submitted last year with respect to the industries, and they were answered. It is unfair that he should be refused an answer now, considering the questions are the same as those put last year. It is a very singular proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very true that some of the questions were put and answers obtained, but the work proved to be very burdensome, and these questions lumbered up the Order paper and took a great deal of time, and it was thought better that they should be put in the form of motions, as the information could be brought down just as readily.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is forgetting that there was no money in the treasury last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When shall we obtain the return ordered respecting the census of the city of London, which was moved for two years ago?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have given an order that it be prepared.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But we want the return.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Make a motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to call attention to the fact that the House is treated with very gross disrespect by the Government when, as I understand, no return has been made to an order granted 18 months ago. I think on every occasion when the House meets, all motions passed at the last session should undoubtedly, if the Government do their duty, be placed on the Table of the House, and if this is not done I think we shall have to cause a report to be made by you, Mr. Speaker, or your officers as to what motions have been complied with. As I understand, when the House orders the Government to bring down papers, the Government must do so, otherwise it is treating the House with very gross disrespect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have prepared a circular to the various departments calling attention to the returns that have not been furnished, asking that they be prepared at once.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is this the first step taken in the matter?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Here is a motion that was passed and papers ordered a year and a half ago, and a circular in respect to them was issued yesterday. This is not treating the House courteously, fairly or properly, I think. I consider these questions may fairly be asked, and thereby a good deal of expense saved, and this is very important as we are very anxious, seeing we have a deficit, not to put the Government to further expense.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of

Ways and Means ; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, before entering upon a discussion of the questions which are pertinent to the motion before the House, I wish to say a few words of a personal character with respect to some remarks made by the Controller of Customs in his speech last night. That hon. gentleman gave us an exhibition, not of dignity or of respectability, but an exhibition of temper, and he pursued a course of conduct that was the exact reverse of respectability. He made an unwarranted attack, an attack entirely without foundation, on the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). He accused that hon. gentleman of paying his men in goods, of forcing them to take payment out of his own store, of issuing scrip to them, and that he oppressed them in the matter of payment of their wages ; and when the hon. member for Russell rose and explicitly denied the accusation, the Controller of Customs failed to accept that denial, as he was bound to do from a brother member of this House, and he equivocated and quibbled about the story having appeared in the papers, about the hon. member for Russell not having brought suits for libel, and he failed to accept frankly and fully the disclaimer made by that hon. gentleman. I venture to say that the hon. member for Russell is well respected by almost all members of this House. He has never introduced a Sabbath Observance Bill, he has never introduced a Bill for the punishment of seduction, and he has never incurred, by his course, the hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite ; and the Controller failed to do that which, by parliamentary rules, he was bound to do, and pursued a course of conduct that failed to meet the approval of the great majority of his own followers, and certainly failed to meet the approval of the friends of the hon. member for Russell. With respect to the charges made against myself, I will pass them over, so far as the running of tugs on Sunday is concerned, because they are not pertinent to the question under discussion. The hon. gentleman, however, when reference was made to the fact that he had been in Washington, said he was not there for the purpose of selling his country to the Yankees. I presume he went down there to borrow something. His party had already borrowed from the Americans the Gerrymander Act, and had borrowed from them protection, and very likely the Controller thought he would borrow something else in the same line that might be used in the elections that are approaching. So far as the allusions to myself are concerned, I have this to say, that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were very glad to accept the advantages that were secured—whether I was instrumental in securing them or not at Washington—in connection with the free lumber negotiations. We secured, under the Wilson Bill, the admission free of—

Logs and round unmanufactured timber not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act.
Firewood, handle-bolts, heading-bolts, stave-bolts and shingle-bolts, hop-poles, fence posts, railroad ties, ship timber and ship planking, not specially provided for in this Act.
Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building wharfs.
Timber, squared or sided.
Sawed boards, plank, deals and other lumber.
Pine clapboards.
Spruce clapboards.
Hubs for wheels, posts, last-blocks, wagon-blocks, oar-blocks, gun-blocks, heading and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn or sawed only.
Laths.
Pickets and palings.
Shingles.
Staves of wood of all kinds, wood unmanufactured.

We secured the free entry of all these articles into the American market, and in return for this, there was a condition that we should not impose an export duty or discriminate in stumpage dues. I repeat, that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were very glad to avail themselves of this condition, and having so availed themselves they close the door of criticism on any persons who may have been instrumental in securing those concessions, concessions which are more important to Canada than any commercial concessions secured from the United States since 1854. Now, the hon. gentleman showed a sense of the importance of these concessions by abandoning—or if he did not do it his colleagues did—by abandoning his petty boom duty ; a duty the imposing of which in the month of May last year, came very nearly losing us the whole of these concessions. I might say with regard to this that I was requested by the then Premier of this Government to do something in the line of averting the disaster, and without entering further into this case, I may repeat, I am ready to meet at any time, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) with regard to the imputation he has made, and to go fully into the question. That is all I have to say with regard to these personal affairs, further than to regret, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) did not conduct himself in a manner consistent with the dignity of his position, that he did not display a statesmanlike line of conduct in his presentation of his case to the House, and that he did not abstain from these petty malignant attacks upon members of this House ; attacks which had no bearing whatever upon the subject under discussion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the discussion of the matter legitimately before the House in connection with the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Government present several postulates in this discussion. They

assert, in the first place, that the farmer needs protection. My hon. friend, the Controller of Customs last night said, that the farmer stood more in need of protection than any other business interest in this country, and that the farmer had received a greater extent of protection than any other interest. The next assertion made by the Government is: that protection is beneficial to the development of manufactures; the third assertion of the Government is: that all classes have benefited by protection; the fourth assertion made by them in this debate is: that the financial policy of the Government has been prudent and commendable; their fifth assertion is: that their financial management has been honest and clean; their sixth assertion is: that their laws and general policy have been good; and the seventh assertion of the Government is: that the Liberals are drifting aimlessly and without a policy. I propose to deal briefly with those points, and only briefly, because this discussion has been protracted for a great many days and these subjects have become threadbare, so that I shall treat them in a general way without entering very fully into particulars.

First, with regard to the assertion that the policy of the Government has afforded protection to the farmer, that the farmer requires protection, and that the farmer is now receiving protection to a greater extent than any other interest in this country. I deny in toto that the farmer requires protection or that he has received protection, or that he has anything to thank the Government for in connection with its fiscal policy. This assertion, of course, Mr. Speaker, is very industriously promulgated by Ministerialists and there is a reason for it. The farmers of this country control the Government, they are the majority of the electors. The Government must of necessity secure a considerable portion of their votes or it cannot carry the elections. Consequently it is necessary to induce the farmers to believe that the beneficent character of the Government policy is of a great benefit to them, so far as their interests are concerned. I am bound to say that hitherto the Government have succeeded to a large extent in their design, and I am bound further to say, that I do not believe they will succeed to any great extent again. Now, Sir, the farmer is a manufacturer. His raw material is the soil that he cultivates, the seed that he casts upon that soil, the sun, and the wind, and the rain, and the transfusive forces of nature which take the seed that is cast upon the earth and bring forth the blade, and then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. His raw materials are machinery, and clothing, and food, and all that it is necessary for him to use in the prosecution of his enterprise. These are his raw materials. His finished products are, golden harvest, fruits, flocks, herds, dairy products, vegetables, and all that the soil produces. He is in the highest and noblest sense a manufacturer, and he depends, not upon man's legislation, but he depends for the outcome of his labour upon the blessings of a kind Providence. Now, the farmer being a manufacturer, the question is, To what extent can he be benefited in common with other manufacturers? What have been his profits under this policy which it is claimed has done so much for him? Will any man here assert that the farmers of Canada are making 5 per cent net on their operations? Will any man point out that farmers are able to rent their farms for 5 per cent upon their cash value? Neither of these assertions could be substantiated: the business has not been a remunerative one. The farmers of the country have not secured large profits. Where are their markets? They have a home market, of course, but they have markets in every country under the face of heaven that require the articles they produce. They send whatever the soil produces to any corner of the globe where that product is needed. Who are the competitors of the farmer? His competitors are the producers in all lands. If he is selling wheat, he must compete with the peasant of Russia, with the coolie of India, with the poorly paid labourer of the Argentine Republic. All these classes he must meet upon a common ground and compete with them in the open markets of the world. He competes with the world at large in all his other products. Now, what the farmer wants, and what is essential for his prosperity is, that if he is obliged to sell his products in the open markets of the world subject to competition from every quarter and from all men, he should be allowed the privilege of buying what he requires under the same conditions. If he is obliged to meet competition in selling, he should have the privilege of having the benefit of competition in buying; and so far as the Government can grant him that, with proper regard to its revenue wants, the farmer is entitled to demand, that if he sells in the open markets of the world, he should be allowed to buy in the open markets of the world upon the most favourable terms that can be secured. He wants relief from taxation, he wants relief from the burdens that press upon him, and he wants to purchase and buy the necessaries of life under the same conditions as he is obliged to sell his products.

I do not deny that agricultural protection under certain circumstances would be beneficial to the farmer. Agricultural protection would benefit the farmer of England, because the farmer of England raises his products and sells them in a market that he does not fully supply. He sells them in a market which must receive the surplus from other countries, of all the kinds of things he produces, and if a duty were put on these products that would enhance the cost of what was brought

in and so would increase the price of what the English farmer raises. Agricultural protection in England would be a benefit to the farmer, but in Canada the case is quite different. Here we have a country where is raised all that is required for the supply of the wants of our own people, and we have a surplus in addition, which is sold abroad; and whenever there is a surplus of any article, it is unnecessary to argue that the price received for that surplus in the open markets of the world will cover the price of the entire crop raised in the country. This being the case, protection cannot be made advantageous to the farmers of Canada.

My hon. friend the Controller of Customs said last night that the farmers of Canada were subjected to great losses under the Mackenzie Administration by the free admission of American grains and other agricultural products, and he pointed to the fact that the importations of agricultural and animal products in 1878 amounted to $15,773,000. I contend that the free and untrammelled admission of grains under the tariff of 1876 was not in any degree detrimental to the agricultural interests of this country. We had constructed a costly system of public works; we had united Lake Erie with Lake Ontario; we had united Lake Ontario with the navigable lower stretch of the River St. Lawrence; we had expended millions of dollars for the purpose of diverting from the Western States a portion of that trade which passed through American channels to New York and other American seaports. The purpose of these expenditures was to secure as large a volume of traffic as possible; and in order to make that purpose effectual it was necessary to remove all restrictions, and allow the flow of that traffic unimpeded through our commercial channels. Well, what was the effect, so far as the farmer was concerned, of American wheat being ground at mills at St. Catharines, at Thorold, or on the St. Lawrence, where water power was furnished? So long as we had a large surplus of wheat, as we had, the American wheat which we used simply displaced so much Canadian wheat and flour, which took its place in our exports; and the mills on the Welland Canal, or on the St. Lawrence, found it to be to their advantage to grind the hard spring wheats of the west mixed with certain qualities of Canadian wheat. This gave employment to Canadian labour, to Canadian capital, to Canadian coopers who made the barrels, to Canadian vessels which exported the product of the mills, to Canadian shipping warehouses, and to Canadian bank capital; and it was in every way an advantage to the country. It was a trade that swelled the volume of our commercial transactions, and did not in the slightest degree interfere with the prosperity of the farmer. Why, Sir, during the Mackenzie Administration the average price of wheat was $1.11, whereas until recently it has not gone above 60 cents; the average price of barley was 83 cents, the average price of oats 42 cents, the average price of pease 76 cents. The average prices of all the products of the farm were from 30 to 80 per cent higher during the time of that Administration, under which occurred all those disasters which the hon. Controller of Customs says it inflicted on the country, than they have been for years past; and the country could not offer up a prayer better calculated to bring blessings upon it than the prayer that the same condition of things that existed under the Mackenzie Administration should be brought to this country again. The only grain affected in price by a duty would be a grain that we consume in excess of our production, and the only grain we consume in excess of our production is Indian corn. A duty would affect the price of Indian corn; but even the importation of Indian corn was advantageous to Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. It was the raw material of the stock feeder, who was producing beef; it was also a grain relatively cheaper than other coarse grains, so that the farmer who bought corn could sell barley, oats, pease and rye at relatively higher prices, replacing them with corn, and make a large profit in the exchange. I found by a careful computation, in 1878, that the advantage to the farmers of Canada from the importation of 7,387,000 bushels of corn in that year was $1,400,000.

Now, it is said that the National Policy has had a good effect upon the price of pork. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia the other day descanted on the great advantages that resulted to the Canadian farmer from the duty on pork. If we were producing pork in quantities less than our consumption, the imposition of the duty would raise the price of pork; but we are doing more than that. Last year we exported 26,826,840 pounds of bacon, 1,682,167 pounds of ham, and 755,722 pounds of pork, a total of 29,264,729 pounds of hog products, valued at $2,976,503. Now, 30,000,000 pounds of pork in round numbers, valued at $3,000,000, is a surplus so large that it is folly to talk about the duty on pork enhancing the price in this country. It has no effect on the price whatever. We are selling in the same markets as the Americans, and——

Mr. DICKEY. I did not intend to say that the duty affected the price of pork, but that it increased the production of pork.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman what has led to the increase in the production of pork. It is the fact that the production of other things has not paid—that the National Policy or something else has depressed the prices of wheat and of other grains, and that the farmer has been forced by the necessities of his cir-

cumstances, into the production of some crop that would be more remunerative, and he has therefore gone into the production of pork and cheese: but it is senseless to talk about this increased production being brought about by protection.

Mr. SPROULE. How was it that the production expanded so rapidly after the duty was put on, and did not before?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I must ask hon. gentlemen to refrain from these unseemly interruptions. Every member who has not spoken on this question will have an opportunity of speaking.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, I wish to point out how utterly without foundation are the assertions that duties on agricultural products have enhanced the prices of those articles in this country, or that we need protection against American agricultural products. At the present moment, owing to exceptional circumstances, the price of wheat is higher in Canada than it is in the United States. This, I presume, is the first time that this has occurred in at least ten years. The reason is that at the low prices which have prevailed for wheat, farmers have been feeding that grain to their hogs, their horses and their stock, and we have waked up suddenly to find that the country has sold short, and that we have not enough wheat to carry us till next harvest. Consequently, we have to import wheat and pay the duty on it. But the farmer in general has no advantage from that, because he has sold his wheat, though any who held wheat may derive some advantage. It is owing to that exceptional circumstance that wheat is higher in Canada than in the United States. I have watched the wheat markets, and there has not been a period for years, till now when wheat would not have been from 3 to 5 cents higher in Canada than it was, if we had free admission to the American markets. Although the surplus of both countries are designed for the same general market, yet, for some reason, probably from closeness of competition and the larger amount of money employed in grain transactions in the United States, wheat has been almost uniformly higher in the American than in the corresponding Canadian markets; and until this circumstance of the shortage from over exportation there has scarcely been a day when the farmers would not have been benefited to the extent of 3 to 5 cents a bushel by the free admission of wheat to the American markets. I have compiled some quotations for the 14th day of this month at Toronto and Buffalo, as relative markets and Chicago as a market not as favourably situated as Toronto. And I want to point out that in this list there is not an article that would be at all likely to be imported into Canada if the restriction were removed. Take oats. I place them upon a basis of 34 pounds to a bushel, because the American standard is 32: and if you make a comparison between 32 in the one place and 34 in another, it is not a fair comparison. I find, based upon 34 pounds to the bushel, that the prices were as follows:—

Toronto	35	@ 36c.
Chicago	29½	@ 30½
Buffalo	38	@ 40

Or 4 cents higher at Buffalo that at the relatively situated market at Toronto. My hon. friend the Controller would prevent the buying of oats in Buffalo at 40 cents, paying freight, and bringing them to Canada for sale at 36 cents:

Rye—
57c. in Toronto.
64½c. in Chicago.
70c. in Buffalo.

Buckwheat—
41c. in Toronto.
55c. in Buffalo.

Barley—
45 to 47c. in Toronto.
46½ to 52c. for the inferior western barley in Chicago.
63c. in Buffalo.

Nobody is going to pay 63 cents for barley in Buffalo, bring it to Toronto, and sell it for 47 cents. It is not necessary to impose a duty to prevent that, and that is about all the benefit the National Policy confers upon our farmers:

Cattle—
$3.00 to $5.60 per cwt. live weight in Toronto
3.30 to 6.15 in Chicago.
3.75 to 5.87 in Buffalo.

We have heard a great deal about Armour sending in beef and supplying our hotels. We have heard a great deal about the danger of having American beef brought in here if the duties were removed and our markets slaughtered. Who is going to buy heavy steers in Chicago at $6.15, bring them to Toronto and sell them at $5.60? Hogs—the National Policy advocates stand firmly upon the assertion that the duty does some good in hogs. Well, on the 14th of this month, the quotations were as follows:—

Hogs—
$3.00 to $4.80 in Toronto.
4.30 to 4.80 in Chicago.
$4.00 to $4.90 in Buffalo.

They were not as high in Toronto as in Chicago, five hundred miles further west. The Controller of Customs, the other night pointed out that mess pork was cheaper in Chicago than in Toronto. That does not affect the farmer. The farmer is affected by the price he receives for live hogs. He sells his hogs alive; and if mess pork is sold higher in Toronto than in Chicago, that simply shows that the packers are making larger profit in Canada than in the United States. In Chicago they carry on the business systematically; they utilize everything

except the squeal—bristles, bones, everything else, and they thus manage to sell mess pork cheaper than in Toronto. But live hogs have been uniformly higher for some years in the American markets than in ours, and the duty on live hogs is utterly useless. We do not need it at all. With regard to the sheep market, the quotation for sheep in Toronto by live weight, as near as I can get it, for they were quoted by the head——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Does the hon. gentleman say there should be no duty on pork coming from the United States ?

Mr. CHARLTON. My assertion is that the duty is useless. It does not make any difference and has not any effect ; as regards pork from the United States sent here. What we want is the duty taken off pork going to the United States :

Sheep—
$3⅛ to $3½ in Toronto.
3½ to 4½ in Buffalo.
Lambs—
$3 to $4 per head in Toronto.

I do not know what the live weight would be :

In Chicago the best are worth $6.75 per cwt.
In Buffalo, $4.75 to $8.50 per cent.

I venture to say that the average price of lambs is $1.50 higher in Buffalo than in Toronto :

Baled hay—	
Toronto	$ 9 00
Chicago	11 00
Buffalo	12 50
New York	16 00
Eggs—	
Toronto	10 to 10½c.
Chicago	13
Buffalo	13 to 14

Butter, potatoes, turnips, vegetables—all are higher in that market than here. What we want is not protection against American agricultural products that are coming from the higher-priced markets to the lower, but the ability to get into that higher priced market with our products. The Government would have shown some sense if they had at least opened negotiations upon the suggested basis and see how far it would be necessary to go when invited to offer to the American Secretary of State proposals based upon the introduction of a list of manufactures in a reciprocal arrangement. If they had entertained that proposition instead of summarily dismissing it, the farmer might have got some advantage from the action of this Government. But he has never received a dollar from it. He has never received any protection. The whole thing is a mockery, a delusion and a snare, and he is beginning to find that out. My hon. friend the Controller of Customs says that the United States is no market for us because they sell everything we do, because they export everything we do. No need, he says, going to that market ; it is folly to think of such a thing. Why, Mr. Speaker, the United States is our best market for hay, small fruits, horses, sheep, lambs, poultry, eggs, hides, wool, flax, barley, beans, malt, vegetables, potatoes, turnips, even with the present scale of duties. It would be much our best market for cattle if the duty were removed. Nothing could confer so great an advantage upon the farmers of Canada as the sweeping away of the entire schedules of American agricultural duties.

So much for this question of protection to the farmers. I proceed next to consider the assertion that our manufacturers depend for prosperity upon protection, and I think that I shall be able to show that protection, even in the case of manufacturers, has not exerted the beneficial influence which is claimed for it. I think that I will be able to show—and I shall take some pains to do so—that protection is entirely unnecessary, as compared with a revenue tariff, even for the manufactures of this country. I may point out, first of all, that we had manufactures before we had the National Policy. We had manufactures that were well developed. We had extensive manufacturing interests in this country which grew up under a revenue tariff policy of 15 per cent duty. In 1871, according to the census of that year, our manufactures stood as follows :—

1871.

Capital invested	$ 77,964,020
Hands employed	187,942
Raw material	$124,907,846
Wages	40,851,000
Products	221,617,773

How does that compare with the assertion that the National Policy created our manufacturing system ? That was the condition of things almost ten years before that policy was inaugurated. There was scarcely a manufacturing interest existing in Canada to-day which was not in existence then, and not only in existence but doing a profitable business. Passing on ten years to 1881, for in 1881 the influence of the National Policy, which was adopted in 1879, had scarcely begun to be felt ; it took a little time to adjust interests to the new condition of things, and you may say that the entire decade from 1871 to 1881 was also passed under revenue tariff conditions—in 1881 what was the condition of our manufacturing industries ? Had they grown ? Was there any evidence of prosperity or growth in that decade between 1871 and 1881, under revenue tariff conditions ? Or were they stagnant ? Did they give evidence of some pressing need for a change of policy ? Let us see. The capital invested in 1881 had increased from $77,960,000, at which it stood in 1871, to $165,202,000. The number of hands had increased from 187,942 to 254,955. Wages had increased from $40,851,000 to $59,429,000. The increase in raw materials was from $124,907,846 to $179,918,593 ; the increase in product was from $221,617,773 to $309,171,-

068. A little later I will give the percentages of increase in this decade, and also in the decade following. But let me say that in 1891, the nominal value of factory products was greater than the true value, because these values, as compared with those of 1871 and 1891, are inflated by protection, while in the other they are down near to rock bottom; and you may safely deduct from the totals of production given in 1891 from 15 to 20 per cent in order to have them on the same basis as those of 1871 and 1881. Bearing this in mind, let us see what the result was in 1891: Capital, $354,620,750; employees, including boys and girls, 370,256: wages, $100,663,650; material, $256,119,042; products, $476,258,886. Now let us endeavour to ascertain, Mr. Speaker, what were the profits realized in the gross, in these three periods. Let us see whether we can ascertain from these returns of the products of manufactures whether the business in 1871 was a ruinous one, and let us compare the profits received in 1871, 1881 and 1891. This is a very important matter in connection with this case. If it can be shown that, even though the product was large, in 1871 or 1881, the business was unprofitable, some argument will be given in favour of a change which would make the business more profitable. What do the figures show? In 1871:

Wages	$ 40,851,009
Raw material	124,907,846
Total	$165,758,855
Product	221,617,773
Balance of profit	55,858,918
Capital	77,964,020

Percentage of profit, 73.

Was this a struggling industry? Was this an industry that required bolstering up by higher duties? It is folly to talk it. What was the result in 1881:

Wages	$ 59,429,002
Raw material	179,918,593
Total	$239,347,595
Product	309,676,068
Balance as profit	70,328,473
Capital invested	165,302,623

Percentage of profit, 42.

That is a good enough business. Now, take the figures for 1891:

Wages	$100,663,650
Raw material	256,119,042
Total	$356,782,692
Product	476,258,886
Balance as profit	119,476,194
Capital invested	354,620,750

Percentage of profit, 33.6.

Profit on working capital of $181,450,136, 65 per cent.

So that we see that the profit in 1871 was 73 per cent on the capital invested; in 1881 it was 42 per cent; and in 1891 it was 33·6 per cent. Who complains of the condition of things in 1871 and 1881? What reason was there to complain? None whatever. Now, the increase in hands between 1871 and 1881 was 35·6 per cent, while the increase in population was 17 per cent. The increase in hands between 1881 and 1891 was 45 per cent, while the increase in population was 11·66 per cent. The increase of raw material between 1871 and 1881 was 44 per cent, while the increase in raw material from 1881 to 1891 was 42·3 per cent, showing a greater increase in the first decade than in the second by 1·7 per cent. I ask you to bear in mind these statements with regard to raw material, because they furnish a criterion by which the other lists can be judged, showing that some of these lists were stuffed as regards the products, and as regards the number of hands employed. The increase in capital from 1871 to 1881 was 112 per cent, while the increase in capital from 1881 to 1891 was 114 per cent, 2 per cent greater in the second decade than in the first. Now, as to the evidence showing stuffing of the lists I will take, first, boots and shoes, and blacksmithing. These are what are called "natural industries"; they exist in all countries, blacksmithing especially, and the result could not very well be manipulated or stuffed in these cases:

Boots and shoes, 1881	$17,895,903
Boots and shoes, 1891	18,990,381
Increase	$ 1,091,478

Equal to 6 per cent.

Blacksmithing, 1881	$7,172,469
Blacksmithing, 1891	8,942,106
Increase	$1,769,637

Equal to 24 per cent.

Here were increases that were natural. The increase in population in the second decade was 11·66 per cent, with the increase of production in blacksmithing of 24 per cent, and in boots and shoes of 6 per cent. Now, let us look at some industries, the tables regarding which may be stuffed a little. Take carpenters and joiners:

1881	$3,893,910
1891	9,111,299
Increase	$5,217,389

Equal to 125 per cent.

Now, does anybody believe that while boots and shoes increased 6 per cent, and blacksmithing, 24 per cent, the work of carpenters and joiners increased 134 per cent, with an increase in the population of only 11·66 per cent? It is absurd on the face of it. Next take dress-making and millinery:

1881	$ 4,926,871
1891	11,111,510
Increase	$ 6,184,639

Equal to 134 per cent.

This increase is nonsense. These figures are due to the fact that in 1891 every woman who sewed in a garret, every woman who

had a sewing machine was entered as a manufacturing industry. Now, considering that the increase in raw material used was less by 1·7 per cent between 1881 and 1891 than it was between 1871 and 1881, these statements of the increasing number of establishments and increased number of hands employed are illusory, and not in accordance with the facts. And I believe that the Government was capable of deliberately entering into the business of giving instructions to enumerators to get figures showing an apparent swelling of the industries of the country that did not exist. Now, Sir, I infer from this table that all these statements made by hon. gentlemen on the Government side that the institution of the National Policy, and the necessity of putting on heavier duties for the purpose of promoting manufacturing interests in this country were false assertions. I assume that the returns made by the census of 1871, showing $221,000,000 of products, that the census returns for 1881 showing 309,000,000 products, the returns showing that the net profits in 1871 were 73 per cent, in the next decade 42 per cent; that all these facts show that all the assertions made by the friends of National Policy, that the introduction of that policy was essential to the well-being and continuance and growth of the manufacturing interests of this country, were wrong. It is a pure fallacy, that does not rest upon a solid foundation in any respect whatever. In fact, Sir, the returns show that our manufacturing industries were more prosperous, in reality, the general degree of prosperity was greater, under the revenue tariff policy than it has been subsequent to that time. What kind of establishments had we in operation, then? Why, Sir, we had cotton mills, well established woollen mills, agricultural implement manufactories, foundries, saw mills, planing mills, sewing machine establishments, machine shops, hat factories—we had nearly all that we have got to-day, and these industries were well established. They were not exotic industries, they were not industries struggling for an existence. Many of these had practically full control of the field. The saw-mills and the wood manufactories of the country, planing mills, sash and blind factories, wooden and hollowware, foundries, agricultural implements, boots and shoes, leather—in fact, all the principal manufacturing industries in Canada had almost exclusive control of the field in this country. How desperate was the condition of the manufacturers? J. & R. Molson had accumulated a fortune of a million dollars; J. G. Worts, a million dollars; E. & G. Gurney, commencing as moulders, were worth $750,000 that they had made in their business of manufacturers; E. K. Green was worth half a million; A. E. Gault was worth half a million; and scores and scores of others were worth from $50,000 to $250,000 apiece.

But it happens that we had a period of depression, extending from 1874 to 1879, and our manufacturers imagined that the world-wide depression that existed was due to something that did not cause it, and they wanted to have something done by the Government to put them in a position that time would have put them in, that the removal of the depression would have put them in. But I think I can show that even in 1878, almost at the close of that depression, the condition of our manufacturing industries was not an unfavourable one. I took occasion to correspond with about 100 manufacturers in 1878, and I received letters from twenty of them, in various lines, in the province of Ontario, and in one or two other provinces. I will give the result to the House now, for the result of that investigation has a direct bearing upon this question. One cotton mill stated that they had made no dividend, and I found out afterwards that they had earned 10 or 12 per cent, and had applied it to the purchase of machinery in order to enlarge their operations. One woollen mill, with a capital of $180,000 reported 10 per cent dividend. One foundry, with a capital of $180,000 reported no dividend in consequence of having been unfortunate in making bad debts to a large amount. One woollen mill reported a dividend of 6 per cent; one hosiery mill, 6 per cent; another hosiery mill, 8 per cent; one sewing machine factory, 6 per cent; one carriage factory said their business was remunerative; one extensive clothing concern said they could make more money by shaving notes; one agricultural implement manufactory said business was satisfactory, and they were very busy; another sewing machine factory said they were running on three-quarters time, and their profit was slightly reduced, and they wanted free trade in iron, steel and coal; another agricultural implement factory were making satisfactory profits; one large foundry made 20 per cent; another agricultural implement factory made 23 per cent; another, 40 per cent; another, 20; another reported business satisfactory; one knitting goods factory was satisfied that they were holding their own all right; and that was the general state of trade in their line. The summary of the statement is that in these twenty establishments one paid a dividend of 40 per cent; one of 28; one of 23; two of 20; seven somewhere between 10 to 15; one of 8; six of 6 and over; and one in iron reported that they had made bad debts, and had no dividend. Now, I want to compare that condition with the condition of manufacturing establishments in New England, where they had heavy protection, a protection that had existed for seventeen years. I want to make a comparison between the conditions

of these concerns in Canada, under a revenue policy, and forty-eight of the principal manufacturing concerns in New England, in 1877 with a capital of $53,320,000. Sixteen of these forty-eight establishments reported no dividend, compared with only one out of twenty in Canada. Nine of them reported dividends of less than 6 per cent; eight reported dividends of 6 per cent; and ten reported dividends of 10 per cent and upwards. Now, if the relative condition of things was such that out of twenty establishments in Canada one only had no dividend, while out of forty-eight in New England, sixteen had no dividend; if, while 9 of those establishments in New England paid less than 6 per cent, and there was only six in Canada that paid as little as 6 per cent —I say that the manufacturing industries of Canada were beyond all question in a relatively healthier, more prosperous, and more profitable condition than they were in six New England states, where they were enjoying very heavy protective duties. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I may venture the assertion that the protected industries in the United States throughout the depression that existed from 1874 to 1879, were more severely affected than ours were in Canada, and were in a less prosperous condition. I make that assertion without hesitation. I make that assertion believing fully, in fact, knowing, that it is true.

Now with regard to protection in a general sense. If one solitary interest could procure protection, it would obtain an advantage; but if you distribute protection over all the industries in the country, or attempt to do it, you handicap one by putting a duty upon what is its raw material, which is the finished product of another; and after you have gone the round of the circle, you leave matters relatively in as bad a position for the manufacturers as they would have been if you had made no attempt to put the duties on. A blast furnace produces pig iron. Where one establishment produces pig iron, forty establishments in the country use it, and the protection that benefits one is a burden upon forty. One establishment produces steel billets, and where one produces them, fifty use them, and the protection that protects one is a burden upon fifty. And so it is around the list. One manufacturer is buying what another has produced; the manufacturer that produced it has been protected, and the protection adds to its price, and the manufacturer that is using it is obliged to buy it at an enhanced price, and charge a higher price for his goods. He is no better off, and the consumer is very much worse off. That is the trouble with protection. It takes out of one pocket and puts into another, and takes out of that pocket and puts into a third, and it goes the round, and the only man that has had anything taken out of his pocket that he does not get back again, is the consumer, who is necessarily robbed by the operation of the system.

I think I can show that the operation of the protective policy in the United States has not been, in any sense, advantageous to the manufacturing interests even of that country. In 1846 the United States abandoned protection after a brief trial, and passed a revenue tariff, which decreased, by a graduating scale, every three years. As that tariff decreased, the manufacturing interests of the country took a new bound towards prosperity, and in 1850 the product of manufactures in the United States amounted to $1,019,000,000 in value, and the number of hands employed was 957,000. In 1860, in a clear decade of a revenue tariff policy, without the intervention of protection at all, the number of hands had increased to 1,311,000, the wages to $378,000,000, and the product to $1,885,000,000; or the increase in the decade from 1850 to 1860, under a revenue tariff, had been 37 per cent in the number of hands employed, 60 per cent in the amount of wages paid, and 85 per cent in the products. Well, this is a highly favourable showing; and it happens, Mr. Speaker, that at no time since 1860—for high protection was introduced in 1861—has the condition of manufacturing industries in the United States been more prosperous or satisfactory than it was between 1850 and 1860 under a moderate revenue tariff. I have prepared tables as to the increase in wages, in prices, in raw material, capital, and in products, for the three decades following 1850, and are as follows:—

1850.		
Hands, males	731,137	
do females	225,922	
		957,059
Wages		$ 236,755,464
Product		1,019,106,616
1860.		
Hands, males	1,040,349	
do females	270,897	
		1,311,246
Wages		$ 378,878,966
Value of product		1,885,861,676
Percentage of increase, hands		354,187—37 p.c.
do do wages		$142,123,502—60 p.c.
do do product		866,755,060—85 p.c.
1870.		
Hands, males	1,615,598	
do females	323,770	
		1,939,363
Wages in currency		$ 775,584,343
Reduced to gold		581,690,258
Product in currency		4,232,325,442
do gold		3,174,244,082
Increase in No. hands		628,122— 47 p.c.
do wages, cur'cy		$ 396,705,307—104 p.c.
Increase reduced to gold		297,528,981— 78 p.c.
do in product, cur'y		2,346,463,766—124 p.c.
do do gold		1,288,382,406— 68 p.c.
Deduct also for protection prices of goods.		
1880.		
Hands, males	2,019,055	
do females	531,639	
		2,550,674
Wages		$ 947,953,795
Value of product		5,369,579,191

Increase of hands, aside from children, in all cases, 611,306—31 per cent.

Increase of wages, $172,369,352, or 22 per cent over currency basis.

Increase over gold basis in 1870, $366,263,537—63 per cent.

Increase of product, on currency basis of 1870, $1,137,253,749, or 27 per cent.

Increase of product, on gold basis of 1871, $2,-195,335,109, or 69 per cent.

A summary of the results shows that, reducing the figures to a gold basis, which is necessary to do in order to make a comparison with the gold basis that preceded it and succeeded it, the increase was as follows:—Increase of hands, not children, 1860, 37 per cent; 1870, 47 per cent; 1880, 30 per cent. Increase of wages, gold basis, 1860, 60 per cent; 1870, 78 per cent; 1880, 63 per cent. Increase of products, gold basis, 1860, 85 per cent; 1870, 68 per cent; 1880, 69 per cent. There is nothing here to show a material acceleration in the development of manufacturing industries in the United States under protection. It shows, on the whole, the reverse, that the development during the decade from 1850 to 1860 was as great as between 1860 and 1870 or 1870 and 1880, and it furnishes corroboration of the statement I have made, that both in Canada and in the United States the operation of protection, as contrasted with the operation of the revenue tariff—I refer to the first period as shown by these statistics—shows beyond question that protection fails to protect, that it fails to secure the object it is ostensibly aimed to secure, and that manufacturers are no better off under high protection than under a moderate revenue policy.

There is another feature of this case which has a bearing on the matter, Mr. Speaker, and that is the population statistics. You take the population statistics of a nation, and if there is a material variation between one decade and another, it is reasonable to suppose that fiscal conditions may have had something to do with that variation. During the decade ending 1860 the United States increased their population by 35·10 per cent, and of that the increase 24·98 was a natural increase, without reference to immigration. In 1890, under a high protective policy, the natural increase had fallen from 24·98 to 14·39 in 1890. If we take our own country, we find in Ontario the increase from 1851 to 1861, under a revenue tariff, was from 952,000 to 1,396,-000, or an increase of 46 per cent in ten years; while in Quebec, for the same period the increase was 25 per cent. From 1871 to 1881, under a revenue tariff, the increase of population was 18·88 per cent, while that of Quebec was 14·05, and of the whole Dominion, 17·31. With the full benefit of protection, the increase of population in Ontario, from 1881 to 1891, was 9·65; in Quebec, 9·53; in the whole Dominion, 11·66. This falling off in the ratio of increase, I think, indicates clearly that the condition of the country was unfavourably affected by the operation of something, and I assert that that something was the National Policy, and that under the operation of the protective policy we declined, as regards increase of population, in the Dominion, from 17·31 in 1881, to 11·66 in 1891.

There is another matter in connection with this question which is deserving of attention. It has been asserted that the condition of this country is satisfactory. The hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Northrup) was driven to asserting that an increase of 11·66 was satisfactory. He compared that increase with the increase of some of the countries in Europe, with France, for instance, and he was highly satisfied that we had increased in as great a ratio as the European countries, which are throwing off emigration every year, which have reached the full development of their resources, and are cultivating all the soil capable of furnishing sustenance to man. I assert that Canada is a country whose natural conditions are such that it should increase in population as rapidly as any country ever has or ever will. We have abundance of food, abundance of soil, a vigorous population, room for expansion, everything favourable to the rapid increase of population. If we take the United States—and I will deal with this question of natural increase alone—the natural increase of that country for the decades from 1790 to 1890, was as follows:—

INCREASE OF POPULATION IN UNITED STATES.

	Total increase.	Natural increase.
1790 to 1810.....	35·10	33·00
1800 to 1810.....	36·38	35·32
1810 to 1820.....	33·06	32·00
1820 to 1830.....	32·50	31·03
1830 to 1840.....	33·52	29·33
1840 to 1850.....	35·83	28·12
		Pop. in 1860.
1850 to 1860.....	35·10	24·98(31,443,321)
1860 to 1870.....	22·45	.....
1870 to 1880.....	30·08	22·79
1880 to 1890.....	24·85	14·39
Average nat. increase, 1790 to 1860, 7 decades	30·54	.....

That was the natural increase of population, leaving aside immigration to the country. Is there any reason why we should not increase as rapidly, especially when it is remembered that when this increase of 25 per cent, in round numbers, took place, the United States had a population of 31,-500,000? Here we are with a population of 5,000,000, with as many advantages, with as great room for expansion as the United States had even in 1810, when they had about 7,000,000 of population. How has the population of Canada increased? We should have a natural increase of 25 per cent. That was the lowest rate of increase in the United States, down to 1860, and we certainly should have that. It is reason-

able to say that our increase should be 25 per cent—I believe it should be more than 30 per cent. Estimating on a basis of 25 per cent increase in 10 years, what should have been the condition of things in this country as regards population in 1891? We had in 1881 a population of 4,324,810. If we had added 25 per cent for natural increase to the population of 1881, that natural increase would have been 1,081,202, and without receiving a single immigrant we should have had, when the census was taken in 1891, a population of 5,406,012 inhabitants. I take the natural increase at 25 per cent for the ten years, which is only 2½ per cent for each year, and that was the lowest natural increase they had in the United States up to 1860. During that period between 1881 and 1891, we received 886,173 immigrants. It would be fair to add a considerable percentage for natural increase to these immigrants, but I will add nothing on that account. I will add to the population of 1881 the bare 886,173 immigrants, and plus the increase of 25 per cent on our actual population in 1881, it would have given us in 1891 a population of 6,292,185 souls. Well, we had 4,833,239 inhabitants in 1891, and so we fell short of what our population should be by 1,458,946, and we fell 572,773 short of our natural increase without the immigration at all. Will any man tell us that is a satisfactory condition of things? Will any man doubt that these figures which show that we fell 1,458,000 short of our proper population, on a moderate estimate of what our increase should be, do not prove that there must be something wrong in this country? The advocates of this policy who base their expectations for success in the future, and attribute to the policy every blessing received in the past; will they tell us, in view of the facts presented here, that this policy is not a failure? Sir, the policy is a failure. It is a lamentable failure, and every argument made in favour of that policy is an argument without foundation and not based upon reason.

Now, Sir, with regard to the next postulate, for it is a postulate, that this policy benefits all classes. Does it benefit the lumber interest, Mr. Speaker? Does it enable you and me to buy blankets, and chains, and axes, and saws, and the outfit for our camps, any cheaper than we could buy them without it? Does it enhance the price of a single article we have to sell? Do we sell in markets that are affected by this policy or reached by it at all? Does it reach the consumer in the United States; the consumer in Great Britain, the consumer in Australia, in the Argentine Republic, or in South Africa? It does not have the slightest influence upon prices, and it loads the producer of lumber with burdens which are incident to the policy, and gives him no compensating advantage in the slightest degree whatever. Does it benefit the mining industry? Well, we do produce a little pig iron, but how much? We produce 46,000 tons. I think, and in return for that little production of pig iron we load up the consumers of this country with duties upon $10,000,000 worth of bar-iron and other kinds of iron, and where the producer of iron gets $1 in protection the consumer in Canada pays $10 out in return.

Mr. McNEILL. How did they build up their iron industry in the United States?

Mr. CHARLTON. Natural advantages.

Mr. McNEILL. Oh, yes; which we do not possess, I suppose?

Mr. CHARLTON. Iron in the United States at Birmingham, can be produced cheaper than at any other point in the world. The actual cost of producing it there is only about $5.75 per long ton.

Mr. McNEILL. We have as great natural resources in Nova Scotia as anywhere in the world.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then we do not need protection.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then with regard to coal. Would it not be better for Nova Scotia to have free access to the markets of the New England States, to New York, to Philadelphia, and to other seaport cities, than to force coal against nature by a long railway route to Montreal and points further west? Would it not be an advantage to British Columbia to be able to sell coal in San Francisco and other Pacific coast cities for consumption in California or Oregon? How is it about iron ore, Sir? There are every year 8,000,000 tons of American iron ore shipped from the Lake Superior region, and with our own mines as accessible and as valuable as those in Michigan, we are shipping only about 2,000 tons per year; a mere driblet compared with that vast stream of commerce that employs one-third of the lake shipping in the inner Lake Basin. With free access to the American market we could swell our exports of iron ore from the paltry 2,000 tons that we have now, to millions of tons. How is it about marble and stone? Sir, $25,000,000 worth of structural materials are used in the United States every year, and we exported to that country in 1894 a paltry $32,226 worth. If the duties were removed, the magnificent quarries we have on the north shore of Lake Huron, of Lake Superior, and the quarries in the region back of Lake Ontario, would share in that lucrative trade. We could supply cities like Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo with millions of dollars worth of structural material. We could send our structural material through the Erie Canal, and supply builders in New York, Philadelphia and other cities. If we had free access to the American market for our iron ore, free access to the American market for our structural material, we

could furnish to the labouring man of this country, $10 worth of labour for every dollar's worth he would be deprived of if we swept the whole system of the National Policy away with one clean sweep.

Does this policy of protection benefit the fishing industry? No. Where does the fisherman find his market? He finds it in the West Indies, in the United States and in Europe. He must meet in competition in the sale of his products, the fishermen of all other quarters of the world. Protection enhances the cost of his supplies, handicaps him, and makes him less capable of meeting that competition. And as regards the labourer. Is the labourer benefited by this policy: a policy that injures the lumberman, a policy that injures the farmer, a policy that injures the miner, and a policy that injures the fisherman? Will any one tell us that the labourer is benefited by this policy? If the labourer makes $1 out of increased employment furnished by manufacturers—if this policy does promote manufacturing, which I deny—his class loses $10 on the other hand through the operations of this policy. The labouring industry of Canada loses heavily in being deprived of the different lines of employment that would be prosperous, and that would employ an enormous number of labourers but for the imposition of these duties and burdens which are incident to the policy of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.

There is another feature, Mr. Speaker, with which I have not yet dealt. My hon. friend the Controller of Customs said last night: A tax on articles not produced in the country is a tax on the people. That is true. But the tax on articles produced in the country is a double tax. It is a tax on the people to the extent that the people pay taxes into the treasury, and it is a tax on the people to the extent that the people pay in enhanced cost for all articles of that nature produced in the country. That enhanced cost is what the political economist denominates an incidental tax. Now, Sir, the price of a domestic production is enhanced to nearly the full extent of the duties imposed upon the corresponding article imported into the country. The duty goes into the treasury, but the enhanced cost upon the domestic article goes into the pockets of the combine, and the monopolist, and the manufacturer who secures this unjust advantage. For instance, the production of cotton in this country would, I suppose, amount to nearly $10,000,000 a year. The cotton import amounted in 1894 to $4,001,618. Upon that the Government received a revenue of $1,139,068. Upon the $10,000,000 worth of domestic products, the manufacturer receives enhanced cost to the extent, perhaps, of $2,500,000 more. So that the consumer is paying $3,600,000 of enhanced cost on cottons in order that the Government may receive a revenue of $1,139,000. The woollens we imported in 1894 amounted to $9,493,629 worth, on which the duty paid was $2,876,873; but on the woollen goods which were manufactured in Canada, the consumer paid almost a corresponding amount in this incidental tax, which did not go into the treasury, but went into the pockets of the manufacturers who produced the woollen goods. During the discussion in the United States on the policy of a revenue tariff, a very interesting paper was compiled by the Hon. Wm. Springer, who is considered a good authority on economical questions, bearing on this very question of the burdensome character of the incidental tax. Mr. Springer selected a line of articles, the aggregate importation of which in to the United States for the previous year was $194,464,758. He showed that the domestic product of the same line of articles was $2,440,502,649. The number of hands employed in the production of that domestic product was 1,327,881; and the wages paid were $463,606,049. Now, mark this, Mr. Speaker, the increased cost to the consumer of these goods, $2,440,000,000 worth, in consequence of protection, was $556,938,637. The excess of increased cost over the wages paid in that production was $163,600,000. In other words, the people paid, in direct tax the duty on the goods imported, and in indirect tax, in the enhanced cost of the goods produced, $751,403,395; and of that sum the Government got $194,464,758, or 23·7 per cent, and the monopolist got $556,693,000, or 76·3 per cent. Is that not a beautiful system that compels the consumer in the country, of every dollar he pays, to pay to the Government 23 cents and 7 mills, and into the pocket of the monopolists, 76 cents and 3 mills? That is protection. That is the operation of the incidental tax. Now, my hon. friend the Controller of Customs claimed that we had free sugar. Well, we had, in a sense. We had free sugar of a kind that the refiner wanted, but we had a duty of $\frac{84}{100}$ per cent on the kind the refiner wanted to sell. The result was that while the Government received no revenue, the refiner was able to take, at least, half a cent a pound more for his sugar than it could be imported at: so that on the 300,000,000 pounds consumed in the country, he was able to take out of the pockets of the people, and put into his own pocket at last, $1,500,000, not one farthing of which went into the treasury. That sum would pay all the wages of all the men employed at the refining of the sugar. A costly, wasteful, absurd system! My hon. friend told us last night that if we had had the tariff of 1878 in operation last year, we would have realized a revenue on tea, coffee, and sugar, of $8,000,000. Well, Sir, I suppose we would, and there would have been no incidental tax connected with it. The people would have paid the tax: the money would have gone into the treasury of the country: there would have been no domestic product of sugar or coffee, or tea, to be enhanced in price to the consumer

by the tax; and, instead of paying to the Government 23 cents and a fraction, and to the monopolists 76 cents and a fraction, they would have paid the whole dollar to the Government. That would have been the advantage of a revenue tariff upon those articles. But, Sir, on refined sugar, on cottons, on woollens, and on many other articles produced in this country, we are paying, in this incidental tax, in enhanced prices charged by the manufacturers under cover of the duty, more money than the entire amount paid by those manufacturers for labour in the production of those articles; and we would be better off if we just turned those labourers loose, paid them their wages for doing nothing, and saved the balance. The obvious inference from all this is that this is a costly, wasteful, absurd system.

I have proved that under a revenue tariff in this country, from 1861 to 1881, the progress of our manufacturers and the net profits made by them were so satisfactory that there was no reason under heaven for a change in that policy in order to promote their welfare. I have pointed out that in the United States, from 1850 to 1860, under a revenue tariff policy, inaugurated four years before 1850, the increase in wages paid, in hands employed, in raw material consumed, and in product put out, was as satisfactory as in the decade from 1860 to 1870, or in the decade from 1870 to 1880, reducing the product of 1870 to a gold basis; and, when we examine into this matter, everything points inevitably to the conclusion that the imposition of this tax, which bears so heavily upon the producing community in consequence of the diversion of the greater part they pay to the pockets of the combines, is not warranted on sound principles, and cannot be defended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we shall come to that postulate as to the financial policy of the Government being prudent and commendable. The following tables gives comparisons of the controllable expenditures for 1874, 1878, and 1894:—

CONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURE—COMPARISONS, 1874, 1878, 1894.

——	1874.	1878.	1894.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Administration of Justice	459,037 49	564,920 11	745,501 00
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	19,091 97	92,365 62	264,879 66
Civil Government	883,685 53	823,369 80	1,402,279 49
Fisheries	76,247 11	93,262 28	466,750 76
Geological Survey and Observatories	97,814 38	96,049 74	158,010 14
Immigration	291,296 57	154,351 42	202,235 52
Quarantine	27,276 30	26,340 02	113,571 43
Indians	146,068 31	421,503 66	968,563 17
Superintendence Insurance	.....	8,577 48	9,578 20
Legislation	784,048 15	618,035 38	698,006 64
Lighthouse and Coast Service	537,057 63	461,967 71	476,635 07
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions	285,882 29	257,534 08	530,702 66
Marine Hospitals	66,462 53	57,484 60	38,403 94
Militia and Defence	1,122,282 27	618,136 58	1,284,517 17
Miscellaneous	102,160 20	62,968 61	249,843 89
Mounted Police	199,599 14	334,748 50	611,263 21
North-west Territories Government	12,729 91	18,199 20	276,951 99
Ocean and River Service	121,818 14	144,837 82	211,922 67
Penitentiaries	395,551 76	308,101 69	446,134 16
Pensions	56,453 84	105,842 05	86,927 18
Police	56,387 54	10,616 44	21,947 47
Public Works	1,778,915 88	997,469 70	2,033,954 91
Railways and Canals	47,085 15	1,125 00	133,996 60
Steamboat Inspection	10,291 58	14,315 82	25,939 89
Superannuation	64,442 84	106,588 91	262,302 07
	7,641,686 51	6,398,712 23	11,720,809 89

CONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURE—SUMMARY.

1874	$7,641,686 51
1878	6,398,712 23
Decrease	$1,242,973 28
Percentage of decrease, 16·02.	
1878	$ 6,398,712 23
1894	11,720,809 89
Increase	$ 5,322,097 66
Percentage of increase, 83.	

Now, I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Finance Minister and my hon. friend the Controller of Customs to the fact that the Mackenzie Government, commencing with the controllable expenditure in 1874 at $7,641,000, reduced it by 1878 to $6,398,000, being a reduction of $1,245,000, and that the Conservative Government, commencing with that expenditure of $6,398,000, increased it to $11,720,000 by 1894, an increase of 83 per cent. If this is consistent with ther assertion that the financial policy of the Government has been prudent and commendable, I certainly am unable to see it. Now, I will give a similar comparison of the cost of the collection of revenue in the same years:

COLLECTION OF REVENUE—COMPARISON, 1874, 1878, 1894.

—	1874.	1878.	1894.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Adulteration of Food		5,964 94	24,006 67
Culling Timber	82,886 43	49,940 38	25,281 18
Customs	727,629 36	714,527 77	921,039 92
Dominion Lands	282,696 28	87,628 52	133,305 06
Excise	206,935 28	215,024 50	484,949 72
Inspection of Staples		1,020 08	2,208 06
Minor Revenues	11,371 03	21,785 45	5,532 27
Post Office	1,387,270 48	1,724,938 52	3,517,261 31
On Public Works	128,859 65	97,123 93	154,257 24
Railways and Canals	2,260,820 07	2,374,313 97	3,760,549 82
Trade and Commerce			9,249 30
Weights, Measures and Gas		96,484 66	94,975 58
	5,088,468 58	5,388,752 72	9,132,615 13

COLLECTION OF REVENUE—SUMMARY.

1874	$5,088,468 58
1878	5,388,752 72
Increase	$300,284 14
Percentage of increase, 5⅞.	
1878	$5,388,752 72
1894	9,132,615 13
Increase	$3,743,862 41
Percentage of increase, 70.	

In whatever way you institute a comparison between the financial results under the Mackenzie Government and those of the succeeding Government, that comparison is, in every instance, in the highest degree favourable to the Mackenzie regime. In 1873-74 the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government was $23,316,000. In 1878 it was $23,503,105, being an increase of $186,000, or an annual average increase of $46,710. If it be possible, let us arrive exactly at what the increase was in the five years of the Mackenzie Administration. Take the Supply Bill of 1878-79. The Mackenzie Government went out of power in October and were not responsible for the expenditure of the balance of that year. Take the Supply Bill of that Administration for 1878-79—and that Administration never exceeded its Supply Bill—and upon the basis of that Supply Bill its increased expenditure for the five years was $356,000. or an average of $71,200 per year. My hon. friend, the Controller of Customs said last night that the fixed charges were $16,750,000, and that the balance of the charges, which was $20,000,000, could not be reduced, and he challenged us to show how they could be reduced. I first of all take the ground that the Government are responsible for the enormous amount of the fixed charges. Although the fixed charges cannot be reduced, yet the enormous figures of these charges is due to the supineness, neglect and extravagance of the Government. Those charges ought not to be nearly so large as they are. With regard to the hon. gentleman's challenge to show where the balance of the charges, $20,000,000, can be reduced, I will call his attention to some figures which I think will show that some reductions can be effected:

ECONOMIES TO EFFECT.

—	1878.	1894.	Reductions that can be made.
	$	$	$
Civil Government	823,369	1,402,279	250,000
Fisheries	93,262	466,750	100,000
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	92,365	264,879	75,000
Immigration	154,350	202,235	50,000
Indians	421,503	968,563	300,000
Steamship Subventions	257,534	530,702	150,000
Militia and Defence	618,136	1,284,517	280,000
Mounted Police	334,748	611,263	125,000
North-west Territories	18,199	276,951	200,000
Penitentiaries	308,101	446,134	50,000
Public Works	997,469	2,033,954	750,000
Superannuation	106,588	262,302	50,000
Franchise Act	.....	.....	250,000
Weights and Measures	.....	94,975	94,975
Customs	714,527	921,039	100,000
Excise	215,024	484,949	100,000
Adulteration of Food	.....	24,006	24,000
Post Office	1,724,938	3,517,261	250,000
Railways and Canals	2,374,313	3,760,549	750,000
	.....	.....	3,948,975

Add savings on railway subsidies which last year were..... $4,600,000
do do Tay and Trent Canals and Curran Bridge, &c.. ....
do increased revenue from increased prosperity..... ....
do strictly revenue duties, if necessary to impose..... .....

In civil government we expended in 1878, $823,000, and in 1894, $1,400,000. That is too large an increase. That is an increase four or five times greater than the proportionate increase of population. If we strike $250,000 from that, the expenditure of civil government will still have increased in a much greater ratio than the increase of population. On fisheries we expended $93,000 in 1878, and $466,000 in 1894. Suppose we allow this fishery expenditure to be three times greater in 1894 than it was in 1878, we will still have $100,000. On agricultural statistics we spent in 1878, $92,000, and in 1894, $265,000. Strike $75,000 off that, and still the increase will be out of all proportion to the increased population. On immigration we spent in 1878, $154,000, and in 1894, $202,000. Strike off $50,000—strike the whole thing off, it would not make any difference. On Indians in 1878, we spent $420,000, and in 1894, $968,000. It takes 47 cents out of every dollar to pay the other 53 cents to the Indians. I think I could arrange that so as to save $300,000 and leave the Indians as well off as they are. On steamship subventions we spent $257,000 in 1878, and $530,000 in 1894. We have subsidized a line to Australia to bring in Australian frozen mutton, and we shipped $18 of agricultural products there last year. We need that line as badly as a cart needs a fifth wheel. Strike it off. On militia and defence we spent in 1878, $618,136, and in 1894, $1,284,517—more than double what we spent in 1878. What is the sense of that? The population has not doubled; it has not increased over 20 per cent. Strike off $280,000 from that, and leave a round million for militia expenditure, and that will be plenty. On mounted police we spent in 1878, $335,000, and in 1894, $611,000. We can effect a saving there, I think, of $125,000. In the North-west Territories we spent $18,199 in 1878, and in 1894, $277,000. We could save the whole of that expense by allowing the North-west Territory people to manage their own concerns. Give them self-government, do not lead them around as infants with a string, but let them manage their own business like free British subjects, and save the whole amount of $276,000, or allow $76,000 for incidental expenses and strike off $200,000. On penitentiaries we spent in 1878, $308,000, and in 1894, $466,000. Strike $50,000 from that. On public works we spent $997,000 in 1878, and $2,034,000 in 1894. Why can you not get along with an addition to the expenditure in 1878 corresponding with our increasing population and wealth. On superannuation we spent $106,000 in 1878, and $262,000 in 1894. I think the way to do with that is to wipe it out. At all events, we can strike $50,000 from that. On the Franchise Act we spent $250,000. Cut the whole thing off. On customs we spent

in 1878, $714,5227, and in 1894, $921,000. A reduction can be effected there. You can wipe out the Controller and some other officers and be all the better off for it. I think we could effect a saving there of $100,000. Weights and measures, $94,975. Strike that off altogether. On excise, we spent $215,000 in 1878, and $485,000 in 1894. Knock another $100,000 from that, and another Controller. Adulteration of food, $24,000. Strike that off. Post office, in 1878 we spent $1,725,000, and in 1894, $3,517,000. While the population of the country has increased about 20 per cent only, was there any sense in increasing the post office expenditure over 100 per cent. I think not. Strike from that $150,000. Railways and canals, in 1878 we spent $2,374,313, and in 1894, $3,760,549. Strike $750,000 from that. What does all this amount to? My hon. friend challenged me to say where any reduction could be effected in this expenditure of $20,000,000. There is a reduction of $3,948,000. If we can get rid of Controllers and supernumeraries and introduce a system into the Civil Service which will require a man to do a day's work for a day's wage and put men in the service who are capable of doing work, and discharge those who are mere attachés, put there by political friends, we can save an enormous sum of money. The men who appointed them will never do that. They cannot discharge these useless civil servants, because these useless people have too much political influence. But put an Administration in office who does not care a continental whether the friends of these useless attachés are friends or enemies, and we will start them on the run sufficiently fast to effect a great saving. Put men in the departments who will turn things over and allow the country to see what is going on. Let in the light. Let us know what is going on. Let us know what there is that is rotten in Denmark. We voted $4,600,000 in railway subsidies last year—waste, the most of it. Almost all these subsidies were purely for political purposes, without any design to benefit the country, without the remotest idea of benefiting the country. Then we can refrain, Mr. Speaker, from constructing Tay canals, from building Curran bridges, from making appropriations for Trent canals; we can refrain from this whole abominable system of squandering millions of the money of the people of this country to benefit ridings and strengthen candidates. Why, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals justified the expenditure of $476,000 upon the Tay Canal that paid last year one three-hundredth part of the interest upon its cost and its charges of management, on the ground that his riding had had no benefit in the shape of an expenditure of public money before. That is the principle these men have acted upon—laying out money, squandering millions for the purpose of making themseleves solid in their constituencies, for the purpose of improving their own political fortunes, acting upon the assumption that all the wealth of Canada can be legitimately used for the purpose of securing them in the possession of power and of excluding their opponents from power.

Then, Sir, with regard to the debt. My friend the Controller of Customs told us last night that the net debt had increased five and a half million dollars in the last five years. Well, I suspect that the hon. gentleman did not prepare his figures himself, and possibly got them mixed a little.

Mr. WALLACE. I stated that the net debt had increased eight and a half millions.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, eight and a half millions. I will take the net debt for four and half years up to 31st January last. The debt on 30th June, 1890, was $237,809,000, and on the 31st January last it was $249,407,000, which makes an increase in four years and seven months of $11,598,000, instead of $8,500,000. And we do not know how much more it is now—it may be a million or two more. What reliance can we place upon the hon. gentleman's statement, if he cannot sum up the increase of our public debt for four and a half years without making a mistake of about $3,000,000?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps he has an explanation to offer.

Mr. WALLACE. I quoted the increase of the debt for five years from 1889 to 1894. I stated that it was about $237,500,000 at the beginning of that period and about $246,000,000 at the end of it. The public accounts will show that I am right.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman must have chosen the period very prudently. But he will be judged by the country by the condition of the debt up to the present time. I will venture to say, without looking at the public accounts which I cannot take time to do now, that the hon. gentleman is wrong, even for the period he chose. At the end of the period he chose the public debt, as he states it, was $246,000,000. Now, the public debt on 31st January last was shown to be $249,000,000, and we have $8,700,000 voted but not paid for railway subsidies, we have appropriations for the Trent Valley Canal, the St. Lawrence Canal and a lot of other public works involving expenditures of $63,000,000 worth? Will they realize their nominal value? How much can you get for the $370,000 in the Fredericton Bridge and arrears of interest? How much can you get for three or four millions of dollars of Quebec harbour bonds? What do these assets that are put down there and carried forward, year after year, epresent of actual value? What would they

realize if we put them on the market or closed them out? If we squeeze the water out of them, I believe they would shrink several millions of dollars. I venture to say that at this moment the net debt of Canada is in reality not a dollar less than $275,000,000. And this is the prudent, economical, financial policy that these hon. gentlemen talk about and justify before the country. The increase of the public debt since 1878 is $109,045,000. The hon. gentleman told us about the increase in the debt under Mr. Mackenzie. But he stopped there. But since Mackenzie's Administration closed, these hon. gentlemen have increased the debt over $109,000,000. The Controller of Customs told us last night—another evidence of his accuracy—that the public debt had increased on the average eight and a half million dollars a year under Mr. Mackenzie. That would be a total of over $40,000,000. But the increase of the debt from 1874 to 1878 was $32,037,000. The increase of the debt from 1874 to 1879, eight months of which was under Tory administration, was $34,665,000. So the hon. gentleman is millions of dollars out of the way in the reckless statements that he makes. And who was responsible, Mr. Speaker, for that increase of the debt? The debt increased from $75,728,000 in 1867 to practically $275,000,000 to-day. The Conservative Government, I say here, in the face of this House and of the country, is responsible for every dollar of it—responsible for the increase from 1867 to 1873; responsible for the increase from 1873 to 1879; responsible for the increase from 1879 to 1894. Why? Because the increase of the debt under the Mackenzie Administration was incurred in the discharge of obligations that that Administration never entered into; incurred in carrying out contracts that their predecessors had made; incurred in consequence of public works or undertakings initiated wholly by their predecessors, except for a paltry sum of one or two hundred thousand dollars. The Mackenzie Government was not responsible for the selection of the route upon which the Intercolonial road was built; it was not responsible for the building of that road, for it came into power when that road was partly constructed and contracts were out for the construction of the remainder. The Mackenzie Government was not responsible for the enlargement of the canals—the whole work had been provided for so far as the incurring of the obligation was concerned, and they had to carry out the agreements and contracts entered into by their predecessors. And so I say that the whole debt from 1867 to the present moment must be shouldered by the present Government and their Conservative predecessors, for they are responsible for every dollar of it.

An hon. MEMBER. Everybody knows that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Everybody knows it. Nobody denies it except those who want to deny a fact.

Now, with regard to deficits. The Mackenzie Government is responsible for deficits up to 1878, amounting to $4,489,000. But if we make them responsible for the year 1879, for more than eight months of which they were not in office, the whole amount of their deficits would be $6,427,000. Gentlemen opposite have incurred deficits since then of $16,138,000, including the estimated deficit of $4,500,000 for the current year. And yet they have the brazen effrontery to stand up here and talk about deficits under the Mackenzie Government, as though they themselves had never incurred one. Yet in reality their deficits are nearly three times as large as those of the Mackenzie Government, even shouldering upon that Government the year for which they were not responsible. Again, the different circumstances under which these deficits were incurred must be taken into consideration. The deficits under the Mackenzie Government were incurred during a period of extreme stringency lasting through four out of the five years of their term of office, and they were incurred mainly through the refusal of the Administration to increase the taxation. Deficits under the present Government have been incurred in face of the largely-increased taxation; the burdens upon the people are from 30 to 40 per cent greater than they were under the management of my hon. friend to my right. Still, with these increased burdens, with these largely increased duties, with much larger revenue, the Government have incurred deficits of over $16,000,000. But my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not want to increase the duty, and he said: Wait, the circumstances under which we are living now, are abnormal in their character; wait till this depression passes away; wait till the normal condition of trade returns, and then we will see where we are. In the meantime, with the cruel depression existing, we do not want to pile additional burdens upon the people, and we can afford to wait. Suppose he had remained in power a year or two longer, suppose he had been in power in 1880——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that the reason the Minister of Finance at that day gave for not imposing new taxes?

Mr. CHARLTON. It is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think you will find out differently.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think not. I think the hon. gentleman took the ground that when trade resumed its normal condition, the revenue derived from the tariff as it existed then, would be sufficient for the needs of the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friend will find, if he reads the Budget

speech, that that was not the reason. My hon. friend from South Oxford won't say that was the excuse he gave.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Most undoubtedly it was.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from South Oxford gave the excuse that he did not want to mix up the discussion with the trade question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have given the reason the hon. gentleman assigned. I sat in this House and heard him assign that reason; I heard his Budget speech, I am a living witness, and know about it. I know the question was discussed in party caucuses. I know what the decision of the party was, I know what reasons he gave the party in refusing to augment the burdens upon the people of this country. I know, furthermore, that the position assumed by my hon. friend would have succeeded, and would have proved that his prognostications were correct, if he had remained Minister of Finance for two short years longer. Our revenue, in 1879, was $12,900,000 from customs; the revenue of the United States, in 1879, was $137,250,000. Now, we changed our tariff in 1879; the United States did not: and if we take the experience of the United States, passing from the depression to that condition of things when trade resumed its normal course, and find what the effect was upon the revenue of that country, we may fairly assume that a corresponding effect would have been produced upon our revenue if no change of tariff had been made. Now, Sir, in 1879 the United States revenue was $137,000,000; their revenue in 1880, after the depression had passed away, was $186,000,000, the increase of revenue in one year was $49,272,000. Now, the increase of revenue in this country between 1879 and 1880, providing our tariff had remained the same, would have been $4,650,000; the entire revenue would have been $17,544,000 in place of $12,900,000, if it had borne exactly the same proportion to the increased revenue of the United States between 1879 and 1880. If taxation had been no higher in 1880, this Government would have had a surplus of $3,100,000, and the assumption upon which my hon. friend proceeded would have been borne out triumphantly by the outcome. The policy of not increasing the burdens of the people, was a good one; it is the policy the Reform Government pursued upon all occasions. They were careful about increasing the expenditure they were careful about increasing the taxation, they were prudent in the management of our fiscal affairs; and in all these things their record has been in striking contrast to the record of their successors. These hon. gentlemen were imprudent, they were reckless, they increased the debt, they increased the taxes, they increased expenditure by fourteen million dollars, and they have piled upon the people of this country burdens under which they stagger to-day; they have piled upon people of this country burdens which, even if an honest, an economical Government comes into power, only long years of self-denial and economy will remove.

Now, to the next postulate, that their financial policy was honest and clean. How was it about the sweating of public contracts? How was it about the imprisonment of McGreevy and Connolly, and their pardon, because there were men upon the treasury benches more worthy to be in jail than they? How was it when Mr. McGreevy took his seat in this House with a cloud resting upon his reputation? I felt sorry for the man. I felt indignant that he had not had the moral courage to expose the whole of this thing from top to bottom, and to have shown that there were other men in this Chamber who were more worthy of punishment than he; that he had been simply goaded on by men who are enjoying the fruits and reaping the advantages of transactions for which he was punished. We saw him come in here escorted by the two Tory whips; he ought to have been introduced by the ex-Minister of Public Works and the present Postmaster General. How much money, Mr. Speaker, do you suppose the Government made by this contract sweating system? How many hundreds of thousands of dollars were diverted from their proper purposes of honest expenditure, and carried into that election fund? How many? And then this railway bonussing to the extent of $7,800,000 yet to pay, besides all the millions that have been paid on the same account—what has been done with that? How much good has the country got out of it? How much advantage does the Government reap from that? To what extent have they benefited by these subsidies? Have they taken 10 per cent, or 25 per cent toll, or what did they take? What do they propose to do with the Hudson Bay Railway grant of $2,500,000 to build a section of the road that will not cost more than $2,000,000? Are they to take $250,000 of the surplus for their election fund, as has been reported, and allow the contractors to take the other half of the surplus? Are these charges that have been made, true? Has the policy of the Government been a clean and honest policy? Why did they increase the mail subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway while a contest was pending in 1891 by order in Council? How much of it did the Canadian Pacific Railway give back to their election fund? Why did they give to the Canadian Pacific Railway 6,400 acres of land per mile for a railway already constructed, that they knew, and every man knew, the company had built for its own purposes, and would have built anyway? Why have they squandered the area of an empire in putting

bogus railway schemes upon their feet, and investing speculative companies with the possession of franchises of enormous value, when they knew, and every man knew, that these companies were not intended to proceed with their work, but intended simply to hawk these charters around the country for sale? How pure was their transaction when they gave away 25,000 square miles of Dominion timber limits to their friends? What were the motives that actuated them in building the Tay canal, the Trent Valley canal, and the Curran bridge, and changing the contract for Sheik's dam? Has their record been an honest and clean record? I deny that such is the case. They have been engaged in humbugging the people. They have been engaged in denying to the people that which could alone conduce to their prosperity. They have made no attempt to secure reciprocity. They have palmed off upon the people their absurd schemes for promoting trade with Australia, trade with South Africa, trade with the West Indies, trade with these outlying countries that could not all together furnish a trade of $2,000,000; and the Government offer this as a substitute for that market of 67,000,000 of people at our doors. They have been the paid agents of the monopolies, and rings, and combines; and they have sat in this House and upon the treasury benches, and have shaped the legislation of the country to promote the interests of this small fraction of its population, regardless of the interests of the agriculturist, of the miner, of the fisherman, of the lumberman, and of the labourer; and they have received from these interests, as a compensation for their services, the funds that have kept them in power. Have their laws been salutary laws? Look at their Gerrymander Act, which gives to 300,000 Liberal voters in Ontario less power than 200,000 Conservative voters, an infamous, cut-throat, assassin-like policy, borrowed from the United States with their National Policy. Was their Franchise Act a proper measure, when the Government took into their own hands the making of the lists and the printing of the lists? Do they tell us that the National Policy has secured them success in three elections, when they have at the same time been supported by the gerrymander, the Franchise Act, and boodle covering millions of dollars whih have been acquired in the way I have described? No; in none of those respects are the claims they make before the House and the country founded on fact; and this Government is unworthy of the confidence of the people, unworthy of their confidence either as regards their fiscal policy, their general policy, or as to the manner in which they are discharging their trust, and for that reason I hope to see the Government replaced by a better one. I shall labour for that purpose and to that end, and I shall consider it a godsend to this country if ever the efforts for securing such change are crowned with success.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, the important question now under discussion before this House attracts, naturally, our attention. I have done my best to study it so as to be able to give an intelligent vote and be ably to understand fully the consequences of the decision in which I will share. The question, which has been mixed up with diverse side issues, is as to whether the protective policy adopted and followed since 1879 should be persevered in, or whether it should be changed. In order to understand exactly the position taken by the Liberal party, we must, I think, look back, and not be entirely satisfied with the motion which the future Finance Minister has presented. I think we have to go back as far as 1889 to understand exactly the meaning of his present motion. Under similar circumstances prevailing in that year, he proposed an amendment to a similar motion to that now in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and that amendment reads as follows:—

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

In 1891, under similar circumstances, and with a new Parliament, the hon. gentleman expressed the views of the Opposition in a motion in these terms:

> That the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity, and more particularly on those more generally consumed by artisans, miners, fishermen and farmers, and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed will be opened in Washington in October next, be conducted so as to secure the most extended freedom of reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States in manufactures, as well as in natural products.

In 1893 the hon. gentleman moved another resolution, as follows:—

> That the present Customs tariff bears heavily and unjustly upon the great consuming classes of the Dominion, and should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of freer trade, and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government, with efficient and economical administration.

In 1894, the hon. gentleman moved another resolution:

> That, while recognizing in the reductions proposed an admission to that extent of the injury in-

flicted on the people by the system of high protective duties, this House is, nevertheless, of the opinion that the amendments suggested, being based on the principle of protection, and not solely on the requirements of the public service, are inadequate to afford sufficient relief from the burdens of excessive and unfair taxation.

And further on the hon. gentleman said :

The tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government, and should have eliminated from it the principle of protection to particular industries at the expense of the community at large, and should be imposed for revenue only ; and it is the duty of the Government to make free, as largely as possible, the necessaries of life and promote freer trade with the whole world, particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Besides these motions submitted to the House, we have had speeches delivered by the leader of the Opposition in this country and in the United States ; and I think I am acting rightly in quoting from those speeches in order to show exactly the aim of the Liberal party in this House. On 12th February, 1891, Mr. Laurier wrote in the public press a letter setting out the then programme of his party, and I find in that programme the following sentence :—

The proposed reform is unrestricted reciprocity, the liberty of commerce between Canada and the United States.

On 17th November, 1891, the hon. gentleman went to Boston and attended a large meeting, and addressing the Americans, he said :

If you are willing to open to us your markets, we are quite willing also to open our markets to your products of all kinds, natural or manufactured.

Further on, he said :

We are willing, therefore, when a new treaty is negotiated between the two nations, that it shall not apply to one class, but to all classes of goods, whether natural or manufactured.

In Montreal, on 22nd January last, there was a large meeting held, and Hon. Mr. Laurier said there :

The programme is reciprocity of trade with our neighbours. * * The first item is condemnation of the present fisical policy, the second is reciprocity of trade with our neighbours. * * This is the whole programme of the Liberal party.

Explaining that programme, the hon. gentleman said :

The Conservative party believe in protection, all their hope is in protection. The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines, such as exists in Great Britain.

A few days afterwards there was a meeting in Sohmer Park, and there the hon. gentleman said (I translate from the French) :

We will start by modifying the tariff with the object of obtaining a revenue, and will try to reduce the taxes to a minimum. The present system places the taxes at a maximum, not only on the consumer, but on the manufacturer.

* * * * * * *

Protection is a fine thing, but only for some monopolies. It prevents the growing of our great natural industries. Now I have been asked, what we shall do ? We will have a tariff for revenue, and we will completely abolish the duties on raw materials.

A few days afterwards, on the 13th March, there was a large meeting at St. Roch, Quebec, but at that meeting not a word was said as to the fiscal policy of the Liberal party. The hon. leader of the Opposition was satisfied there with throwing out jets of eloquence, but he did not throw any light upon the programme of his party. Next he went to Lorette, in the neighbouring district, and there he said :

And, after all, if we have to choose between the farmers and the manufacturers, my choice would be speedily made. I would side with the farmer. I am not indulging in demagogism. I declared the same thing at Montreal, Quebec and Toronto. When the farmers are rich, the manufacturers are rich ; on the contrary, when the farmers are poor, the manufacturers are poor. The prosperity of the farmer, that is the national wealth.

Mr. Speaker, I might ask : What is the exact meaning or bearing of these diverse programmes ? I believe that a greater number of economic heresies are not to be found anywhere than in these addresses of the leader of the Opposition. He says that the farmer is the basis of national wealth, and that he would prefer the farmer to the manufacturer, but how can the farmer become rich if he has nobody to buy his goods ? If he goes to town and finds the manufactories closed and the labouring classes idle or going away, to whom will he sell his products ? I will quote another extract from a speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition at Lachute, on the 8th March, 1895. He said :

In the first place, farming does not pay, because farm products have fallen in value. The Government does not control this matter, but what I blame the Government for is, because you have to take free-trade prices for your goods, and you have to give high tariff prices for your materials.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at present before the House, concludes by advocating a tariff for revenue only. And so, reciprocity is given up entirely by the Liberal party, and we have a right to ask the leader of the Opposition and his friends : Why do you give up reciprocity ? You proposed that system in 1889, you have repeated the proposal constantly before this House in your official motions, you have repeated it from hustings to hustings and in the press for many years, and why have you given it up ? There is only one reason, Mr. Speaker, which I can discover. It is because the Hon. Edward Blake is coming back to this country and he has already declared that the unrestricted reciprocity asked for by his then colleagues,

was treason to Canada, was the giving up of our authority over our customs, was the giving up of our autonomy, was the giving up of Canada to the United States, was sacrificing the tie which binds Canada to England, and was disturbing the present and the future of Canada. With his loud voice, the Hon. Edward Blake has condemned that project. In spite of that, and when he left the country, the Liberal party continued saying, that they would ask for reciprocity, but now when they see that Mr. Blake, who is their schoolmaster, is coming back, they give up reciprocity. At all events if such is not the reason, why do they not give us their reasons? They must have a reason; what is it? What change has taken place in the American market, or in the American condition of affairs, or in American manufactures to cause them to give up their plan of unrestricted reciprocity? One thing is certain, they have gone back on that policy and they now want a tariff for revenue only. Let me ask them: What is your revenue tariff? In the years 1868, 1874, 1879 and 1894, we had our principal tariffs in this country, and they were all revenue tariffs. In 1879 we made a tariff subordinate to the interests of protection, but it was a revenue tariff; and last year we amended our tariff, but we always have framed it in such a way as to have sufficient revenue for the wants of the country. Then what is the distinction between the tariff policy of the Liberal party and the tariff policy of the Conservative party? The Liberals have given one often. They have said that they want to take away from the tariff all vestige of protection, and they want to make a tariff in such a way that it will, as nearly as possible, amount to "free trade as they have it in England." Such is the programme which we have to guess at between the lines in the motion before the House. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, will they tax the raw material with their revenue tariff? There are many hon. members of the Liberal party around me and let them answer that question. I would like a straight answer to that. The juggling of figures by millions and millions is all very fine, but the people of this country have a right to know whether or not the Liberal party propose to tax the raw material. At Montreal, Mr. Laurier declared most emphatically that the raw material would not be taxed, and perhaps many a manufacturer in Montreal, admiring his eloquence, said to himself: I will vote for that man who is so brilliant and who will protect the manufacturers by not taxing the raw material. But, Sir, if the Liberals do not tax the raw material they will not take away every vestige of protection. Again let me ask: Does the Liberal party propose to tax the produce of the farm? That is another question to which we have a right to know the answer, because they must go before the country with an open programme. I suppose their tariff for revenue only means pretty much the same tariff as they had when they were in power before, but still we have to guess at what it means, and I ask them: Will they not be good enough to come straight before this House and say, that their proposed tariff means this and nothing else. I challenge the Liberal party to declare to the House whether or not they will tax the raw material, and whether or not they will tax the products of the farm. At all events for the present, we have to deal with their statement, that they will endeavour by their tariff to remove the last vestige of protection. I ask myself, what will be the effect of that? Seeing in the press so many contradictory contentions, and hearing speakers either in this House or on the hustings expressing views so diametrically opposed to each other, I thought proper for my own information to institute an inquiry. I will not use the results of an inquiry made in 1878, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did this afternoon. I will use facts as they are at the present time, and I beg to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen of the left to them. I prepared some questions and sent them to manufacturers carrying on business in the division which elects the hon. leader of the Opposition. It is perhaps the most liberal division in the province of Quebec. I could not find one which would be more unlikely to give answers favourable to the policy of the Government, though I wanted to ascertain the truth, and I thought that any answer favourable to the policy of the Government I might obtain there could not be looked upon as from partisans. I will give the names of the parties whom I addressed, and their answers. The first answer I received was from Messrs. Cantin & Bresse. It is as follows:—

Question.—Since what date has your establishment been in operation? Answer.—Two years.

Question.—How many persons do you employ? Answer.—Forty persons.

Question.—What is the total amount of wages paid by you yearly? Answer.—$13,000.

Question.—What is the effect, as regards your establishment, of the duties imposed by the Canadian tariff on products similar to yours manufactured abroad? Is it advantageous or disadvantageous? Answer.—Advantageous.

Question.—Are the said duties a sufficient protection for your establishment? Answer.—Yes.

Question.—What would be the effect of the abolition of the duties? Answer.—Against my industry.

Question.—How many persons do you estimate are employed in the leather industry in Quebec? Answer.—12,000 persons.

The second set of answers is from A. Pion & Company. Their establishment has existed for twenty years; they employ 75 people, and they pay $22,100 in wages every year. According to them, the present

duty of 17½ per cent is not sufficiently high; it should be made 25 per cent. In answer to the question regarding the effect of the abolition of the duties, they say :

The effect of the abolition of those duties would be advantageous, provided our products would be received free of duties in other countries.

Mr. LANGELIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. These, the hon. member for Quebec Centre knows, are strong Liberals, their establishment having existed for twenty years, is so strong that they would be in favour of free trade in their line, although they find, as conditions are now, with the protective duties which they have to meet in the United States, that our duties should be increased from 17½ to 25 per cent. I will next give the answers from Mr. John Ritchie. His establishment dates from 1879, and he employs 375 men, and pays $80,000 annually in wages. He says that the present duties, so far as his trade is concerned, are about right. If the duties on raw material should advance, the present tariff on shoes will not be sufficient. I ask him what would be the effect of the abolition of the duties—and now I will see whether we shall have "hear, hear," from the hon. member for Quebec Centre. The answer is, "ruinous." I ask him how many persons are employed in the leather industry in the city of Quebec, and he answers, about 6,000 people. The next answers are from Mr. H. Griffith. His establishment dates from 1883, he employs about 150 people, and he pays wages to the amount of about $37,000 annually. He says the effect of the tariff is advantageous, and he adds :

Several articles of machinery for the manufacturing of boots and shoes, also what is termed findings, would, if admitted free of duty, be of great advantage for the boot and shoe industry, not only of Quebec, but of the Dominion at large.

He says that the duties are sufficient protection for his establishment. I ask him what would be the effect of the abolition of the duties. His answer is "ruinous." I next take the answers of G. Bresse & Co. Their establishment dates from 1869 ; they employ 500 people, and pay $140,000 of wages annually. They say the effect of the tariff is advantageous, but would require to be higher in certain lines. They require more protection, especially in fancy goods, a great quantity of which are still imported. I ask them what will be the effect of the abolition of the duties, and they give me a detailed answer, which I translate, as follows :—

The complete abolition of the tariff could have no other effect than to reduce to an insignificant figure the amount of our operations, for the reason that American manufacturers work on a much larger scale, are infinitely ahead of us in their machinery, get their leather in their own country, and have tanneries much ahead of ours. We have to import from the United States part of our green hides for the upper leather, all the leather for soles, and a great part of the fine leather, such as goat-skin, patent calf-skin, &c. The abolition of the customs duties would favour the importation of boots and shoes. We believe that after one year their manufacture in Canada would amount to very little, if to that we add the spirit of enterprise of the American people and their way of doing business. They will always be ready to sell at any sacrifice, so as to take hold of a foreign market, and we fear that they would be disposed to sell their goods in Canada much cheaper than in the United States.

They say that the number of people employed in that industry is from 3,500 to 4,000 people. The next set of answers comes from Mr. F. Gourdeau, whose industry is that of a currier. His establishment has existed for eighteen years ; he employs from 80 to 100 men, and pays $35,000 in wages every year. He says that the effeect of the tariff is advantageous, but should be made higher for certain articles. He says the present duties afford a sufficient protection for the leather made in Canada or imported without paying duties, but not for leathers subject to a duty of 15 per cent. I ask him what would be the effect of the abolition of the duty, and he answers :

For us it would be ruinous, and we believe it would have the same result for the industry of leather in general.

He believes that at least ten thousand people are employed in the leather industry in Quebec. Now, let us see what Mr. H. Polley says. He is asked : How long is your establishment been in operation ? Nine years, he replies. He employs 100 people and pays $50,000 in wages. He says the National Policy constitutes a sufficient protection for him. I ask him what would be the effect of the abolition of the duty, and he answers :—It would close up our establishment. How many persons are employed in your industry altogether ? Six thousand, he replies. Let us take Mr. Elie Turgeon, tanner, of St. Roch. His establishment dates from 1840. He has a small establishment, employing fifteen people, but he pays $9,650 wages per year. He says : The protective tariff should be maintained upon all the leather and boots made in other countries. The tariff should be made higher, especially upon dongola. He would be against commercial union because it would ruin his industry. The tariff should be made higher on black leather made in foreign countries, because in spite of the actual tariff, a great quantity of that leather still comes from the United States. I ask him what would be the effect of the abolition of those duties ? It would be the ruin of our leather industry, he says, in which from ten to twelve thousand people are employed in Quebec. What does G. H. Larochelle of Quebec, boot and shoe manufacturer, say ? His establishment exists since five years. He employs between 125 and 130 people, and pays about $600 per

week in wages, or $30,000 a year. He says the effect of a protective tariff is advantageous, but that higher duties are required. I ask him what would be the effect of the abolition of the duty. It would kill the manufacture of boots and shoes, in which about 6,000 people are employed in that line. Here is Mr. Max Frankenberg. This gentleman is an Englishman from Manchester, where he is a large manufacturer of india-rubber. He sells a great many of his goods to the States, but seeing that in Canada we have a protective tariff, he conceived the idea of establishing a branch of his manufacture in Quebec. He obtained a small bonus from the corporation, bought a property and laid down his engines, but he found that some of the raw material he has to employ is so heavily taxed that he will not be able to go on unless he receives a further protection in the way of a reduction on raw material. Mr. Frankenberg answers me as follows :—

My establishment has been in operation seven months. I employ 200 to 400 hands and pay $75,000 to $100,000 in wages every year. The effect of the tariff is advantageous, but it would be more so if raw materials were admitted free. The actual protection is not sufficient. On proofed cloth in pieces, the duty ought to be 32½.

I asked him what would be the effect of the abolition of the duties. He answered :

Removing my works to the United States.

That is, if we abolish protection and adopt a revenue tariff he will have to remove his establishment to the United States. And he gave the reason :

I will have to remove to the United States, where my industry will be protected, and my losses in this country will have been enormous.

To give an idea of the value of this industry to the population of Quebec, he writes me as follows :—

Your letter of yesterday to hand. In reply I beg to say that my contract with the corporation is thus : They granting me a bonus of $2,500 per year for five years, payable at the end of every year, on condition that I employ one hundred hands ; and that I must lay down machinery sufficient for such number of hands, and that I must establish the manufactory within six months from the date of the local parliament passing the grant of the bonus, and in the event of my failing to establish the works within the time specified, to pay a penalty of $500.

That I deposit $300 as security for expenses to be incurred by the corporation in applying to the local legislature. In the event of such legislature passing the grant and I should change my mind in the meantime, to forfeit the above deposit and pay the additional amount of $200, making the $500 mentioned.

I deposited the $300 in October, 1894, and the local legislature passed the grant.

Now, a great many of our manufacturers to whom we have applied have answered : Oh, we see that what you want is to strike at our chief, Mr. Laurier ; we will not give you any answer. What is the average of the answers I have received ? Ten manufacturers employ 1,756 hands and pay in wages $600,000 a year. Ask one of those manufacturers, how is it that you are in favour of protection and Mr. Laurier ? Mr. Laurier tells you that he will establish free trade and yet you support him. Oh, he answers, Mr. Laurier is not serious, he will never do it. What is the inference to be drawn from that ? The hon. member from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) is here and he hears me. He knows that the whole city of Quebec, more especially St. Sauveur and St. Roch, live exclusively on the leather industry.

Mr. LANGELIER. They export to England.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman knows the contrary. He knows that they provide only the local market, and that they cannot sell in England because the English people themselves manufacture boots and shoes too cheaply. I say that the whole of St. Roch and St. Sauveur live on this industry, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to ask for an inquiry and examine those manufacturers under oath. He knows that they would say under oath : If you take away protection, we will have to close our establishments. If the policy of free trade or revenue tariff should prevail, over 8,000 heads of families in Quebec would be deprived of work, and that would mean that over 20,000 people would be without a means of subsistence. What would be the consequence ? The farmers in Bellechasse, Montmorency, Quebec County, Portneuf, Lévis and other surrounding places would be deprived of a market for their produce. When they came to Quebec and found nobody earning any wages and no market, where else would they go to become rich ? Now, in Quebec, those who do not work in the manufacturing industries are grocers or milkmen or joiners or men of other avocations ; but if they have nobody to work for, what will become of them ? Therefore, the policy of the Opposition will have the effect of killing the city of Quebec by destroying its industries. Many of those who answered my inquiries are Liberals, and the others who did not answer would have given the same reply did they not fear being obnoxious to their chief who speaks so well. But the whole appeal to Parliament is : Please keep up protection in this country or we will be ruined. What has been said with regard to the leather industry, Mr. Speaker, may be said of all the other industries of the country. Take, for instance, the sugar industry. If you remove the protection on sugar, some of the large manufacturers in the United States will invade this country with cheap sugar, and will make any sacrifice to kill the sugar industry here. And they will succeed in choking it, and then all our people employed in this manufacture would be

deprived of work. But we are told that Mr. Redpath makes millions. Suppose he makes a million, is it not as well that a Canadian should make a million as that an American should make it? Suppose that after selling his sugar very cheap and making an eighth or a tenth or a sixteenth of a cent per pound, he makes a million or two millions, who suffers by it? Somebody has to make a profit; the manufacturer is supposed to make large profits, because his sales are large. I say it is better that these manufacturers who make money out of things they sell in Canada should be Canadians rather than Americans; and if Mr. Redpath and others make millions, I am well satisfied, because they sell me my sugar very cheap. And they cannot do otherwise, because there is competition in the country, many being occupied in refining sugar here, and, besides, the tariff is made in such a way that if the Canadian refiners sought to make exhorbitant profits, immediately the American sugar would come into the country and undersell the Canadian product. What I say about sugar applies to all the other industries; the brass industry, glass, furniture, ship-building, and so on. So far as ship-building is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Government will seriously consider this great question. For my part, I would be willing to make any sacrifice to encourage iron ship-building in our country. I would be ready, and I know the people at large would be ready, to vote millions for that purpose. We are able to carry on that industry; we are well situated for it. That industry requires protection, and heavy protection at the start. But, this given, we are sure to succeed. Years ago, we had a large industry in the building of wooden ships. But these have been supplanted by ships of iron construction. We should do our utmost to start ship building in iron, which would employ many people in this country and give rise to so many other industries. We have seen what would be the effect of the proposed tariff upon manufacturing industries. What would be the effect upon agricultural industries. Let us see in what condition the United States are in this regard. On the 10th December last, in the House of Representatives at Washington, Mr. Hatch moved the following, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture:—

Whereas, the current market prices of the principal agricultural staples have declined about half their former rates, and are sold, in many instances, at and below the cost of production; and whereas such a condition must tend to the elimination of the independent land-owning farmer and his replacement by a dependent peasant tenantry, which, unless prevented, will not only prove detrimental to agricultural and the kindred industries, but also to the perpetuity of American institutions: Therefore, resolved, that the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives be, and are hereby directed to inquire into the causes of the depression of American agricultural staples, and the relative condition of agriculture to the manufacturing industries, and report the same to the House with such suggestions as they may deem proper regarding the differences or inequalities, if any exist, so far as they are caused by legislation, or as legislation can remedy them.

So here we have an official admission that in the United States farm products have diminished by one-half in value. And yet we want that country of 65,000,000 people, exporting domestic products to the amount of $831,000,000 a year, to be allowed free competition with our farmers. This is the most extraordinary proposition that ever was dreamed of. Hon. gentlemen say that the Liverpool market rules the prices for America. Let us admit that for the sake of argument. Let us suppose that wheat at this moment is worth 50 cents a bushel, or a dollar a bushel, in Liverpool. Then, at this moment, it would be worth the same in Quebec, Toronto, or New York, and you wish that we should allow American wheat to come in free. My answer is that the Canadian farmer has the right of privilege in the local market. The Canadian farmer should be allowed to sell his wheat first, then, when he has sold the whole of his wheat, let the American wheat come in. If the American wheat is worth the same price as our wheat, give a better price to our wheat by a duty imposed upon the American product. It is not only a question of equality of prices, but it is a question of giving the local market to the Canadian farmer. I have spoken of wheat, but I might speak of all the other farm products in the same way. Those products represent a value of $350,000,000 a year, of which $50,000,000 are exported and $300,000,000 sold in Canada. That shows the value of the Canadian market to the farmer, and I contend that it is our bounden duty to protect the Canadian producer by securing for him the Canadian market. I will not go into the details of the exportation of the United States in that line of products, because the hon. Controller of Customs went over that yesterday. Now, we frequently hear it said: we want free trade as they have it in England. On that subject we have had the authority of the hon. members of the left in this House; we will seek some other witnesses now. I will translate from Jules Domergue, in his book entitled "Comedy of Free Trade," published in 1891. On page 84, he says this:

Our neighbour (England) has been sensible enough to become by means of prohibited measures the first marine power of the globe.

During nearly two centuries, any merchandise in destination to England or her possessions, had, under penalty of paying double duties (and those duties were then pretty high), to be transported upon an English ship, belonging to an Englishman, built in England, commanded by an Englishman, and provided with an English crew.

Such were the prescriptions of the Navigation Act, only abrogated in 1849, and passed in 1660. That is, in two words, how England became mistress of the seas. It is from her island, to-day the warehouse of Europe, that the manufactured products on the continent, ours amongst others, are directed to their ultimate destination.

Whilst I have the honour and advantage of holding the floor, I think I could not better occupy the time which I am allowed, than by reading to the House a quotation from Mr. Jules Poinsard, a French economist who wrote last year some of the reasons why England has become a free trade country. There will be nothing in these lines but glory and praise of the English people, and in fact any one who has read that book will necessarily become an admirer of the English people. He begins by a quotation from Montalembert:

Montalembert has said it in his own matchless words: "There is within Europe, within seven leagues of Paris, within sight of our northern shores, a people whose empire is vaster than that of Alexander or the Caesars—a people at once the most powerful, the richest, the most manly, the most daring and the best ordered to be found in the world. No nation presents a more instructive study, a more original aspect, more striking contrasts.

"Eager for conquests and discoveries, the Englishman wanders and rushes to the ends of the earth, and then returns imbued with an affection deeper and intenser than ever for his native land, and more jealous than ever of her stability and her venerable dignity and greatness. The Englishman is gifted with an originating energy that nothing can appall, and a perseverance that no obstacle can overcome.

Further on he says:

By thus holding aloof from political influences the English succeeded in preserving in full vigour their private manners, and these latter, modified by the exigencies of the times and of facts as they arose, have imprinted upon the race certain essential characteristics. The general practice of the duties of rural life, and the personal and permanent conduct of agricultural operations, have established in all classes the habit of industry and of self-reliance in constant vigilance and activity. This latter was fostered yet more by the extent and the power of the institutions of local government. The undivided transmission of property compelled the father of a family to train up his children to a sturdy, active life, in order to avoid leaving them unprepared to encounter the difficulties involved in the inevitable task of making their own way in the world. The very tradesman himself, though often but a temporary occupant of communal land, shared in that training.

Further on he says:

In short, the Anglo-Saxons constitute a race singularly vigorous and well fitted for action. Work sustained with energy from generation to generation, for fifteen centuries, has imbued the race with its own special qualities, and laid the foundations of its greatness. It is by the exercise of the useful arts, practised in all classes of society, with hardly any exception, that the race manifests its superiority, wheresoever nature requires the help of man. Work and the spirit of enterprise explain the fact that that race is, it would seem, about to over-run the world. Its whole history is summed up in those words, expressing, as they do, its power and accounting for its unfailing success. This is manifested unceasingly in daily practice, and inspires every manifestation of the national life, and even its very literature. English novels are, in the first place, truthful pictures, setting forth, not the silly or scandalous adventures of a so-called elegant and aristocratic life, but the precise and useful actions of a real life, and are fraught with good examples and manly counsel.

Further on he says:

We have already referred to the great changes operated during the eighteenth century in the fundamental conditions of property and agriculture. After 1750, there came a revolution of a like fundamental kind in English industry, a revolution which, in less than sixty years, wholly modified the relative position of agriculture and manufactures. Manufacturing industry, which had up to that time remained in all but embryotic condition, in a few southern and midland towns, then began a rapid movement, which has been accelerated ever since from year to year. This is the result of a radical reform in implements and the substitution of mechanical motors for human strength in the handling of machinery. After 1750, and in quick succession, were accomplished six great discoveries destined to transform the conditions of labour: in 1769 Arkwright invented his water-frame, in 1770 Crompton his mule, in 1792 Kelly his self-acting mule.

These inventions found a multiplier in the steam-engine, which, patented by Watt in 1769, was applied in 1785 to the cotton industry, the very year in which Cartwright constructed his power loom.

Coincidentally with this improvement in the industrial implements, came a great advance as to rapidity, thoroughness and perfection in the methods of labour. Thus, smelting with coke was inaugurated in 1740. This was a priceless discovery for a country stripped of timber; the metallurgical industry is indebted to it for the leading element of its importance. In 1788 steam bellows were applied to the fusing of iron. In 1793 the invention of the flying shuttle greatly simplified the process of hand-weaving; mechanical weaving sixty years later operated a perfect revolution in the textile industry. Chemical works, the making and dying of cloth, the manufacture of delf, pottery and porcelain made immense strides between 1750 and 1815. Lastly, the subdivision of labour, which was early adopted on a large scale to nearly all branches of production imparted to them a mighty impulse.

Since that period the movement in advance has not only continued, but it has gained in speed. To say nothing of the more perfect product resulting from the mere fact of using machinery, it is safe to say, that within the last fifty years great industries have sprung up into new life. Metallurgy has adopted as to smelting and as to steel in particular, processes of wonderful efficacy and power. The same is true as to tanning, in which time, space and products have been economized.

And that is one of the reasons why the tanners of Quebec do not sell in England:

This applies also to paper-making and printing. The textile industries and their products have not lagged behind, and we all know the variety, richness and economy which have been attained therein to-day. England, in short, was the first country which succeeded in applying

machinery to most branches of labour, and in establishing the great workshop. In this way she took twenty-five years' start of all her competitors, and has always kept it.

Further on he says:

From all these causes, the improvement in machinery and the method of using it in a country otherwise richly supplied, and occupied by an energetic and highly gifted race of people, the consequence was, the development in the United Kingdom of an enormous growth of manufactures. Let us endeavour to measure its extent.

Again he says:

The situation which has carried England on to free trade is at once simple and manifest: the immense development of manufactured products necessitated the opening up of new markets, for this reason, that this increased production far exceeded the capacity of the home market to absorb it. Now, when people produce, it is in order to sell, and when customers are wanting at home, it is well to go in quest of them at a distance.

That is exactly what the English do, and we shall see what means they took to increase their customers in proportion to the growth of their manufactures.

Further on he says:

With respect to manufactured products, there is but a small part of them that can pretend to enter into English consumption in competition with similar ones of local origin. Certain manufactures have indeed succeeded in forcing themselves, in some sort, on the English market, but it is necessary to see under what conditions. The industry of refining sugar, for example, has almost disappeared in England. The competition of the continent succeeded in destroying it. Let us see what it cost to do it. The Governments of France, Germany, Austria, Holland, Russia, and Belgium agreed to pay to the exporters of native sugar, under different forms, high premiums, enabling them to sell the exported article abroad at a very low price. In this manner the English consumer can purchase sugar at a low price, for which the inhabitants of the countries mentioned have to pay double, and even more.

Behold, then well settled, well defined, the type of a country of free trade. It is so, not through the effect of a sentimental, unprofitable and chimerical theory, of a priori artificially combined system, but, "in truth," by the powerful and logical result of a long course of natural circumstances which pushed forward English production to the greatest extent possible. The economical policy of England has been successful, and remains unchangeable, because it is directed by special facts, by the wants which imperiously obtrude themselves.

I draw attention to this fact:

To take England as a pattern, without possessing its natural resources, its social organization, wonderfully worked out, its economical and technical advance, and to wish to enter into rivalry with her, this is to go into battle with unequal forces, it is to expose oneself to a competition impossible to be sustained. We find numerous proofs of it in the course of this work. But we shall study first the economical condition of some countries which, without presenting the amplitude of figure of the British Colossus, are, however, brought also to practice free trade naturally and for analogous reasons.

This is the reason why England is a free trader. France has had to give up free trade in spite of all her economic writers. If I had more time at my disposal I would go on reading from these authorities, but I will not abuse the patience of this House by giving the reasons why France, Spain, Germany, Italy and Russia are protectionist countries. But it has been admitted this afternoon that England has suffered from free trade so far as her agriculture is concerned. I have many quotations at hand to prove it, but as so many quotations have already been given to the House it will be useless, perhaps, to increase the number. But why is England suffering in its agricultural departments from her free trade policy? Because the economic situation of nations has changed. There are agricultural communities in hot countries where the land cost but a trifle, and where for 10 cents a day a man can be fed and clothed, and from these countries agricultural products can be transported to almost any part of the world for almost nothing. If free trade prevails in a country, the farmers of that country are called upon to meet the competition of the farmers of Russia, South America, the Southern States and all other countries where there is cheap farming. Here in Canada we have to pay taxes levied by the local governments and municipal institutions, we have to endure our severe winter, we must dress heavily, and be fed in a particular way, and we must spend a great deal of money on the education of our children. All these items involve a large outlay, and at the same time our summers are short; and so when we have a bushel of wheat to sell, that wheat has cost a large amount to grow. By adopting a free trade policy you bring the Canadian farmer's wheat in competition with the wheat of other countries which has not cost to grow more than one-tenth that sum, and the transportation of which will not amount to more than one or two cents a bushel. We have only to consider the position of the United States. There they complain that the prices of their agricultural products have decreased over one-half. Why? On account of the competition of other countries of the world. Let protection to agricultural products be abolished and on the very next day Canadian farmers will suffer immensely. I had prepared notes to explain the term free trade as applied in England, and to establish that in England while they collect over seventy millions in taxes, yet only one-fourth of this amount is collected from customs; but that subject having already been treated at length I will not further discuss it. We have listened this afternoon to a lecture upon the effect of protection in the United States, in which it was stated that protection has been useless there and that a revenue tariff proved more favourable in its results. I deny that proposition in

toto. I will not occupy the attention of the House by reading any more quotations. I have in my hand Alexander Hamilton's report on manufactures, 1791; President Washington's last annual address, 1796; President Madison's special message, 1809; Thomas Jefferson's letter to Benjamin Austin, Boston, 1816; President Monroe's address, 1817; President Adam's message, 1828; Ex-President Adams' address to his constituents, 1844; James Buchanan's speech in the House of Representatives on the Tariff Bill of 1824, and many other quotations. These all show that a revenue tariff destroyed the industries of the country. But I cannot refrain from reading the following extract in answer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon :—

The history of free trade and protection in the United States, a country having so many points of resemblance to our own, is more instructive to us as a modern example. In the language of Dr. Carey, one of the most vigorous writers :

"Protection ceased in 1818, bequeathing to free trade a commerce that gave an excess import of specie, a people among whom there existed great prosperity, a large public revenue, and a rapidly diminishing public debt."

Free trade ceased in 1824, bequeathing to protection a commerce that gave an excess export of specie, an impoverished people, a declining public revenue, and an increased public debt.

Now, protection began in 1824, and here is the result :

Protection ceased in 1834-35, bequeathing to free trade a commerce that gave an excess import of specie, a people more prosperous than any that had ever been known, a revenue so great that it had been rendered necessary to emancipate tea, coffee, and many other commodities from duty, and a treasury free from all charge on account of public debt.

Free trade ceased in 1842, bequeathing to protection a commerce that gave an excess export of specie, a people ruined and their Government in a state of repudiation, a treasury bankrupt, and begging everywhere her loans at the highest rate of interest, revenue collected and disbursed in irredeemable paper money, and a very large foreign debt.

Protection ceased in 1849, bequeathing to free trade a commerce that gave an excess import of specie, a highly prosperous people, state Governments restored to credit, a rapidly growing commerce, a large public revenue, and a declining foreign debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, every time they had protection in the United States since they have become an independent country, they prospered, and so soon as the dreams of the economists brought in free trade, or revenue tariff, depression began, and went on until they got the proper remedy by protection again.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Are you in favour of protection ?

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker. We have been speaking of Mr. Gladstone in this House, and I will quote what Mr. Gladstone himself said. I take this quotation from a book entitled "Protection and Free Trade," by Mr. Hurlbert, page 102:

When Mr. Gladstone, an out-and-out free trader in theory, was called upon, while Finance Minister, by the free traders of Liverpool to throw off the shilling duty on corn instead of reducing the income tax—for, they said, to retain the duty on corn was inconsistent with free trade, which they were supposed to have adopted—his answer was a very remarkable one for a scholar of Cobden and Bright, though it would have been perfectly natural had he been a protectionist, not as immutable truths, but as policies, wise or unwise, according to circumstances. Gentlemen, said Mr. Gladstone, free trade in theory, no doubt, is right, but have mercy on us while in office.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Are you in favour of protection yourself ?

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has been acting like a little mosquito, and he wants to put some questions which he thinks will trouble me. I am for protection of common sense and the hon. gentleman does not seem to respect it. That is the answer he deserves. He does not put his questions to get information, but he only throws them out to put obstacles in the way of a gentleman he is not able to disturb ; he is too small.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have a speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) here in which he says he is not in favour of protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. AMYOT. What is the matter with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette). Is he sick ? If so I would entrust him to the care of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin). If what I say is too hard a pill for him, let him go outside and take fresh air and the House will get rid of him for a time.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have your own speech here.

Mr. AMYOT. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has been the consequence of protection in Canada ? On that point I will not repeat what I said elsewhere. I printed it in the press, and I challenge contradiction, and I printed it subsequently in pamphlet form, and I still challenge contradiction. My conclusions were the following :—

A protective tariff has created and developed thousands of manufactories, employed over 100,000 labourers additional, gives millions of dollars additional in wages, contributes to the diminution of the cost of manufactured articles, makes us independent of the monopolies of the other countries, develops the agricultural industry, increases the value of the products of the farm, encourages the farmers to join together to add to the quality and value of their products, ameliorates the home market, increases the foreign market, has brought a stop to emigration in large numbers, and has brought in repatriation and colonization, keeps Canadian gold in the country, insures the solidity of our financial institutions, increases the national credit, develops

our marine, consolidates the work of confederation, and makes the colonial tie the firmer.

I will not go into details, but I will take as a proof the external commerce of the country. In 1874 the total commerce of Canada, imports and exports, amounted to $217,000,000 in round numbers. Instead of increasing, in the following year it decreased, and in 1875 it was brought down to $200,000,000. In 1876 it decreased to $174,000,000 ; in 1877, it was $175,000,000, and in 1878 it amounted to $172,000,000. Therefore our total trade had decreased from 1874 to 1878 by $45,168,000. Here was a decrease of $9,000,000 a year in our commerce with other countries during the five years that the Liberal party were in power in Canada. Let us take now our trade during another period when Canada was under a protective policy. From a total of $172,000,000 in 1878, our trade was in 1894, $1,857,000,000, and in 1893 it amounted to $240,000,000, while in 1879, a year for which the tariff of the Liberal Government is responsible our total trade was only $153,000,000. Therefore, our trade increased from 1879 to 1894 by $87,000,000, making an increase of $5,000,000 a year under protection. In 1893 our trade was $247,000,000. It is true that during the year 1894 our trade fell off $7,000,000, but, Mr. Speaker, Canada is not the only country where there was depression during that year. In the United States the total foreign trade was in 1893, $1,857,000,000, and in 1894 it only amounted to $1,714,000,000, making a decrease for that year of $143,000,000 in the external commerce of the United States. Now, let us take what happened in England. In 1892-93 the trade of England was £631,000,000 sterling, and in 1893-94, it was £628,000,000 sterling, a diminution of £2,351,000 sterling or about $11,000,000. The depression which has caused the diminution of our outside commerce was experienced in England. I find in Hazell's Annual of 1895, the following :—

> The year has not came up to the sanguine expectations formed in many quarters ; but, on the whole, allowance being made for the fall in prices and for many unsatisfactory conditions which are passing away, it is probable that a steady, though slow, improvement will show itself during the next twelve months. After so serious a period of depression as we have passed through, a rapid advance is improbable, and even undesirable.

I will quote from the same work the divers items in which commerce has been depressed in England :

> Coal.—The course of the market has been a steadily downward one.
>
> Copper.—The downward movement in prices, which continued pretty steadily in progress throughout 1893, continued through a considerable part of 1894.
>
> Cotton.—The movement of cotton prices, like those of so many other staples, has been in a steadily downward direction during the past year.
>
> Iron and steel.—The condition of this important branch of commerce still continues unsatisfactory, both absolutely and relatively to other industries.
>
> Jute.—The market for this article has been, on the whole, a declining one throughout the year, with occasional rallies.
>
> Linen and flax.—Flax prices were firm during the year, but the linen trade was not of a satisfactory character.
>
> Shipping and ship-building.—The freight market throughout the year has been in a very unsatisfactory condition. Prices have ruled very low, and tonnage has been in superabundant supply.
>
> Tea.—Prices have again ruled low this year.
>
> Woollen goods.—The year has not been a satisfactory one so far as woollen and worsted goods are concerned.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to account for the diminution of trade in Canada last year, but under the protective policy our external trade has been constantly increasing, whereas under the revenue tariff it had been constantly decreasing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why, the object of the National Policy was to diminish our trade.

Mr. AMYOT. The object of the National Policy is first to increase the value of the local market ; secondly, to manufacture more cheaply ; and thirdly, to sell more goods in other countries. The object of the National Policy is to buy in larger quantities in other countries the raw materials which we have not in Canada, thus increasing our external commerce ; and, when we have those raw materials, to work them up into manufactured articles, which we sell cheap in the country and export the surplus to other countries, increasing our commerce in that way, too. The hon. gentleman does not seem yet to understand what protection and its results are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Your leader said that was the object of it.

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman wants to speak I will hear him with pleasure, but I hope he will speak in such a tone that I shall understand him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you will have to be recreated.

Mr. AMYOT. We will give you recreation after the next election, and you will then have ample time for the recreation of the party. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen talk about having free trade as it exists in England. I say that England is not completely free trade. What is the law of England to prevent the importation of our live stock ? Here is what a French author says about it, and I quote it as better authority than my own :

> In England, the pretexts for prohibition are never missing. So, as our neighbours are desirous of protecting their cattle, they declare, on their own authority, that all foreign cattle are sick. In consequence, they shut their doors

against those cattle. Do learn, if you ignore it, that sound cattle are only to be found in England—that from time immemorial the French stables have fallen from peri-pneumonia into cocotte, from cocotte into cackexy, from cackexy into bradypepsy, and from bradypepsy into all the epizootics, wherein John Bull finds his benefit.

That is the reason Canadian cattle are said to be in a state of disease. That is not the example of a nation wishing to be completely free trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to say a few words about the speech delivered this afternoon. We have heard a great deal about the purity of the party, about gerrymandering, and so on. The first objection I heard to the protective tariff was that we have borrowed the gerrymander and protection from the United States. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how it is in Ontario, but in the province of Quebec the people at large complain that we have had no gerrymandering. In the district of Quebec, the county represented by the young gentleman who interrupted me a moment ago, Montmagny, is a county of about 10,000 people, while other members represent counties having 40,000 people. In other words, the votes in that county are worth four times the votes in other countries. If our Government had wanted to use its actual strength and power to give full justice to us in the province of Quebec, we would have had an equalization and a redistribution of counties so far as population and area are concerned, and we could have returned here a majority of 20 or 25 members, which we have not now. That is the position. There is no use in going around the country and saying that the Liberal party have been ill-treated by gerrymander Acts. In the province of Quebec the Conservative party has been entirely sacrificed; but we do not complain; we endure that; but, instead of receiving thanks from the left for that sacrifice, we have been daily insulted, and generally those who insult the most are those who represent the small counties. To show the purity of the party, Mr. Speaker, let me quote the figures. I find since the last election that 25 Liberals were unseated, while only 13 Conservatives were unseated. Of the 25 Liberals unseated, 16 were rejected on applying to their constituents for re-election, while of the 13 Conservatives unseated, only one was refused re-election. Of course they will preach purity. Oh, they say, Mr. McGreevy has been re-elected—what a corrupt party. But it is not brave to strike an old man when he has paid the penalty of the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He did not pay the penalty of the law.

Mr. AMYOT. I repeat it. But there is some thing to his credit—he preferred losing his seat in the House rather than divulge the secrets entrusted to his honour.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. I prefer shaking hands with that old man than with the one who divulged the secrets confided to his honour. I would not shake hands with pleasure with the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) who received these papers under promise of keeping them secret and who nevertheless published them in his newspaper. The one who divulged the secrets received a large part of the boodle money; the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. McGreevy) did not keep a cent of it. He gave it to his friends, to the hon. member for L'Islet, whom the Opposition admire. I do not approve of his actions; but is the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, which has been slaughtered by the courts, in a position to make reproaches? Do they forget the big push? Do they forget those subscriptions of past years? Do they forget those elections where $15,000 and $20,000 and $25,000 were spent to mezmerize the electors? When did these gentlemen get a chance to corrupt the electors and fail to use it? It is true the hon. member for Quebec West, who had gone too far, was wrong, but the electors of Quebec West have thought proper to re-elect him, and this Parliament has no right to deprive them of that liberty. They thought that he had acted nobly in going before the court and receiving his punishment, and in preferring to lose his seat rather than to the laws of honour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. Let the honourable and gallant knight who says "hear, hear," with such an air of purity come to Quebec and there indulge in his sneering laugh, and there he will meet electors who would be just as free in expressing their opinion as he is. The honourable and gallant knight was re-elected in his constituency although for five years he had led the country to the verge of bankruptcy, and we did not reproach him. I say that the fact that Mr. McGreevy was re-elected to this House does not prove for or against a revenue tariff; and hon. gentlemen opposite must be short indeed for an argument when they resort to such a one as that. We are told that protection is of no use to the farmers. How then is it that the farmers since 1879 do not want anything else? Does the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) think we are going to accept his dictum on that point in spite of the expressions of opinion given repeatedly at the polls by the farmers of this country? That hon. gentleman says that protection is no use to the manufacturers. If not, why do hon. gentlemen opposite call them legalized robbers and plunderers? They say it is of no use to the lumbermen. I would be glad for the present if that class would diminish and we could keep our raw material in the coun-

try. I should be glad if we could refrain from shipping it abroad and keep it in the country to manufacture it ourselves. But as matters are, lumbermen do benefit by the tariff. How do they benefit by it? They procure all their tools and their clothing cheaper. We cannot give them more protection than they have, and what protection they have suits them for we have heard no complaints whatever. Our fishermen are protected in spite of what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says. They have their nets free, and we protect the three-mile limit in which they have the exclusive right to fish. Great use is made of the census to show that protection has not obtained the expected results. But there is one thing that surprises me. When hon gentlemen opposite quote the figures of 1881 and 1891, they forget that in 1881 we had experienced three years of protection. In those three years many an industry had been established and many thousands of dollars of capital invested. It is not just to compare 1881 with 1891, as being one a period of revenue tariff and the other a period of protection. I would rather take 1871 for comparison when we had a revenue tariff. Protection is blamed because we have built the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial and deepened our canals and in this way incurred enormous expenditure. But it is always the same cry. Since confederation the Liberal party has been the enemy of all the great enterprises which have opened up Canada and made it a land of value. If we had not the Canadian Pacific Railway, we would not have the wheat of the North-west, we would not have those immense territories which give us the hope of becoming one of the first nations of the world. But what has that to do with a revenue tariff or free trade? I fail to see. They also speak disparagingly of our increase in population according to the census; but they should not forget that in 1881 they complained that the basis selected for the census was not a proper one, because we were counting as Canadians people who were only passing through the country as travellers. That system was blamed, and in 1891 a proper system was followed. Only those were entered who were really Canadians established in this country, so that we cannot really form an idea of the increase from the census figures, but we shall be able to do so when the next census is taken. That will show the real increase during the ten years between the censuses. They also point to raw material, and say that the import of that has not increased very much, but they forget that the raw material is not entirely taken from the United States or England. We have also our own raw material. We have our coal and our timber and our pulp and beet root and any amount of raw material at home, which we did not use when we had not the industries which have been created by protection and in which those raw materials are employed. In conclusion, let me say that I know I will be attacked personally as I was last year. Whenever I make a speech in this House, it is agreed that five or six Liberal members shall look through the pages of "Hansard" in order to find out something in my past speeches to contradict the present one, and they think that they have answered all my arguments when they show that in 1887 or 1889 I said something different. I will answer them in a few words, and we will see the value of the attacks. I have been a life-long Conservative. I was a candidate for this House in 1878 as a Conservative. I was defeated. I contested the election. That contest took four years, and the case came twice before the Supreme Court. At last, I unseated my opponent. I was again a candidate as a Conservative in 1881 and succeeded. My election was contested, but the contestation was dismissed with costs after enquete. In 1882 I was elected again as a Conservative. In 1885 came the Riel question, a question of sentiment and nationality. Yielding to the pressing requests of my political friends, I joined the national movement, and that national movement took me into the arms of the Liberal party. I was elected in 1887 as a National Conservative. There was no question of free trade or protection, then, in my country, the question was whether or not the Government had been right in hanging Riel —or rather, in my county, whether or not the Government had been right in saying to the province of Quebec: Ask for his pardon and you will get it, and then hanging him after all. In 1891, I was again a candidate as a National Conservative. A Liberal parish in my county refused to have me as a candidate, because I would not declare myself a Liberal. I wanted to be a National Conservative, and nothing else, while they said: We want either a Conservative or a Liberal, and we are Liberals. The question was submitted to the hon. leader of the Opposition, and he decided that I should be the candidate. And I have never forgotten that since; I have always thought I was in duty bound to recognize that fact publicly, and never deny it. I was a candidate, and in that year I accepted the programme of reciprocity. I never went so far as unrestricted reciprocity; what I favoured was a treaty of commerce with the United States such as we would make with France or any other country in the world. At all events—I do not deny it—I did my best to convince myself that something else was possible than protection. I did my best to convince myself that I could find something right in the Opposition. I strained every nerve, but it would not work, Mr. Speaker. There was always something lacking; there was always a weak spot somewhere. I asked them: What will you

do to raise a revenue if you get reciprocity with the United States ? But I could never get an answer. What would you do for a revenue under free trade ? No answer. And when I questioned a member of the Left, What is your policy ? Free trade, and another, What is your policy ? Continental free trade. What is your policy ? Commercial union. What is your policy ? Unrestricted reciprocity. I found nearly as many policies as heads in that party. And I could not accept them all. I know, Mr. Speaker, that in my speeches they will probably find something in favour of reciprocity. And, to-day let us have a good commercial treaty with the United States, and I will be in favour of it. Why not with the United States as well as with Cuba, with Spain, with France, with any country in the world ? But not such a treaty as to give up our privileges, to give up our autonomy, to give up our control of our tariff, to give us our right to govern Canada. At all events, Mr. Speaker, suppose I was wrong, should I be justified in continuing in error for ever ? When I decided to go back to my party, things had changed. Those men whom I had blamed, rightly or wrongly, were no more. But my party remained, my old friends remained, and my principles were what they had always been, and I thought it was my duty to go back. One day, after the death of Sir John Macdonald, I made a speech in this House and said the Conservative party was wrong to refuse to take Sir John Thompson as its leader because he was a Catholic. I said : You want a Protestant and, therefore, you take Sir John Abbott. Was I right or was I wrong ? Later on, Sir John Abbott withdrew, and the Conservative party accepted Sir John Thompson. Was I not bound by my declaration then to go with him ? And now that Sir John Thompson has departed this life, the Conservative party have taken Sir Mackenzie Bowell as their leader, and am I not bound to return the compliment of the other and join those Canadians who want to make a great nation here, who want to unite the people without distinction of creed or race, who want to do justice to all ? I should not be true to myself and to my past if I did not try to join the party which works for union and for justice in this country. In two words, Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation of my carrer. I have been, and I am a Conservative. For a certain time, on a national sentiments I was a National Conservative. Being a National Conservative I had to work in the ranks of a party—without being mixed up with it—whose sentiments have never been the same as my own. I withdrew from it. On the day that I withdrew I offered the hon. leader of the Opposition my resignation. I told him that I wanted to go back to my constituents or to leave Parliament and return to my law office. But he would not consent to that, and I could not impose upon him an election between two general elections. So I had to stay, and I did stay. But, staying here, I want to exercise my independence and my judgment, and to take my instruction from these official records and not from the imaginings of the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon. I cannot be ready to answer all he said. He said, or at least I understood him to say, that he had gone to Washington at the request of Sir John Thompson. I have not been able, since that time to have any communiaciton with Sir John Thompson to learn whether that is true or not ; but I am sorry that he did not leave some letters to that effect, or some Orders in Council, for it is unusual, I believe, for a Government to charge a private member of the Opposition with the important duty of representing it in negotiations with a foreign country.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. I understood my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to say, not that he was requested to go to Washington, but that he was requested by Sir John Thompson to make representations to the American Government with regard to the duty on boom sticks.

Mr. AMYOT. That is the same thing. It would surely be an unusual thing for Sir John Thompson to ask a member of the left with whom he was not in very frequent amicable intercourse, to make such representations. Of course, I am bound to accept the declaration of the hon. gentleman, but I cannot help it if there remains still some doubt in my mind. Now, I am sorry to have taken up so much of the valuable time of this House. I am thankful for the patient indulgence granted to me, and I am sure that when the country at large will have had all the definitions that we expect will be given by hon. members on the left about a revenue tariff, and when the country has studied that question, the overwhelming majority of the people will ensure the country's prosperity by returning to power the great Liberal Conservative party.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me to interrupt the progress of the debate, that I may lay on the Table of the House the principle papers in connection with the negotiations between Canada and Newfoundland for the entrance of that colony into confederation.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) I will not undertake to reply to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), it is a task which would uselessly

take the time of this House, and it might, perhaps, take some time without any corresponding usefulness, as I have just stated. The hon. gentleman has just made a general confession. He thought it his duty to explain to us the position in which he stands. He thought it his duty to explain to us why in recent years he changed his course. He thought he was bound to state that he never had been a Liberal, and he endeavoured to have his present course understood. He thought it his duty to state certain facts in relation to the industries and exports of our industrial products. He mentioned the case of the leather manufacturers of the city of Quebec. He told us the leather producers of Quebec did not export to Great Britain. Yet, what do we find? We find in the Trade and Navigation returns of the Dominion that, last year, the leather exports from Quebec amounted to $1,113,458. It is, Mr. Speaker, a trade worth mentioning and the hon. gentleman, who would take under his protection the leather manufacturers of Quebec, ought to have known this particular. He read to this House several letters from Quebec manufacturers claiming that, should the protective system not be continued, they would not be in a position to keep their own ground against foreign manufacturers by continuing their industries. We all know that manufacturers, and monopolists in particular, who so largely and so easily, as is well known, profit by the present tariff, call for protection which is acting against the people's interests and especially those of the agricultural class in this country, which is compelled to support the heavy burden of the present taxation in order to enable those gentlemen to heap up large fortunes. In the course of his remarks, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) mentioned the name of a man named Gendreau, of Quebec. It appears that this gentleman handed him a testimonial in favour of the Government's policy. If I am well informed, Mr. Speaker, the Mr. Gendreau referred to went four or five times into insolvency these few last years. It would show that this gentleman is no extraordinary authority; and if all the other gentlemen mentioned by the hon. member are worth this particular one, I may be allowed, I think, to come to the conclusion that it adds no great force to his arguments. The hon. gentleman opposite told this House that the flour producers were in need of protection. Manitoba and the North-west are large wheat-producing countries, and their wheat is exported to Europe, especially to Great Britain. I never understood, and I cannot yet understand why wheat and flour should be protected, and why we should not be in a position, without any protective tariff, to produce flour and wheat as cheap as in any country in the world. Now, it is plain to me that a protective duty on flour is nothing less than an enormous speculation done at the expense of the people of this country. In December last, and even in January last, a combine was formed through which some speculators grew rich. The price of flour was increased by twenty and even thirty cents a bag or a hundred pounds in Montreal. That increase was solely due to the monopolists who are protected by the Government to the detriment of the people's interests. Yet we export large quantities of wheat to Great Britain and other countries. Last year, we exported wheat for $9,555,000, and flour for $1,842,000. Now, the flour and wheat producers sold a quantity of these products outside the Dominion. They had therefore to compete with the other countries in the world. They necessarily had to compete with the other people when selling their products on foreign markets. It is plain therefore that these producers could now produce these commodities and continue their trade in this Dominion without any protective tariff. They could do it without needing the protection granted now to them by the Government, to the extent of 75 cents a barrel. This duty is imposed for no other object than enabling these favourites of the power that be to make larger profits to the detriment of the people's interests. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down professed his faith in the policy of the present Government. Let us look therefore to the statements he made in 1891. I am quoting from "Hansard," page 4933; here is what he said:

> Those who contend with us that we should have reciprocity with the United States and a wide market for our products are right, and those who support the government, who say that in order to be happy and prosperous we should support the manufacturers, are wrong.

In this quotation of the very words of the hon. gentleman, we have the extent to which we are to believe in the statements he made to-day, and we know thereby what we are to think about his professions of sincere devotion to the great Conservative principles. Were I willing to go on with such quotations, I might make many more, Mr. Speaker. However, without giving all the statements which are in contradiction with those he has just made, I will refer to another passage of one of the speeches delivered by the same hon. gentleman. On Septembr 3rd, 1891, he said:

> The census returns prepared by the officials of the Government prove to us that over a million of people have left this country. And why? Is it not because they could not live here during the ten years just passed, when the hon. gentlemen have been telling us: We are happy, we are prosperous; Canada is rich; Canada is increasing in wealth and in population? The contrary has been proved to us.
>
> They tell us—these great loyalists—that we prefer annexation. We say that those who are disloyal are those who ruin the country, those who steal from the country, those who chase away the population from this country, those are

disloyal, while those who want to purify the political atmosphere and to have a natural commerce with our neighbours are loyal to the Crown, and are true citizens of the country.

No doubt, some of them like power, some of them like to sit near the highly-favoured treasury benches, some of them like to have the ear of a minister, some of them like to know when a contract will be given—not for themselves, they are too good, too pure, but for their friends; and as long as their friends surround them with millions at their disposal, they will say: We are prosperous. And that word "we" means whom? Themselves.

When a young country like Canada is prosperous, the population increases. If, in a young country like this the population decreases, it is absolute proof that the country is not prosperous, and if the country is not prosperous it must be so, because the fiscal policy is wrong.

Prominent members on both sides of the House have taken part in this debate, which has now been going on for several days. The gentlemen opposite mostly endeavoured—as did the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot)—to show that the country is prosperous, the policy of the Government wise and the people happy. On the other side, the Opposition has shown to an evidence, I think, that protection is nothing short of an unfair and wrong political system, a pretense whereby people are made to pay large amounts in order to favour some privileged classes, in order to make those who are strong stronger, while crushing the weak. The time has surely come to go back to years gone by and to ask whether protection has given to the country what the latter was promised when it was led to approve of it. We all of us remember, indeed, that, in 1878, in order to induce the electorate to approve of the political system now in force, we were told that manufactures were going to spring up as if by enchantment all over the country. What do we find now? The Government, in order to try and have it believed that we have manufactures and that the goal has been reached, caused to be made a census whereby people who have not a clear idea of the true position of the country are made to believe that, in fact, we have a great many manufactures. But, if we are to judge of the correctness of the census by the number of manufactures it gives for the place where I live, fifty-two, while there are hardly five or six, we may safely say it is quite wrong. Then protection was to put a stop to emigration. This is another point as to which it is plain we have been deceived. Yet, the Government went to a large expenditure to bring here foreigners who were to increase our population. For the last twelve years, we have been paying, on an average, $270,358 a year for immigration, or a total of $3,244,296. In the meantime, the present Cabinet Ministers were guiltily unconcerned about our own citizens going to the United States, who were the best fitted people to go and take possession of the Manitoba and North-west lands, and it never occurred to them that they could direct towards these new countries that agricultural part of our population which was best fitted to develop their resources. Protection was likewise to increase the value of lands. Well, there is no man in this country, if he observes at all what is going on, who is not aware that the price of lands has decreased, especially in the rural districts. In country places, farms are surely worth thirty, forty and even fifty per cent less now than in 1878. Again, with respect to this, the National Policy has been a disastrous failure. They also wanted to deceive us with the promise of a so-called local market. Yet, our rural parts are in a very critical condition, and for some years past, had we not had the British market where to send chiefly the products of our dairy industry, such as butter and cheese, the position of the farmers would be much worse still than it is. But now the overloading of this very market has brought a decrease in the price of these products, and our farmers are not without feeling some uneasiness for the future. We are greatly threatened with seeing this market pass away from us, and this last resource on which our farmers relied to meet their liabilities, is going to vanish, or, at least, to be much decreased. Those were quite wrong, therefore, who claimed that protection was to be a benefit to this country. We were likewise promised that Manitoba, as soon as 1891, would have a population of several millions. Optimists went so far as to say fifteen millions. What do we find now? Manitoba and the North-west Territories put together had but 346,941 souls at the time the last census was taken. Such were, however, the promises made by Sir John A. Macdonald. And Sir Leonard Tilley announed that the sale of lands alone, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, would, in a few years, yield so large a revenue, that it would cause the public debt to decrease by a hundred million dollars. Well, the proceeds of the sale of lands can hardly meet the expenses in connection therewith. Therefore, we are right when we say that the country was utterly deceived by the promises of the Conservatives. I am not ready to say that protection cannot sometimes be useful. I believe that an infant industry is in need of protection. But such a policy ought, at least, to be carried on with prudence and justice. But where is the sensible man to be found who will hold that industries protected during fifteen or twenty years by a high tariff cannot self-support themselves, in this country as well as in any other country? The duties imposed by the Government on certain goods are nothing short of an injustice to the people of this country, and especially to the agricultural class. As an evidence of this statement, Mr. Speaker, I will mention, among other things, the fence wire, on which there is a duty of three-fourths of a cent per

pound, which, along with the other duties imposed on the raw material, has caused an increase of from forty to fifty per cent on this article, which is, so to say, indispensable. Nails are also an article of prime necessity which no one can dispense with, and yet the Government has imposed on it duties to the like amount of three-fourths of a cent per pound, which, added to the other duties on iron, are found to raise the price of this article to such an extent that in this country nails, which in the United States are sold for 90 cents or $1 per hundred pounds, are sold to our Canadian consumers at a price varying from $2.20 to $2.30. If, however, this was of some use to the Government, if it enabled them to get the money which they need in the management of public affairs, it could be tolerated; but when it is considered that on the articles I have mentioned the Government, last year, only collected duties to the amount of $13,000 and that the nail manufacturers, who exercise a monopoly, got from $225,000 to $250,000 out of this duty kept up by the Government, it is simply intolerable. There is also the duty on cotton, which raises from 25 to 30 per cent the price of this article of prime necessity to the people. This duty has caused an increase of $3,836,000 in the price of the cotton goods consumed last year in the Dominion, and yet the Government only got for their share, out of this large sum paid by the people, $1,140,000, while the monopolists got $2,696,000. Coal oil is likewise an article of prime necessity. Last year, we imported 6,546,000 gallons of coal oil, valued at $420,575, on which the duties paid amounted to $466,164 for the Government. But a certain quantity of coal oil was also extracted from our own mines. The quantity thus extracted amounted to 11,000,000 gallons, and as coal oil is protected by a duty of six cents a gallon, the owners of the Petrolia wells, owing to this duty, must have raised their prices by at least four cents a gallon, which enables these favourites of the Government to get out of the current prices of the market, in excess of a fair profit, the sum of $440,000. The Government only got $466,164. Let us now come to sugar, of which so much was said during the present session. We imported, last year, 3,356,526 pounds of sugar. We all know that the duty is 65 cents per 100 pounds. The Government collected duties to the amount of $168,000, but the monopolists, I mean the refiners who profit by the advantages of this so-called protection granted by the Government, got at least 50 cents per 100 pounds. They therefore realized a trifling profit of $1,500,000. In reply to those who contend that sugar is cheap, I say this is no answer. The market here is ruled by the foreign market prices. The price of this article is therefore raised to that extent, owing to the protective duty imposed by the Government, which enables the producers and sugar refiners to sell it at a higher price. By means of this policy, by means of the protective duty it imposes, the Government favours to that extent the sugar refiners. We find the same state of affairs existing with respect to rice. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that imported rice has to pay a duty of 1¼ cents per pound, and unmanufactured imported rice three-tenths of a cent. The Government got out of this duty, last year, $76,942.23, but the manufacturers, that is to say, the two manufacturers we have in Montreal, got for their share about $200,000. Yet these manufacturers need no protection, at least, they need not be protected any longer. Is it not quite a disastrous policy, adverse to the true interests of the people of this country, to keep any longer in force duties which are intended to favour people who are in no need of any such protection, to keep up duties in order to swell up the fortunes of those who are already rich, and cause to suffer the people who pay these imposts? We are often asked by our opponents what we mean by a tariff for revenue and how the Government committing itself to it could continue to get the revenue required for the public service; how such a Government could get the amount required to meet the cost of administration, if the present duties should be taken away? It seems to me, however, the thing is easy to be understood. We would adopt quite a different principle. Instead of imposing duties intended to favour monopolists and manufacturers, the duties would be lowered, but they would be imposed so as to protect only the interests of the public treasury. Instead of causing the people to pay three dollars for each dollar received by the Government under the system now in force, the proceeds of the duties would go into the public treasury and would enable the Government to meet the expenditure of the country. While on the one hand we view the perpetuation of a deplorable state of affairs, while we find the working and agricultural classes in unprecedented straightened circumstances, on the other hand we find some favourites of the party now into power heaping up colossal fortunes, we find the Government following a policy based on quite different grounds, a policy utterly to be regretted and censured. If we consider what has been going on for some time, it is truly astonishing that in a free and civilized country as this is, in a country where people are the arbiters of their own destinies, it is, I say, truly astonishing that political scandals can happen such as were seen during these last years. I intend making no extensive reference to them, but it is necessary to recall some of these scandalous doings for which the Government is responsible. Let me mention here the McGreevy-Langevin scandal through which the country lost several hundred thousand dol-

lars, I might even say in round numbers a million dollars. True, the Government, fearing for a moment the people's wrath, made a show of their intention to cause to be reimbursed to the public treasury the sums embezzled at its detriment by those who had profited by these frauds, who had extorted these funds which were nothing else than the people's money. As we all know, they took proceedings for a sum of $570,000. They acknowledged thereby that the public treasury had been robbed to that extent. The Government acknowledged thereby that their friends had got out of the public treasury, under various pretenses, a sum of $575,000. Now, what have we learned, from the very mouth of one of the Crown Ministers, since the opening of this session? We learned that this trial has been settled. Instead of receiving the amount which the Government claimed, they were satisfied with accepting $60,000 by an arrangement. But what is astonishing is that not a cent of this has been paid, and I will be very much surprised if the Government ever receives a cent of this money. This arrangement was therefore nothing else than dust thrown into the eyes of the people so as to allow the storm to pass, and a means of favouring their friends. This House is also perfectly aware that for the St. Charles Railway branch, a large amount was illegally got out of the public treasury. The building of this railway which, according to the estimates of the very engineers of the Government, was to cost $140,000, has reached the sum of $1,750,000. And during last session, when the Minister of Railways was asked whether the last sum asked for by the Government would settle all the pending claims, he said he did not know about that. We also, all of us, are perfectly aware of the Little Rapid lock affair, on River la Lièvre. This work, originally estimated by the engineers of the Government at $44,000, has now cost $260,000, and there is a pending claim for $90,000 which will likely be paid when an election is near. All the members of this House are also aware of the extravagances indulged into in the building of the famous Tay canal, which was built we are still to know why and for whom. According to the estimates of the official engineers, its cost had been fixed at $132,660, and it has reached the enormous sum of $476,128.73. To show the uselessness and even the absurdity of this work, we have only to give the following figures: According to an answer given by the Government last year, $2,600 were expended thereon, and it gave a revenue of $135. This year, the Government expended $2,458.89 thereon, and the receipts were $128.79. It is plain, since there is neither trade nor navigation on this canal, that its building had only one purpose, that of giving some patronage, of expending large sums of money in a county represented here by a Crown Minister. And then there is the Cape Breton Railway, for which the Government paid, notwithstanding the disapproval of the Auditor General, a final claim for $230,066.75. But there again there were friends to protect. Indeed, one is led to believe, that the present policy of the Government has no other purpose than to use the people's money to favour their friends. Indeed, one is led to believe, that the Government have come to this, that they cannot keep themselves into power otherwise than by wasting the people's money. Let us now come to the Curran bridge. Here is another piece for edification. According to the original estimates, this bridge was to cost $125,000. A committee of inquiry appointed by the Government brings these estimates up to $160,000. It has now cost $430,900. In this case again, the Government have been acting a good farce. As we all know, they entered proceedings against Mr. St. Louis for a sum of $144,874. This trial has afforded to friends of the Government an opportunity for receiving large fees. Now that the farce is over, we know that the part played by the Government was simply this, that they wanted to gain time so as to evade the question, while making a show of taking at heart the interests of the people. During last session, the Minister of Railways was forced to admit that much waste had accompanied the building of the Curran bridge. He gave as an excuse to this House and to the country, that it was no fault of his, that he was not guilty. Well, Mr. Speaker, who else is responsible for all these scandals, all these robberies which the Government allowed to be committed in the various public departments, if the Ministers themselves are not? I contend that a Minister who receives the large salary of $7,000 a year is responsible to the people for all his officials, and he has no right to come here and throw on his officials the responsibility for these squanderings. The Minister is responsible, and so is the Government, for the Ministers are jointly and severally responsible. Then again we have a nice little scandal which was brought within the knowledge of this House by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I refer to the Fredericton bridge. There is something for edification in the history of this bridge. It has been told the other day, but it is well to recall it again, since I am giving the nomenclature of these various scandals. This bridge was built by a company which appears to have subscribed a capital of $20,000. The Government loaned to the company a sum of $300,000, while giving it a bonus of $30,000. Here is again a masterpiece from the friends. Here is again a construction in which the people's money is utterly wasted. Do the Government think they will ever recover these moneys? Do they think they will ever receive a cent of this money? I earnestly hope they will, for

the sake of the country, but I am incredulous as to that. This money was expended for no other purpose than to favour friends of the Government. Now, looking at it from another standpoint, I beg to call the attention of the hon. members of this House to the way the Government expends large sums, the expenditure of which is unwarranted. Let us take in the first place the expenditure the country has incurred for the Behring Sea commission. It cost to the country the sum of $134,191.68. Another commission, more famous still, and which was undoubtedly quite useless—and here I have no hesitation in openly saying that, in my humble opinion, the appointment of such a commission was a stupid action, that is the word—was the Prohibition Commission. This commission, which ought never to have existed, will throw no light whatever and will be productive of no good result. It was appointed for the mere purpose of evading the temperance question, which threatened to become embarrassing for the Government. As usual, the Ministers wanted to throw on somebody else the responsibility of a decision, and they entrusted this commission with the trouble of solving the question. If, on the contrary, the Government had risen to a sense of their duty, they would have freed the public from the expenditure of an amount which will, in all likelihood, exceed $150,000, and cause quite useless costs. Then we have the famous Franchise Act. The electoral lists prepared last winter under this Act already cost $195,415.05, and there will be an additional expenditure which will increase that amount, so that I may safely say that the cost of the final revision will be at least $200,000. What benefit has this Act procured to the country? In what respect are we better than we were before it was passed? The present electoral lists are no better than those formerly prepared by the municipal councils. The electoral lists made by the municipalities for the local elections are better made and less liable to errors than those made under this Federal Franchise Act. They are less obnoxious to voters when it comes to correcting the errors which may creep into the making of these lists, and they cost nothing to the Government. We might adopt these same lists, as we once did, and spare these costs to the public. It is, therefore, a useless expenditure, an extravagant expenditure, and this Act has cost to the country, since it was passed, the enormous sum of $1,200,000, and that for nothing worth mentioning, simply to cause inconveniences to voters when the lists are made and revised; nothing worth mentioning, nothing that might be approved of. True, the Government used it in some cases to appoint compliant friends, who set to work from the standpoint of party interests. It is nothing short of an abuse of power, of which the Government became guilty in order to appoint their favourites, their friends, while causing the people to pay large sums. We have also another Act, to which an occasional reference was made last year and this year. I refer to the Civil Service Superannuation Act. Nobody approves of this Act. It is an insidious Act, which costs to the country over two hundred thousand dollars a year, an amount utterly wasted; an Act which has caused the public treasury to pay a total amount of $2,531,810, and which above all is a cause of enormous abuses in the hands of men not overscrupulous, such as are those who make up the present Government; an Act which leads to notorious abuses. To show to what extent this Act gives rise to shocking abuses, I will only cite one single case. Mr. Thibault, who is well known in the country, and especially in the province of Quebec, is a state pensioner. He had the advantage of being in the Civil Service during nine years, as secretary of a commission. During nine years, he received a salary of two thousand dollars a year. During that time, he contributed to the Superannuation Fund to the amount of $286.79. Six years ago, he was superannuated when he was only forty-nine years old. The Government deemed it proper to superannuate him, although he was still able to work, and now we are paying him $759.76 per annum, and that for his lifetime. Ah! if the people are in the end made aware of such monstrous doings, if in the end they may discern those who deceive them under pretense of taking their interests, who delude them and extort large sums from them, if the people made aware of the turpitudes we have seen here for years and years, may at last have an opportunity of pronouncing themselves. I am satisfied they will hand over the management of public affairs to men who will be more honest than those who are now into power. But we must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Thibault, to whom I referred as a state pensioner, is a man always willing to come and give the party a helping hand. He is a man whom they send in localities where there is a bad cause to defend, where there is dust to throw into the eyes of the voters. Mr. Thibault is devoted to his party, and this is why he is entitled to a pension at the cost of the people. As the party assures his living, he may well be devoted to it, and those who know Mr. Thibault know that he is not a scrupulous man, and that he spares no pains. Any means are good for him, false statements, anything is good for him. Is there any room for surprise, Mr. Speaker, if he is paid for that? Is not this fact sufficient to evidence the danger there is in leaving such an Act as the Superannuation Act at the disposal of men with as little scruples as those who are now ruling this country? With such a system continued and carried on from year to year for too long a time already, must one be surprised if the Government find themselves now in a most difficult

financial position, in a financial position really alarming, at a time of depression such as this? The Government are guilty for not having managed the public affairs in a straightforward and honest way. They are guilty for causing heavy burdens to bear on the people's shoulders through the imposition of onerous and unfair taxes. The following table shows the rate of increase in taxes and expenditure from 1878 to 1894:

	1878. Liberal Administration.	1894. Conservative Administration.
Taxes	$ 18,476,613	$ 27,579,203
Total revenue	22,517,382	36,374,693
Expenditure	23,503,158	37,585,025
Net debt	140,362,069	246,183,029
Gross debt	174,957,268	308,348,023
Interest	7,773,868	10,212,596

But, moreover, according to the last number of the Canada "Gazette" the gross sum total of the national debt amounts to $317,166,193 for a population of about five million souls. This is a debt of $63 per head of the population. Our expenditure is reaching the enormous figure of $38,000,000 a year. It has been increasing from year to year, since 1878, at an average rate of $900,000 a year, and last year, notwithstanding the need of saving money, it has increased by $922,127. As we all know, the deficit, last year, was $1,210,302. The Minister of Finance acknowledges one of $4,500,000 for this year. But any one who only knows the hon. gentleman knows that it will be larger than stated by him. The deficit of the present year will surely exceed $5,000,000. He contended that, for next year, it would only be $1,700,000. If we bear in mind that we are on the eve of a general election, we cannot help thinking that the Minister of Finance has given such a low figure in order not to afraid the electorate. I have no hesitation in saying that the deficit for next year will be in the several millions. We find, however, in the Speech from the Throne that the Government are intent on practising economy. These savings are not visible with the naked eye; on the contrary, the very same course is followed and I have no doubt whatever that the Government, once the election is over, if they remain in office, will impose new burdens on the people, so as to be able to favour their friends and remain on the treasury benches through the people's money. Another point which deserves a protestation on my part is the steady increase in the number of officials. It is impossible to think that if the Government were intent on lightening the burden which bears on the people of this Dominion, they would not begin by decreasing the number of their employees. If they would compel the civil servants to work reasonably, I have no doubt whatever that they could dismiss a great number of them, but this is no part of the policy of the Cabinet, since it has likewise increased the number of its members. With a population under five millions, we have come to have eighteen Ministers to rule us, while our neighbours to the south of us, with a population of seventy millions, have only eight Ministers receiving the very same salary ours receive. Is not this again a new evidence of an intolerable abuse of power? To sum up my views in relation to the various points to which I have referred, I can do no better, I think, than to give the following observations with respect to Canada taken from an American paper:

CANADA: BORROWINGS AND PLUNDERINGS.

(Translation.) The October number of the "Investors' Review" may be said to be a Canadian one; almost half of its columns being devoted to a scathing criticism of Canadian methods and financing. It appears that Canada is fast being driven to the state of things which confronted Australia two years ago. The prosperity of Canada, like that of Australia, was created by capital borrowed in England. The "Investors' Review" gives a list of the moneys raised on the English money market, in behalf of governments, municipalities and railway companies, from which it appears that since 1878 the total amount of money poured into Canada from abroad reaches up to £85,000,000 sterling ($413,000,000). When it is borne in mind that the population of the country is under five millions, that the public debt of the Dominion Government alone is £50,000,000, one cannot help granting that it is high time for this sparsely settled colony to begin cutting down its expenses. Canada being ultra-protectionist, its import and export trade is practically at a standstill. The loans secured by Canada were mostly devoted to the establishment of cities and to public buildings, or to the subsidizing of railways of problematic utility. The Canadian population, like that of Australia, instead of toiling for the development of the natural wealth of their vast territory, flock to the towns in search of means of livelihood, which they find in industrial pursuits or booms on real estate. In a letter which he sends us from British Columbia, Mr. Nicholas C. Shou, formerly of this city, writes: "The land is valueless, for want of capital and labour put in reproductive industrial undertakings, and not, as is too generally the case, in speculations in town lots."

Another shameful job which the "Investors' Review" calls attention to is the Act by which the Canadian Government agrees to pay to a fast line of Atlantic steamers running between Cananda and England, a yearly subsidy of £150,000 for a term of ten years, and further to guarantee, for the ten years subsequent, the interest of 4 per cent upon the capital of £1,500,000. Canada cannot afford to supply enough traffic to the old lines which run steamers between Liverpool and the Canadian ports, and which do as excellent service for those ports as for those of Boston or New York. This little scheme is going to cost the citizens of Canada two millions sterling before they see the end of it; and all this expenditure for the benefit of a band of schemers and ship-builders, who succeeded in getting this job through the Canadian House of Commons.

Such is, Mr. Speaker, the appreciation made by a foreign paper of our transactions with public money. I may, after that, mention one which we know but which, presently, seems to stand. I refer to the scan-

dalous gift made to a railway company known as the Hudson Bay Railway Company. At a time of embarrassment such as this; at a time of financial difficulties such as those in which the Government happens to be, it is simply shameful to see the Cabinet, always to favour its friends, committing itself to as large an expenditure as $2,500,000 promised to that company. And if we are to believe the reports of the newspapers, this company is in a position to have its road built for seven or eight thousand dollars a mile, while the Government pledge themselves to give it a bonus of $10,000 a mile, or the total of $2,500,000 to which I have referred, which will enable the promoters of this scheme to realize a net profit of half a million dollars out of the sole subsidies they receive from political friends. I think it is high time to put a stop to such a system; I think the rural population is tired of causing fortunes to be made by the favourites of the power. I represent here an agricultural county, and in making these remarks, I think I am perfectly voicing the views of the farmers of my county. I thought it my duty to protest against the course followed for years by the Government. I protest against the abuses of power which I have evidenced in the course of my remarks. I also protest against those who wish the same state of affairs to be continued, and in making this protest before this House, I am only filling a duty which is imposed to me by the opinions of the voters I represent in this circumstance, and who desire nothing so much as a change in the tariff which could, as much as possible, facilitate our trade relations with the United States. I hope, therefore, that when the opportunity will offer, the people will pronounce on these various matters; the people will pronounce on all these questions. I hope the people will not fail to see where are their true friends. The people will not approve of the course of those who forsook the cause of the weak to uphold the monopolists and manufactures who are speculating upon them. The people are waiting for the time when they will pronounce on all these questions. I myself, Mr. Speaker, am waiting with confidence for this verdict of the people, and I have no doubt that this time the verdict will be against those who thus abused of the public trust and power confided to them.

Mr. SMITH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WALLACE. Before that motion is carried I wish to say a few words. Last evening when I was making some remarks before the House, I used the following language:

That was his great solicitude—to see the workingmen of this country protected, as they were not sufficiently protected to-day. Suppose he found a man in this country engaged in a most lucrative business, and employing a large number of men, and paying them in store pay instead of in cash; suppose he found that man paying them in a currency that was depreciated in the neighbourhood, I am sure that his bosom would rise in righteous indignation against such a man, and he would do all he could to prevent such a practice.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if he knows of a case of that kind in the country?

Mr. WALLACE. I have been told of one—that of a man engaged in a large lumber business not very far from the county of Russell.

Mr. EDWARDS. I deny the statement entirely. Such was never the case, and is not the case to-day. It is an entire fabrication.

A little further on I mentioned the fact that he paid them with store pay, and used a species of script:

Mr. EDWARDS. If the hon. gentleman refers to me, I say I never did it, and do not do it to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at a later stage of the debate, the same hon. gentleman got up in the House and declared on his honour as a member of the House of Commons, that the statements I made were entirely untrue. He spoke as follows:

I now state upon my honour as a member of this House, that ever since I employed labour I never paid a man in scrip, nor ever paid a man in anything else but cash. I never bought a product that I did not pay for in cash, and my men are paid regularly in cash, and paid in nothing else.

That was the statement of the hon. member for Russell. I knew that I had seen the statement in the papers that the company of which the hon. member for Russell was the head, were doing business in another style. I find this in an Ottawa paper of October, 1894:

ROCKLAND "MONEY."

THE KIND ISSUED BY THE "WORKINGMAN'S FRIEND" AND M.P.

Below we print a "true copy" of the "scrip" issued by the W. C. Edwards Co. to their employees at Rockland. Study it carefully, and then ask yourself if white slavery still exists:

Here follows a fac simile of the script:

"Good for 25 cents in goods at our store, Rockland, and for no other purpose or place.

"W. C. EDWARDS & CO., Ltd."

The newspaper comments on this:

Organization, among the workingmen at Rockland, would not only wipe out the scrip, but the obnoxious M.P. as well. Will the toilers of Rockland take the initiative in this matter?

To-day, Sir, I received the following letter from a reliable gentleman, unsolicited by myself altogether, but called for, I suppose, by the fact of the report in this morning's paper:

RE EDWARDS AND THE SCRIP.

The system practiced is to issue scrip to the men, to be paid quarterly in the company's store. This scrip is taken at par at any of their stores, hotels and business places in that village. This scrip is taken at a discount of 20 cents, or worth 80 cents on the dollar.

Mr. CASEY. I think when any one reads a letter, the House has a right to ask that it be laid on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not the rule of Parliament. If a Minister of the Crown cites from or quotes from a public document he is bound to lay it on the Table ; but this is not a public document of that nature.

Mr. WALLACE. I have two documents in my hand, and for the information of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), I shall lay them on the Table. One of them is as follows:

This bon is good for 5 cents in goods at our store in Rockland, and for no other purpose or place.

W. C. EDWARDS & CO.,
Rockland, Ont.

Countersigned by J. L. Woodley, who, I believe, is secretary or manager of the firm. I think this justifies the statement I made last night, and I will leave the hon. gentleman to make whatever explanation to this House he may desire.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the statement that I made last night is absolutely true. I again reiterate the statement, and the statement made—I do not think at all wilfully by the Controller of Customs—is, as I said last night, entirely untrue. We pay our men in cash monthly. We have always paid our men in cash. We never paid a man in script in the manner stated, and we never intend to. The statment is entirely without foundation. It is the case that men come to our office, when there is nothing due them whatever, and ask for advances in which case orders are issued on our store. The man goes to the store, and it used to be the case that if he did not take up the full amount of the order as used that the amount was endorsed on the back of it, he returned again the next day, or when he pleased, and took it. In some instances we found erasures were made, and our store manager—not our business manager at all—simply for his convenience, had these due bills printed, and took up his order and gave him a due bill to return and receive the balance when he pleased.

Mr. REID. It is scrip.

Mr. EDWARDS. Not at all, that is not scrip. No man is ever paid with it, it is nothing of the kind.

Mr. REID. What is it, if it is not scrip ?

Mr. EDWARDS. What do you call it ?

Mr. REID. Scrip.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is nothing of the kind. When a man has performed his labour he goes to our office, and if he received scrip or anything of that kind, then this charge could be made. But he does not receive it, and the charge cannot be sustained. My statement is absolutely true, and every man in Rockland who understands the case will confirm my statement. I will just say this, though, perhaps, I should not go further, that I think the people in that vicinity have already expressed confidence in me on several occasions, and I believe they will express confidence in me again. I am not going to make any charge against the Controller of Customs or against any hon. member of this House. I do not know how they conduct their private business, and it is not a matter of importance to me or to the country. It is a matter of importance to the people with whom they transact their business, and this is a matter entirely between myself and those with whom I do business, and it is not a matter for this House. I repeat what I have said, that the statement made by the Controller of Customs is entirely untrue and without foundation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly this House should not adjourn without the Controller of Customs withdrawing the remark he has made with reference to the hon. member for Russell.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. FOSTER. What remark ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If he does not, after the explanation of the hon. member for Russell, there is no business man in this House, or out of it, but will know that the explanation given by the hon. gentleman is true and that the statements made by the Controller the other night, that the hon. member for Russell paid his men in store goods or depreciated currency, must be untrue to the fullest possible extent. The reason I take the opportunity of making this statement is, that I could hardly think the Controller, occupying the position he does in the Government, would acknowledge, or his friends sitting in the House would acknowledge that he is so thoroughly ignorant of the business system of the country, that after the explanations made, he would not be prepared to admit that the business system adopted by the hon. member for Russell, or by the company to which he belongs, would bear out to the slightest extent the statements made by the Controller. The statements he made would be damaging to any business man in the country ; they were most unfair, I think, under the circumstances, they were utterly uncalled for, and as an hon. friend beside me says, they were disgraceful. They must tend to injure

the good name and standing of any business man, especially a firm doing as large a business as the company to which the hon. gentleman belongs. Instead of the system adopted injuring the workingmen, what does it mean? If a man comes and asks for employment and requires something for his family, he having been out of employment for some time, if he requires to make some purchases, as I know is the case in the business with which I am connected, where men sometimes require to purchase their very tools or clothes necessary to commence work, and such men ask for advances, out of sympathy or charity, instead of advancing them money, they are given orders on the store or on some merchant, and the company making the advance takes the chance of the men earning the amount and deducting it from his wages on pay day. Mr. Speaker, you and other hon. members in this House know that it is, if not a general system adopted, one frequently adopted where the men seeking employment have been out of work for some time and their families are suffering—an order is issued on a merchant to give them either goods or tools. It is due to the hon. member for Russell that the Controller should withdraw the statements he made, because it is not pretended that they are correct, that the hon. member pays his men in store goods or depreciated currency instead of in cash. As the hon. member stated, his company do no such thing, but that when the men have done their work and apply for their pay they get it in cash. The company do not ask the men to take store goods or depreciated currency. There is no pretense that the orders issued, either on a store of their own or on a merchant, represent payment to the men in depreciated currency; and it is a matter between the hon. member and the men he employs as to the value received, and at all events those orders are not issued as scrip on which a discount might be made. I think, Mr. Speaker, the case is perfectly clear it is evidently an attempt to bring discredit and injury on the standing and character of the company to which the hon. member for Russell belongs, and to bring such a charge should be beneath the dignity of any member of this House, or any honest business man in the country.

Mr. CASEY. The Controller has seen fit to take advantage of the formal motion to adjourn to renew the attack and reiterate the statements he was compelled yesterday to withdraw, according to the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman has without notice, so far as I know, reiterated statements which had been declared by the hon. member for Russell, on his honour, to be untrue.

Mr. WALLACE. I gave the hon. gentleman notice.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. CASEY. Then the Controller is exonerated to that extent. But he has taken advantage to renew his attack and reiterate statements which he was bound to withdraw when the hon. member for Russell made his denial on his honour that those statements were untrue in fact. You, Mr. Speaker, would have to rule that under such circumstances the Controller must withdraw his statements and accept the denial of the hon. member for Russell. The Controller has, however, taken this side opportunity to renew his attack. On what does he base it? On an article in a newspaper, which is hostile, and on a letter from an anonymous individual, which letter he dare not give to the House.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not true.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman dare give it, let him do so. If he dare not, let him admit it. Let him either be a man or a mouse. Let him either give the name, or submit to the taunt that he dare not give the name. The Controller has refused to lay the letter on the Table, and he has refused to give the name. He has backed up his statement by producing a worn piece of paper. The hon. gentleman has no right to indulge in such a subterfuge.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CASEY. Do, you, Mr. Speaker, rule the word "subterfuge" to be unparliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Then I withdraw it; and I say the Controller should not use any method for the purpose of concealing the actual facts of the case. The hon. gentleman then read from a worn piece of paper, which he held in his hand and which he said he was going to lay on the Table, but he has not done so yet, although he made a great boast that he would lay it on the Table for the information of the House and the hon. member for Russell. Let him put it on the table even and let us see what this so-called scrip is. It appears to be a dirty piece of paper, or, perhaps, metal, about an inch square which the Controller held between his finger and thumb. He is playing with it now, but he does not put it on the table.

An hon. MEMBER. He won't disgrace the table with it.

Mr. CASEY. On that ground he may be excused for not putting it on the table. The Controller promised to put it on the table and he does not do so.

Mr. WALLACE. So I shall.

Mr. CASEY. So he has not.

Mr. WALLACE. I say; so I shall.

Mr. CASEY. Now, Sir, with this paltry and misleading piece of what he calls evi-

dence, he resumes his venomous attacks upon the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) and he attacks that hon. gentleman because of his ability and his high standing in the House and in the country. Now, that the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has explained, any ordinary man, even though he has no more business ability than the Controller of Customs, must clearly understand that these are not payments, but advances made in the way of charity and friendliness to men who had not as yet done work for the member for Russell. That explanation of the member for Russell was made clear, so that even a child, or even a Controller of Customs could understand it. But the Controller of Customs has not yet apologized and withdrawn the statements by which he meant every one to believe that the member for Russell was defrauding those whom he engaged of a part of their hire. I say that it was a vile attack to make on any member of this House in his business capacity, and an attack for which the Controller of Customs owes an abject apology to the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). If he does not apologize so much the worse for him in the country. The country at large will know what the Controller is, they will know that he is a man who can make unfounded statements on the floor of this House and back them up with flimsy and anonymous testimony, and who, when the falsity of the statements is clearly explained, will refuse to apologize for them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I said the falsity of the statements and they are false. I did not say the Controller was lying. He has told us that he thought at first there was something in these things, but the fact is now made clear to him that there is nothing in them, and it is his duty as a gentleman sitting in an Assembly of gentlemen to observe the decencies of parliamentary usage, and to apologize and withdraw. We did not expect very much from the Controller of Customs, but we did expect that the decencies of debate would be followed to that extent, and we expect that he will do so still.

Mr. WALLACE. I have only to say one thing in placing these articles upon the Table of the House, and that is, that they were issued by the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) or his company for labour.

Mr. EDWARDS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. For labour performed—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WALLACE.—That they were redeemed in store goods——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order——

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to say that they were redeemed——

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman must take his seat.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to say before I sit down——

Mr. CASEY. No, he will say nothing before he sits down. He is called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) ?

Mr. CASEY. The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman must accept the statement of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) that this so-called scrip was not issued for labour performed, but as an advance for labour which might be performed in the future, or might not. He cannot repeat that statement in the face of the denial of the member for Russell. I ask your ruling on that point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. My own impression is, that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), having made the statement that these documents or whatever they may be, were not issued in payment of labour, that statement ought to be accepted by the hon. member (Mr. Wallace).

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear, and it must be.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall place them on the Table, Mr. Speaker, and I shall ask : What were they issued for ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair. Order.

Mr. CASEY. Withdraw. I rise to the point of order that the hon. member must withdraw, as you have ruled, Sir, before he proceeds. That is one of the established rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The established rule of the House is, that if an hon. member is alleged to have made a statement upon the floor of this House, and he denies that he has made it, then the hon. member must accept his denial. This, however, is something that has occurred outside the House altogether. It is not a statement that has been alleged to have been made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) in the course of debate, but, as I have stated, upon previous occasions, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), presumably knowing the circumstances better than any person else could know them, having denied the allegations, I think it would be a desirable thing that this denial should be accepted.

Motion agreed to ; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to have the Supplementary Estimates tomorrow ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure whether I will be able to get them to-morrow or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then on Monday ?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have made several attempts to mention the hour or the day, and I don't think I will say positively whether it will be to-morrow or Monday.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BAKER moved :

That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts to employ a short-hand writer to take down such evidence as the committee may deem necessary, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the first report of the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see a notice on the paper in the name of the Minister of Finance with respect to the Markland mortgage. Does that refer to certain properties in or about the city of Kingston or that locality ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it does.

BOSTON POST OFFICE, NORFOLK.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the name of Boston post office, county of Norfolk, Ont., been changed ? If so, what name has been substituted for Boston ? If a change of name has been made, what reasons influenced the Postmaster General in making the change ? Is the Postmaster General aware that the post office in question has been known as Boston since it was established over fifty years ago, and that a change of its name will be protested against by a great majority of the inhabitants who are served by the office ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The name has been changed to Shawmut. The reason was that it was alleged that large numbers of letters intended for Boston, Ont., were sent to Boston, Mass. The Postmaster General is aware that the Boston post office has been so named for many years, and he has received a letter from the postmaster stating that certain persons objected to the change.

BEALTON POST OFFICE, NORFOLK.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the name of Bealton post office, county of Norfolk, Ont., been changed to Shawmut, and if so, was the change made at the instance of the inhabitants of the section served by the office through representations made by petition ? If not, what reasons influenced the Postmaster General in making the change of name ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The name has not been changed to Shawmut.

CUSTOMS DUTIES ON AMERICAN HARDWARE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement which has been placed in my hands, and if desired I shall conclude with a motion in compliance, Mr. Speaker, with your usual ruling. The statement is as follows, and as it is highly germane to the question now under discussion, I shall not apologize for calling the attention of the Government to it :

For some time past the hardware trade of Toronto and Montreal have been greatly troubled in getting goods purchased in the United States through the Canadian customs. They would purchase a bill of goods, pass the entry, and then get a notice to make an amended entry, some 15 per cent to 30 per cent being added to the original invoice, and then a fine equal to the amount of the amended entry being added. This has unsettled the trade for some time, and set them to ferreting out what was at the bottom. Imagine their surprise at discovering what follows : What the Customs Department have said was that they sent a special agent, who visited all the manufacturing centres, called on the different manufacturers, and asked them for their prices to the home trade, as the Customs Department held that the United States manufacturers sold cheaper to Canada than to the home market; and on this special agent's report they based prices on which duty should be paid, regardless of what prices they were bought, although invoices were duly sworn to as correct.

Imagine the surprise of the trade to discover that this special customs agent was no other than a Mr. Hawthorne, general manager of the Welland Vale Manufacturing Company, who control all the manufactories of agricultural tools, axes, &c., made in Canada, situated in St. Catharines, Oshawa and Côte St. Paul.

Imagine the Government playing into the hands of the manufacturers to such an extent as to send the general manager to such works as mentioned to visit competitors in the same lines in the United States to examine what they make, examine their books as to prices and terms, acting as a spy and all this time at the expense of the Government for the benefit of the protected manufacturer and to the great inconvenience and annoyance of the trade. This is carrying the National Policy to rather a farce.

Now, Sir, I have called attention to that because I am aware that, whether the statements made in this memorandum be absolutely true or not, somewhat similar practices have prevailed in the department on other occasions; and what I desire specially to call the attention of the House and the country to is this—that the power which has been vested in the customs authorities and in the Government, to enable them to disregard original invoices and to levy, practically at their own pleasure, a large additional sum of money for taxes beyond that which Parliament authorized to be imposed, is one that is likely to lead to the very grossest abuses and a thing which ought to be checked. Apart from that, if the facts alleged in this memorandum be true, I can imagine nothing more indecent, nothing more improper than for the customs authorities to employ the agents of certain protected manufacturers, who have a direct personal interest in interfering with the importation of goods, and, on these men's reports, to take the steps which are explained in the memorandum, amending the original invoice to the extent of 15 to 30 per cent, and then inflicting a fine equal to the amount of the amended entry. I can imagine nothing more tyrannical, more unfair, more outrageously in violation of the liberty of the subject than such proceedings, if, as I say, these statements remain uncontradicted by the Government. And, I must add that if, as I said, these statements are correct, I can imagine nothing which shows more clearly the extent of the servile dependence to which the Government of Canada are reduced, the extent to which they are, as I have frequently pointed out, the mere tools of the protected manufacturers' association. Sir, for the purpose of allowing the Government and other parties to state their views on this extremely important subject, and, if possible to draw the attention of the country to the gross abuse which appears to prevail, I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to the law which the hon. member for South Oxford objects to and which he says is so unjust, I may call the attention of the House to the fact that it was enacted by the hon. gentleman himself when in power in 1877, and it stands on the statute-book precisely the same now as it was then. The Government has to ascertain what the prices of goods are in foreign countries to-day in accordance with the law. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not inform us in some way that he was going to bring this matter up, so as to give an opportunity to fully answer his charges. This is the first intimation I have had of it. I will read the clause of the Act referred to as enacted by the hon. gentleman himself:

Whenever any duty, ad valorem, is imposed on any goods imported into Canada, the value for duty shall be the fair market value thereof, when sold for home consumption, in the principal markets of the country whence and at the time when the same were exported directly to Canada.

That is the law, Mr. Speaker, and, as one appointed to administer that law, it is my duty to ascertain what the prices of these goods were in the United States, in order to know what the changes were made in the invoices for these goods imported into Canada. We have known, what every member of this House knows, that in many cases—and I could have produced the proof here in scores of cases if I had had notice of the intended action of the hon. gentleman—on goods that are to be imported into Canada, the American manufacturers agree to make a special discount, making the price lower than that at which they sell in the United States. And the duty of the Government is to protect the revenue of this country in accordance with the law passed by the hon. gentleman. In accordance with that law it has been my duty to send to the United States—special officers, trained and competent for the purpose of such duties—to find out the prices of such articles. We have done so in the case of bicycles, agricultural implements and numerous other articles, and we have fixed the prices in accordance with the prices they are selling in the United States. Well, Sir, with reference to the case he mentions, that of Mr. Hawthorne, the case was this: We discovered that the American manufacturers were selling scythes in this country lower than their American quotations. We had their price list giving the discounts on their scythes, and we found that, in order to sell these scythes in Canada—as acknowledged by their own agent to me in Ottawa a week or so ago—they were making differences in the prices, through changes in the descriptions as given in their price lists. They had so changed the goods that our officers, not specially informed in the trade, were not able to detect the difference. For instance, clipper scythes, quoted at $11 in the American price lists were offered here for $8 or $9. There was some change in the appearance of the scythes, but we have proved that these clipper scythes sold by them at $9 were the identical scythes they were selling on the American price lists at $11. In all these prices there was about the same discount allowed off the list. In order to detect these changes I found it necessary to appoint a man specially trained in the business and well informed, and I sent Mr. Hawthorne—to inquire and report to me as to the various scythes that were imported into this country and their resemblance to the scythes that were given in the American price lists. I did so, and in doing so I was protecting the public revenue and the best interests of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not a bit of it.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that when a scythe is entered on a price list of $9, which is sold in the United States for $11, and we are levying a duty of 35 per cent, we are not protecting the revenue in revising those invoices ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are protecting the manufacturers.

Mr. WALLACE. I say it was my duty in the position I hold to take the steps I did for the protection of the revenue. It is because I do that these hon. gentlemen are making these attacks upon the department. I say that the whole course of the Customs Department has been in the public interest, and I challenge investigation into any part of it as to compliance with the law and the carrying out of the law as Parliament has enacted it.

Mr. EDGAR. We know that it has been a provision of the law for a great many years that the Government had the right to examine into the valuations placed upon imports in order to correct these valuations where they are wrong, and we do not complain of that. But we do complain of that provision being made an instrument of tyranny upon the importers of this country, and an instrument to increase the protection of the manufacturers who are already so enormously protected under the law. That is what we complain of, and the statements made in the letter which my hon. friend has read, prove that to a demonstration, in fact the statements are not denied by the hon. Controller of Customs. Why, Sir, could anything be more indecent, as was pointed out, than choosing for such a mission the manager of one of these highly protected industries, whose representative came down here last session and bulldozed the Government and the members who supported them, and forced them to put on specific duties after they had taken them off. This representative of the manufacturers is sent on as a confidential agent of the Government to report upon the subject of importations which would interfere with their own trade, as if the country was not already burdened enough in protecting them. This is what we complain of, and as long as that sort of thing is allowed, we have good reason to complain ; and the more it is exposed the more the people will understand the operation of this whole system of protection.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says the Government have not looked after the protection of the revenue, but that it was the protection of the manufacturers they were looking after. As a manufacturer I repudiate that statement, and being a large purchaser of goods in the United States as well as a manufacturer, I think I can disprove it. There is no merchant in Canada to-day, selling any class of manufactured goods that he can purchase in the United States but can go over to that country and purchase them from 20 to 50 per cent less than they will sell for in their own country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All the better for the Canadian consumer.

Mr. TAYLOR. All the better for the Canadian consumer. It may be so ; but I would ask the hon. gentleman what he is going to do with the Canadian labourer ? I say the Government and the Controller of Customs are deserving of the highest credit from the workingman of this country, for the manner in which they have administered the law which they found on the statute-book, placed there by the hon. member for South Oxford himself. If the Canadian importer had been allowed to bring goods into the country during this last year at the face value of the invoices, for what they can be purchased for in the United States, there is not a manufacturing industry in this country but would have been closed, not a labouring man in this country but would have been walking the streets, as the American labourers have been doing this last year. The American manufacturers have a surplus of goods and they would sell them at any price in this country, but they would hold them for their own markets at their regular list prices. I, myself, am just now completing the settlement of a claim for an importer who purchased goods in the United States, imported them into this country, and gave his invoice to a broker, who went to the customs and made an entry on the face value of the invoice. The customs raised an objection. He wrote over to the party from whom he purchased, that party made an affidavit and sent it here, stating that the prices at which he sold to this importer, were the prices that he sold for in the United States. But, upon an officer of the Customs Department investigating the books of this manufacturing concern, he found that the statement they had sent here for the purpose of getting these goods through the customs at an undervaluation was a libel, and that he had decreased the value of these goods to the importer by an amount of $778, and I expect a cheque from this importer to pay the increased value. Had these goods been imported, not only these goods, but goods in hundreds of other cases that have come under my observation, the manufacturers of which in this country sell them just as cheap to the Canadian consumer as they can be bought from the United States——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just as cheap ?

Mr. TAYLOR. You cannot name an article to-day manufactured in the United States, and which is also manufactured in Canada, which the Canadian farmer is not

getting better and cheaper than the American consumer is getting it. I challenge the hon. gentleman to name one. Let him ask for a commission, and we will send them over to the United States and investigate the American price and the Canadian price, and I will pay the expense of that commission if my statement is not correct. If the hon. gentleman's policy were allowed to prevail, there is not a labouring man in this country to-day who would be earning his dollar or his dollar and a half a day in our industries, as he is now doing.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think if the question were raised as to which was the head and which was the tail in the management of the affairs of this country, the Government or the manufacturers' association, it would be a very difficult question to decide. I do not know as it would be, either. Now, Sir, I can conceive of nothing more indecent, than for the Government to employ, practically, as judge and jury for the settlement of this question as to the valution of the invoice, the person who is directly interested in excluding these invoices from the country. The hon. gentleman chooses the manager of a concern engaged in the manufacture of the very articles in question, and sends that interested party as the Government agent to the United States to make inquiries and to report for the Government, and the Government acts upon the report of the man who is interested in excluding these invoices and these importations from Canada. Now, it does not seem from the Trade and Navigation Returns that the trade in scythes is a very serious matter, that the competition is very great, that a manufacture of this kind is very seriously threatened by the amount of importations. The importation last year was 3,880 dozen scythes, a very small fraction of the numbers used in this country, and the greed of the men engaged in this business is so great that they cannot tolerate even that small importation, and that small degree of competition.

Mr. WALLACE. We have reduced the duty very materially since.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not very materially, I think. You may have done so in name, you may have done so in the letter, but you have not done so in the spirit, because the Government adopts the plan of sending an interested agent to the United States to make reports, and although you may nominally have reduced the duties, yet through increasing these invoices 5, 15, or 30 per cent, through raising the valuation at the Custom House; and then imposing a fine equal to the increase of valuation you double the increase, making it from 30 to 60 per cent, it is simply mockery for the hon. gentleman to talk about having reduced the duties. He is acting in the interest of the manufacturer, he is employing the manufacturer as his agent, he is sending that manufacturer to the United States to report for him what he shall do, and the collector of customs is to obey the behests of that manufacturer. The reduction of duties that the hon. gentleman speaks about —why, you would imagine that the present duty was a mere bagatelle. The duty is still 35 per cent, and if he adds to that duty 60 per cent more from raising invoice and imposing fine why, the duty is a prohibitory one. Now, the hon. gentleman talks about the price lists and about discounts. Is the hon. gentleman aware that almost all articles manufactured in the United States are sold upon price lists that are discounted to the trade in some cases to the extent of 70 or 80 per cent? Uniformly, the price lists in the United States are vastly above the net prices of these articles; and he is playing upon words, he is deceiving the House—

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON—when he talks about manufacturers in the United States——

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON—practically deceiving the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must withdraw the word, "deceiving."

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly, I withdraw the word. I will qualify the word, and I will say that the hon. gentleman was making a statement with regard to the price lists by which he conveys the impression that the American manufacturers sell to the domestic purchaser at a price much higher than to the Canadian purchaser.

Mr. WALLACE. I said nothing of the kind. I will say, for the hon. gentleman's information that about 60 per cent of this price list is about the same for the United States and Canada. What I said was that practically the same article that was in the American price list for $11, was in the Canadian price list for about $9, with the same discount in each case. I did not refer to the discounts, because they were nearly the same in each case.

Mr. CHARLTON. Upon what authority does the hon. gentleman make that statement? He makes that statement upon the authority of an interested party who goes to the United States, and who is interested in making it appear that the price lists upon which goods are sold to the American customer are higher than those upon which the goods are sold to the Canadian customer. It is absurd to talk about the manufacturing interests of the United States making different conditions and different trade lists with one customer from what they make with another. If the hon. gentleman adopts this course of excluding these importations from Canada, thereby aiding the

manufacturers that wish to exclude them, he is laying a burden upon the consumers of this country, in the benefit and for the interests of the manufacturer, and he is extorting from them more than he should do for these goods, more than the law allows. According to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), if the manufacturers of scythes and other goods could not maintain their monopoly, all the labour of this country would be idle. Why, what proportion of labour in this country is engaged in the manufacture of goods? There are other labourers besides those engaged in factories. There are farm labourers, labourers in lumber fields, labourers in mining fields, labourers in fisheries; there are ten labourers in other forms where there is one in manufactories. Even if you admit the policy the Government is pursuing may be a benefit to that consumer, or to the labour engaged in that manufacture, it is disastrous to ten times that amount of labour engaged in other industries. I repeat that the Government, in the course it is pursuing in this matter in sending these agents, sending these spies, who are interested in excluding importation from this country, reflects no credit upon them, and their course is a course not conceived and not carried out in the interests of the great consuming masses of this country. What harm would it do if the consumers of Canada got their supplies a little cheaper than they otherwise would? How much damage is there in a man buying a dollar's worth of goods for 75 cents? We could stand that kind of disaster. But the Government is not intending to permit the Canadian consumer to take advantage of the low prices in another country. The gravamen of this charge is the indecency, the impropriety, the injustice of sending the agent of the concern engaged in the business, and at the wish of the monopoly, to the United States to go around among the manufacturers and to make his report, misleading, no doubt, in its character and framed for the manufacturers' interest, and then for the Government to act upon that report. It is a nice commentary upon the management of our fiscal affairs by the Controller of Customs, and by the Government in general.

Mr. FOSTER. This debate, which has been precipitated without notice upon the House, and so much to be deprecated in view of the way in which deliberative assemblies ought to be conducted, is the best illustration of its inopportuneness, and the best reason why the House should come to a conclusion as soon as possible to pursue a different course, and to prevent an abuse which has been growing during several sessions, but which has been especially apparent during this session of the House. But before dealing further with this phase, I want to call the attention of the House to two or three points. The hon. member who made this motion had not primarily the desire and motive of asking for information, of putting before the House the grievance of an elector or a citizen of this country, of asking if information contained in a statement presented to him and as given by him to the House was correct or not, and letting the matter stay there, getting his information. The object of the hon. gentleman was simply to make an attack on the Government. It was to make an attack in an underhand way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. What I mean will be seen when my explanation is given.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for West Elgin has raised a point of order.

Mr. CASEY. The word "subterfuge" was ruled out by you, Mr. Speaker, last night. I claim that subterfuge and underhand mean the same thing, they mean deceit. I claim the Finance Minister is out of order, and I ask for your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the Finance Minister had better withdraw the word.

Mr. FOSTER. If so, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the word, and I will say left-handed. The hon. gentleman's purpose, I imagine, was to make an attack on the Government, and I would direct the attention of the House to the left-handed manner in which he proposed to make that attack. We have certain rules of the House, which are supposed to be for the orderly conduct of business, which are supposed to prevent surprises, which are supposed to give fair notice when attacks are to be made, which are supposed to make it so that the business of the House which is on the Order paper shall have its due precedence, and that those motions will come on when they are expected by the House in due course as notices are placed on the Order paper. But the hon. gentleman makes an attack on the Government without giving any notice at all to the hon. gentleman whose department is chiefly interested, and so giving him no fair chance to marshal the facts in reply. It just happened that the Controller had the information in hand, which enabled him to make a partial reply, I think a very fair and a very good reply under the circumstances, but which did not place him in a position to give the House that full information which the House and the country should have as an antidote to the attack which has been made. The hon. gentleman did not bring on anything of which he had given notice, and he did not give the hon. gentleman's department, which was concerned, the least intimation that he was going to raise a question here

to-day. What is the question he did raise? The simple question he raised was, whether or not an officer of this Government, a member of this Government was doing his duty when he exercised and took what means he thought were proper and right——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not the point.

Mr. FOSTER—to execute a law which was on the statute-book. The hon. gentleman may quarrel with the system of protection, we know he has a standing quarrel with that, and he is perfectly right to do so; but so long as protection is the law of this country, and so long as the Liberal-Conservative Government is in power, and so long as any Government is in power under that system, it is the duty of that Government to see that the system is carried out in its entirety, in its fulness, and not made a sham. This Act was placed on the statute-book under the hon. gentleman's regime. His own Minister of Customs acted upon them. The Hon. Isaac Burpee, I am informed, and the hon. gentleman can put me right if I am wrong, took methods of finding out——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not the same methods.

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that later. That gentleman took means to find out what were the prices at which goods were made and sold for in the markets where they were produced, and he issued order after order fixing the prices of goods upon which the ad valorem duties were by the Customs Department to be appraised when those goods came into this country. The hon. member for Oxford said that Mr. Burpee did not take the same methods. Mr. Burpee took the methods that commended themselves to him, he took the methods which would be effectual in giving the information he wanted; and the hon. Controller of Customs took the very same, and there has not been an hon. member who has spoken who has impugned the veracity or trustworthiness of the information. They have found fault with the Controller because he took an expert, who happened to have been at one time engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements himself. They thought that was indecent; but has any hon. gentleman made the assertion or proved the assertion that the information which was given by this expert was incorrect? Not one of them. They have stated that the information, as given by the expert, was acted upon, and that this expert was himself the judge and the jury, the evidence and the judge. There is not a particle of evidence in support of that statement. An expert is asked to give information; he seeks out information, he finds it, he makes his report. There his duty ends, and the Customs Department, its head and its officers, analyse that report, digest the information, and act upon it in whole or in part just as they please. They are the persons who act as the judges. Will any hon. member say that the information given has been misleading, that the decision made thereon has been wrong? If he will prove that, he will make a case, but he cannot prove his case unless he proves that assertion. The person who is to get the information, they may attack. Unless they show that the information is wrong, they have no case whatever against the department. The hon. member for Oxford calls it tyranny. Is it tyranny to see that a law on the statute-book is fairly carried out?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not criticising the matter fairly.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it tyranny to say that a system of tariff, which has been ratified four or five times by the people, shall be at the mercy of any man who wishes to play double with his prices? Is that tyranny or wrong?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's code of political and tariff morals is no better, apparently, than to give that as an excuse; it is no better than to say that a foreigner who sells his goods below fair market value, and, therefore, injures a manufacturer who works under the tariff system which has been adopted by the country, is unfairly dealt with when the law steps in and revises his unfair prices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unfairly dealt with!

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says that it is quite sufficient for us, that the person who buys goods at less price may sell them at less, and the consumer, therefore, is not hurt. The consumer is not hurt when the smuggler gets in his work. Will the hon. gentleman's political morality allow him to protect the smuggler?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, under some conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. And take the halter off the neck of the smuggler, if by smuggling operations the consumer gets what he buys at a less price? It is exactly on a par with the present case. I say the smuggler has as much right to ply his trade and look to the hon. gentleman for a defence as has the man who carries on systematic undervaluations against the law of this country to expect to find a strong protecting defender in the hon. gentleman opposite. So long as he can bring no greater charge against the Customs Department than that it lives up to the law and protects the people who have asked for a certain tariff system, and, despite the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite, have maintained that system for 17 years, so long as the department has done nothing more than that, hon. members will

look in vain to raise much of a breeze in this House or the country from these attacks made on the Controller of Customs. I leave that, and I come back to the point from which I started. I say this system of moving the House to adjourn when the Orders of the Day which are on the Order paper, and to which the House looks for the guidance in the business before it, and when hon. members come here with the idea of taking up the business which is advertised and set out for them; that any gentleman can spring up in this House, and by simply moving to adjourn can bring up any matter that he chooses, can take the place of the regular orders, and can take the whole time of the House day after day; I say that this is not, to my mind, in the interests of that orderly and correct mode of doing business which is most in accordance with parliamentary dignity, and parliamentary efficiency as well. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows, that is not allowable in the English House of Commons. He knows that the abuse grew so in the English House of Commons that that sturdy exponent of the liberties of the people, and of the liberty of speech and the fullest discussion, was, in 1882, forced to frame rules to prevent an abuse that my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), more than any other man in this House, is responsible for carrying to the extreme this session. I do not know what the powers of the Speaker are in this respect; but I do know that it seems that any hon. gentleman opposite can move to adjourn when an order of business comes up, and can discuss a question which he declares he thinks is urgent; but under cover of that the hon. gentleman and his friends can introduce any subject, as wide asunder as the poles from the one with which he commences.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I say that has been done in this House, and the difficulty of making a connection here and there sufficient to give a prima facie case that the two questions have somewhat of a bearing on each other; that difficulty is not great for an ingenious debater, and he can so effectually do this, that I have no doubt the Speaker finds it difficult to rule that the subjects are not in some way cognate. I draw the attention of the House coolly and calmly, and with the best intentions, to this abuse; an abuse which if it is carried on will destroy the efficiency of this House, and will prevent the ordinary despatch and conduct of business. I would like myself to have the ruling of the Speaker, as to how far this matter can be guided, in order that we may consider as to whether, if it cannot be guided by the Speaker, under the rules as they are at present, it will become necessary for this House to protect itself by some rules which will conduce to the orderly execution of business.

Mr. CASEY. Put on the gag.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Casey) has made a splendid argument when he calls out "gag." My hon. friends opposite are looking to Britain in these times, and I suppose they will admit that the British Parliament may be considered to be a very fair exponent of the liberty of discussion. But the British Parliament has felt itself forced to apply a method of restriction to this very matter about which I am speaking. Now, if this practice of moving the adjournment of the House and bringing up every conceivable question upon that motion is to be carried ont; it does seem to me that we will have very great difficulty in carrying on the business of this House in an orderly and consecutive manner. I should like very much to have the Speaker's ruling on this matter; as to how this abuse may best be prevented, and as to the limit to which the moving of the adjournment of the House can in such cases be allowed to go.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker: the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not been very long the leader of the House, and it seems to me, that before he should undertake to propose to interfere with the liberty of discussion here, he had better wait until some serious abuse springs up. Now, one of the most important duties that devolves upon the House of Commons is to discuss the grievances of the people. Legislation is a matter of very much later growth, but the discussion of the grievances of the people is as old as the Commons itself. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has read a communication which shows what a very important grievance this is, and the leader of the House says: that this is not the proper time to discuss that, but it should be put as a notice upon the paper, and that the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) should wait, perhaps a week or a fortnight, before it can be reached, if indeed it can be reached at all. Well, Sir, I dissent from the view which the Finance Minister has expressed. I decline to have the liberties of Parliament interfered with, I insist that the people's representatives in this House shall have an opportunity of discussing their grievances when any member of this House sees proper to submit a grievance to the consideration of the House, and to make the facts known. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has told us how important it is to guard the public revenue, and he says that no one has complained that the public revenue has been interfered with. I would like to know whether it is the practice to make a man a judge in his own cause, and whether a man who is interested in a cause is the best witness that can be called for the purpose of testifying in regard to that cause. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not denied that Mr. Hawthorne is the agent of a manufacturing company in this country. The hon. gentleman has not denied that Mr. Haw-

thorne has been appointed by the Government to make inquiry into the prices for which competitors residing abroad are selling their articles for the Canadian market. Does the hon. gentleman think it is a decent thing on the part of Mr. Hawthorne to accept such a position at the hands of the Government, or on the part of the Government to appoint Mr. Hawthorne to that position? Does the hon. gentleman think that Mr. Hawthorne is a man that can be implicitly relied upon with regard to the prices at which these articles are sold in the American market? I say, Sir, that in no courts of justice, in no tribunal in the world where evidence is to be regarded, would the testimony of such a party be looked upon as the highest testimony that could be obtained in such a matter. That is the position which the hon. gentleman has taken with regard to this. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has said: Oh, we are inquiring into this matter, we are determined that the law of the land shall not be made a sham and that this provision with regard to the price of articles shall be honestly carried out. Well, Sir, for what purpose was that provision put upon the statute-book? It was put there for the purpose of protecting the public revenue, and to see that the rate paid by the parties was the rate which the law itself imposed. Is that the object of appointing Mr. Hawthorne? Is that the purpose for which Mr. Hawthorne was appointed? Why, Sir, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has indicated that it was for no such purpose. The Government have in view the question of the development of the industries of this country, and not the collection of revenue. The Government have appointed Mr. Hawthorne to prevent articles being purchased abroad and imported into this country, and so to prevent revenue being collected on such articles. The Government are acting simply as the agents, the servants, of the manufacturing interests in this country. A rival establishment to the foreign manufactories exists here, and its manager is appointed to go abroad and get information, by which the Government can shut out of this country the articles which may come into competition with this establishment, and upon which articles alone revenue could be obtained. That, Sir, is the position; that is the work in which the Government are engaged. That is not the protection of the public revenue, but it is a conspiracy to destroy the public revenue, and to secure the market of Canada for the sole use of parties who are engaged in the manufacture of these products in Canada. I will mention a fact which came under my own notice. A year or two ago, an important hardware firm in London were purchasing certain articles. The agent of a New England manufacturing company came to them and offered to sell them articles at a very moderate rate, and they purchased them. A year or so afterwards, the agent of the Gananoque company was in town, and called upon the same parties with the view of selling them articles of the same sort. He did not make a sale. A short time afterwards, an agent of the Government came up, no doubt upon the representations of that gentleman, and insisted upon the production of the firm's books to see on what value they had paid duty on the New England purchase a year and a half or two years before. By this means he put those men to any amount of trouble and annoyance—annoyed and worried and persecuted them because they had purchased their goods in New England. Is that the purpose of the Government? Is that the purpose for which these officers are appointed? Is that the object of inserting that clause in the Customs Act? No, Sir; that is not the object; and I am pointing out the abuse which the Government are practicing under this provision of the law, and under the pretense that it is being carried into effect. The statement of the hon. gentleman in regard to this matter shows that he is not, it is true, making this provision of the law a sham, but he is making it an intolerable nuisance to the business men of Canada. Sir, the manufacturers of Canada are adequately protected, even from the protectionist point of view, by the rates of duty hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed; but the imposition of those duties is not sufficient to satisfy the Government or the gentlemen who are behind the Government in this matter. They insist on going abroad and examining the books of business men in foreign countries, getting possession of information under false pretenses—information which is in many cases wholly unreliable—because of the extraordinary interest these men have——

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? He speaks of obtaining information under false pretenses. I have never authorized any one to obtain information under false pretenses, but, to go to the manufacturers themselves, state what their business is, and ask them if they will give the information, so as to enable us to judge of the value on which we should impose duties on the importations brought into this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not charging the hon. gentleman with obtaining information under false pretenses.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is what you said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was speaking of the agents the hon. gentleman appointed, who are not disinterested men, but men who are intensely interested in the business in which they were engaged. In the case I mentioned, did the Government get additional duties from those gentlemen in London, whose books they took possession of?

Not a bit of it. They put them to any amount of trouble and expense, but the result of their investigation was to show that the price at which those goods were invoiced to them was the price at which they were sold all over the New England states. When I say that information was obtained under false pretenses, does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that a man occupying the position of Mr. Hawthorne, the agent and manager of a company in Canada engaged in making edged tools, goes to rival manufacturing establishments in the United States, represents them in business, and gets information fairly from those gentlemen? If the hon. gentleman thinks so, he is very much more credulous than I gave him credit for being. Why, Sir, in the very appointment of this man, he has expressed suspicion; and can he suppose for a moment that the evidence obtained by him has been fairly obtained, or is altogether reliable? I say that my hon. friend, in bringing the matter up, has done his duty. We are not simply attacking the protective policy on this occasion, but we are pointing out to the whole country what are the abuses connected with that system, and to what mischievous and unnecessary annoyances the Government have lent themselves in carrying that policy out.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance, in his capacity of new leader, has, as my hon. friend who has just sat down, stated, taken a very new and very fresh departure. He has shown himself in the character of a very fresh young leader, indeed, in trying to teach the older heads in this House how the business of this House should be conducted. He complains that the custom of moving the adjournment of the House in order to bring up grievances has been abused. I admit that the practice of moving the adjournment of the House for certain purposes has been abused, but not for the purpose of bringing up grievances. We know a very late case in which the motion to adjourn the House was used for the purpose of making an attack upon the business character of a member of this House. I am not going to refer to a past debate; that would be out of order; but the fact is well known.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is wrong if he refers to my hon. friend the Controller of Customs. My hon. friend's remarks were made on the motion of an hon. member to adjourn the debate.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has fitted the cap on the head which I meant it to cover. As for the difference between a motion to adjourn the debate and a motion to adjourn the House, I do not see any difference in the animus of the attack and the unfairness of the proceeding which took place.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. WALLACE. I gave the hon. gentleman——

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman is rising to a point of order, I will sit down; but I object to being interrupted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to suggest to him—I do not want to interrupt him——

Mr. CASEY. Then he had better not. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a distinction without a difference; it makes no difference of principle whether the motion is for the adjournment of the House, or for the adjournment of the debate. But I say it serves the Controller of Customs particularly well right that he has got a dose of his own medicine to-day, with the addition that in this case the charge against him has not been denied, either by his counsel who pleaded for him, or by himself. The charge made is that the manager and agent of a firm manufacturing certain agricultural implements has been engaged by the Government as an expert to settle the price of such goods for duty. The hon. Minister of Finance says that is all right, because Mr. Burpee took means to obtain the same information when he was Minister of Customs. Mr. Burpee did take means, but how far from the same means? Did he send the manager of a manufacturing company to attend to such work? No, Sir. If he had done so, it would not have been endured. No Government previous to this Government, no head of the Department of Customs previous to the present head of that department, would ever have ventured to perpetrate such a glairing unfairness upon the consumers and importers of this country, as has been done in this case. It is not only the consumer that is interested but the importer. If he is going to be worried to death by interested parties being allowed to bring such information to the Department of Customs as they think fit, we have both classes, the consumer and the importer to fight for in this case. As to the fairness or unfairness of this particular person, the Minister of Finance says nothing has been proven, but we all know what is likely. We all know that the Controller of Customs would not have appointed an inspecting agent of this kind unless he wanted to get a certain class of information from him. The hon. Minister of Finance admits that. He said the Controller of Customs had appointed a man to get this information, and he had got the sort of information that the Controller wanted. I do not doubt it at all. Let me tell the House the sort of position this Mr. Hawthorne occupied last year when the tariff of Canada was being revised by the manufacturer's combines, and when the Minister of Finance held a brief and registered their decrees on the statute-book. Mr. Hawthorne was here

one evening in the lobby, talking in a general way to everybody who came along about the proposed changes. That was the time when the Minister of Finance, in a moment of weakness proposed to knock off the specific duties. Mr. Hawthorne said: If Foster knocks off those specific duties "and will not put them on again, we will let him know where we stand at the next election." I said to him 35 per cent ad valorem is pretty good protection. Ad valorem be hanged, he said, what we want is the specific duty to exclude these things. Well, the specific duties were put on again, and the Minister of Finance having heard from Mr. Hawthorne, Mr. Hawthorne heard from the Controller of Customs, and Mr. Hawthorne has been paid for collecting information which is to be used for his own private interest. It is about as nice a job as any one can imagine. It is almost incorrect to say, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had told us, that the Government have appointed Hawthorne. The boot is on the other leg. It is the Hawthornes, Masseys, Redpaths, and people of that elk who have appointed the Government, and the Government do their duty by them as good nominees should. In this debate the complaint of the Minister of Finance would have been fair, if it had been borne out by the facts, that extraneous matter has been introduced. No extraneous matter has been introduced in the debate. We have discussed the question of the grievance and that only, and I claim it is a grievance. To talk about undervaluation being the same thing as smuggling, to pretend that this is a question of undervaluation, is as extraneous as possible to the question. If there was anything extraneous in the debate it was introduced by the Minister of Finance. The question before the House is whether it was right to get an interested party to gather information for the use of the Controller of Customs. I am satisfied the country will believe there is a grievance.

Mr. WELDON. I rise merely to say a few words with reference to the point affecting the rules of the House, raised by the hon. leader of the House. I think it well to call the attention of the House to the English practice. Up to the change made a few years ago in the English rules, it seems clear enough, from the books of authority, that the Speaker had lodged in him, on motions to adjourn the House made on proceeding to the Orders of the Day, the discretion to rule that the matter was or was not urgent. If he ruled that the matter brought up was urgent, he allowed the discussion to go on, but insisted that it should be kept within the narrowest possible limits. And, furthermore, the leaders of the House —and none more strongly than Mr. Gladstone himself, old and experienced parliamentarian as he was—were very careful that these limits should not be exceeded, and sometimes, even where the Speaker ruled that the matter was urgent, Mr. Gladstone, with all the weight of his great authority in parliamentary practice, took the responsibility of insisting that the question must be brought up at another time and in another way, and refused frequently to discuss its merits on such motion. More recently the abuses to which this procedure gave rise, in impeding the proper discharge of public business, caused the House of Commons to take a new departure, and lay down the new rule which, with the consent of the House, I will read:

> A motion for the adjournment of the House, for the purpose of raising debate, may only be made when all the questions to members upon the Notice paper have been disposed of, and before the Orders of the Day, notices of motion, or motions at the commencement of public business have been entered upon. The member who desires to make such a motion, having previously delivered to the Speaker a written statement of the subject to be discussed, rises in his place and states that he asks leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and he states the matter.
>
> If the leave of the House be not given, Mr. Speaker desires those members who support the motion, to rise in their places; and, if not less than forty members rise accordingly, Mr. Speaker calls on the member to make the motion. If, however, fewer than forty members, and not less than ten, have so risen, the member may, if he thinks fit, claim a division, upon question put forthwith to determine whether such motion may be made.

Now, the experience of England is of profit to us. Every one must admit that it is an abuse of power to make so many motions to adjourn in order to provoke a discussion on so many matters, some of them urgent or of very grave importance, as have been on during the present session. I think every hon. gentleman will agree that at no time during eight sessions has that rule been so far stretched as this session.

Mr. LAURIER. How many times?

Mr. WELDON. A good many.

Mr. LAURIER. Three times.

Mr. WELDON. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we may hear your view of the present rule; and I hope the House will consent, if it be necessary—if the present rule be not sufficiently stringent—to adopt something approaching the stringency of the English rule.

Mr. PRIOR. As an importer, I do not think it would be right for me to be silent on an occasion of this kind, and I feel bound to say a word in defence of the Controller of Customs. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who have spoken on this matter, may be very successful politicians, but it seems to me that they are not practical business men. My hon. friend, the Controller of Customs, as far as I can make out, has done nothing wrong

at all. He simply wished to carry out the business of his department in the way he is supposed to do by the country. Any one in business knows perfectly well—any one who buys anything from the United States—the artifices put forward by the American manufacturers to get their goods into this country below the prices at which they sell them in the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk said, that as a rule, goods were sold on lists and the discounts were changed—that large discounts were given varying from 20 to 85 per cent. That is a fact, but there are lists and lists, and there are manufacturers and manufacturers. There are honest and dishonest manufacturers, and I can assure the hon. member for North Norfolk that in my own personal experience I have seen, time and time again, one list for the United States and one for Canada. That being the case, how can the Controller be expected to accept these lists as authentic unless he has evidence to that effect? Not only that, but there are manufacturers in the United States who are only too willing, if they can make a sale of goods, to send a blank invoice and ask the buyer to fill it up himself. I will leave it to any importer in the House to say if that is not a fact. I do not think that the labourer who has been spoken about to-day is the only man that wants protection; the honest importer wants protecting. Take an importer who tries to do right, who knows what the real prices of goods in the United States are and is willing to pay those prices and does pay them. He has a competitor in the same town or one who is supplying the same district as himself, and this competitor gets his goods in under false invoices and on false lists. Does not the honest importer want protecting against that sort of competition? What the hon. Minister of Finance said with regard to smuggling met my views exactly; I do not think there is any difference between a man who is smuggling and a man bringing in goods at undervaluation. We may have our different opinions as to whether these goods should come in free or be subject to duty, but so long as the law of the land provides that they shall be dutiable, it is the duty of the Controller of Customs to see that they are entered at a proper valuation. I think everybody will agree with me that although the importer and the consumer may like to get their goods as cheap as they can, the honest people among them do not want to do it in any unfair manner, and it is only by the Controller of Customs getting the best quotations he can—and in order to do that he must have the evidence in each case collected by a man who understands the business—that justice can be done to all. I do not see how the Opposition can reasonably attack the Controller of Customs for carrying out his duty. I did not wish to take part in the general discussion, but I thought that as an importer it was not right for me to hear this attack upon the hon. gentleman and not say a word in his defence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman intervenes in this debate apparently in the character of an impartial observer, and he will probably be surprised to learn that very little exception can be taken to the general tenor of his argument. The larger part of that argument is entirely apart from the question before the House and from the charge made against the administration of the Customs Department. We know that the law exists providing that if goods are imported into Canada at lower prices than they are sold at in the regular way in the country from which they are imported, it is the duty of the Customs Department to intervene. Nobody is here advocating smuggling or the importation of goods at undervaluation.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, they did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), following the lead given him by the leader of the House, who skilfully tried to draw a red herring across the trail, has been arguing upon a point entirely foreign to the specific charge made against the Controller of Customs. The charge is not brought against him that he attempted to carry out the law, because we are anxious to see it carried out, but that in the carrying out of the law, he has engaged the assistance of a party directly interested in preventing goods being brought from abroad and that in this justice is not being done to the importer. It has been pointed out that this gentleman is the general manager of an association of the largest firms engaged in the manufacture of hardware, and it is the interest of that association and their agents that foreign importations shall be hampered and prevented so far as they can be, so that the hardware merchants may be compelled to buy from the manufacturers at home. Now, I would appeal to any honest and impartial man, is this gentleman a fair disinterested man to send upon this delicate errand? Sir, I do not think the hon. member for Victoria will acknowledge the assumption implied in his remarks that the hardware merchants in this country are knaves. I know a good many of them, and I know them to be among the most honest and capable business men in the country. If a spy is to be put upon their track and their importations are to be examined let it be done, but in the name of heaven let it be done with some show of honesty and fair-play. Do not take a man who has an interest in preventing them from importing their goods and send him to report whether there has been any improper valuation or not; send an impartial disinterested man. Now, we have had not only a statement made as to who this gentleman is, but we

have a member of this House rising in his place and giving his personal testimony that this gentleman is personally interested to a large extent and that he last session expressed to a member of the House in a manner not creditable to himself as to the improvements the Minister of Finance was making. Will any hon. member say that this was a proper man to send on such a delicate mission? But the Controller of Customs with the knowledge that this was an interested and improper man to choose for such a mission, sent him to make this report, and he makes a report the effect of which is to hamper the importers——

Mr. PRIOR. How does it injure the importer?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How does it injure the importer? Surely that has been made plain. This gentleman goes out to ascertain and to show if he possibly can that the prices at which the importers had purchased their goods are not fair prices.

Mr. PRIOR. If they want to purchase at fair prices——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They do want to purchase at fair prices. But I suppose you want the investigation made by an impartial man, not by a man who is interested in proving one side of the case. As to the statement made by one hon. gentleman that this question was not of sufficient importance to justify my hon. friend in moving the adjournment of the House, all that I can say is that I do not agree with him. The motion to adjourn has not been abused. It has been moved three times this session, and in each case the question brought up was of the gravest importance, and I venture to say that the three discussions that took place challenged the attention not of this House only but of the whole country from British Columbia to Nova Scotia. Sir, we propose on this occasion to do our duty as we have done it on other occasions; and, having brought this matter before the House we are not going to allow hon. gentlemen to escape by bringing in side issues or attempting to turn attention away from the charge that is brought against them.

Mr. OUIMET. Two questions arise in this debate. The first is a question of procedure —whether it is well for this House to encourage such discussions, and whether it is fair for the Opposition to bring on debates of this kind without giving any notice at all. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that the motion for adjournment before the Orders of the Day are called has often been resorted to in order to bring up matters of great public importance and of special urgency. In such a case it could not be objected to, but I say that in every such case it is the rule, and it is according to the dictates of ordinary courtesy, that the hon. member who wishes to raise a question of that kind shall give notice, even if only a short notice, to the Minister or member whom the question may affect particularly. In this case I venture to say that an hour's notice given to the hon. Controller of Customs would have placed him in a position to bring all the papers and give a full defence, if he has any, and he has shown he had a good defence to offer. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that such a practice ought to be discouraged. Now, it has been said that the grievances of the people should be brought up at any time and ventilated. This would apply, Mr. Speaker, if the grievances were really grievances of the people. But I think that in most cases they are only grievances of the Opposition against the Government, and I think the pople at large are very little interested in the discussion of these party grievances, which after all have not, as viewed from outside, the magnitude that gentlemen opposite seem to think. These gentlemen seem to be always anxious to bring questions before this House without notice and upon subjects respecting which the papers have not been brought down. But as soon as the papers are down and the question placed fairly before the public, they are very careful not to discuss them. They are very anxious at times to give their advice to the advisers of His Excellency. They appear to be very anxious that we should know exactly what we should do according to their opinions. But in some questions that are before the public and that have been before the public for many years, they do not seem to be so anxious that their position should be known. If this question is to be brought up, Mr. Speaker, in justice to those who administer the Customs Department, notice should be given in the regular way. Mr. Hawthorne can be brought any day before the Committee on Public Accounts, and he can there be called to account for his conduct. The Controller of Customs also may be brought to account for that appointment, and then the country would know exactly what to think of the appointment of Mr. Hawthorne. Then, Mr. Speaker, if this special question is of so much importance for the Opposition, why should it not be referred to a special committee? It seems to me that the challenge of my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) deserves to be taken up. He has challenged the Opposition that if he was given a committee he would prove to the satisfaction of this House and the country that in every case goods manufactured in the United States were sold to the consumers in that country at a higher price than the same articles are sold in this country. We have been talking here for nearly a week about protection and its effect upon the prosperity of the country; here is an opportunity for the hon. gentlemen to establish the very basis of their contention: that protection raises the price of manufactured goods in this country. The Americans are willing

now to send us their goods at a slaughter price in order to compete with the manufacturers of this country, but they must not be allowed to bring their goods in, either free or at an undervaluation. The result would be that our manufacturers would be obliged to close their doors. And, Mr. Speaker, after their doors were closed, what would then happen? The American manufacturers would then sell us their goods at the same price at which they sell them to their own consumers. Sir, the Controller of Customs had only been inforcing the law in the course he has taken. The law must be enforced, because the policy of this country is embodied in the law; and if that law were not carried out, it would be a graver reproach to the Government than is this charge now made against the Government that they are endeavouring to ascertain in an improper way the ordinary price of those goods in the American market. As I said before, two things grow out of this debate: first, that the Opposition are too anxious to start debates on questions when proper information is not before the House; and I say they ought to submit to the ordinary rules of procedure under which no debate can be raised under these circumstances, except on questions of privilege, and even on questions of privilege there must be urgency shown. In the second place, this debate will prove to the public that the law is carried out not only for the protection of the manufacturers, but for the protection of the revenue of the country and also for the protection of the consumers. Who will deny that the tariff has been made to protect the manufacturers? On this side of the House we never conceal our policy—the tariff has been made to encourage and protect the manufacture of goods in this country with the labour of this country, and when possible with the raw material of this country, and we are not ashamed to say that we intend to carry out that policy to its full extent. We will keep faith with the manufacturers, as we will keep faith with the consumers. The course pursued by the Controller of Customs shows, and the challenge of the hon. member for Leeds proves it, to my mind, that we are endeavouring to protect our manufacturers against undue competition from the United States, a competition which, if it were successful, would have no other result than to crush our manufacturers and to increase the price of goods to the consumers of this country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the question before the House has been plainly stated by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). There is not a single Minister on the Treasury benches who has dared to reply to the charge he has made. The hon. Minister who has just taken his seat, either does not understand the charge that is made, or if he does, he wants to avoid answering it. Neither himself nor any other Minister has attempted to reply to the direct charge. The question of protection is not under discussion, the tariff policy of the country is not under discussion. The question under discussion is this: that the Customs Department have placed in the hands of an interested party the right, in the interest of the manufacturers of Canada, to go to the United States, and, in their interest, and in order to exclude the introduction of manufactured goods from that country, to arrange and fix values and prices upon which they shall be permitted to come in here, and upon which duty shall be paid. That is the charge, and no member of the Government has attempted to answer it. Nobody for a moment thinks that it would be improper on the part of the Government to ascertain, through a disinterested party, what is the proper value of goods that may be entered for consumption into Canada, for such a course is in accordance with the Act. But the point is that the Government have taken the chief manager, the man that goes over the whole of the concerns of which he is the general manager, to arrange the price upon which goods shall be admitted into this country and upon which duty shall be paid. That is the man that has been sent to the United States, clothed with authority from the Controller of Customs, to find out, in the interest, presumably, of the country, but actually in the interest of the party that pays and keeps him in his present position, and whose interest is more important to him than the interest of the customs of the country. He goes clothed with that double authority, first, in the interests of the manufacturing institutions of this country, and secondly, in the interests of this country, and he fixes the price upon which the goods shall be introduced here. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to one point that has not been touched upon, and that is that last night the Controller of Customs said that the price at which goods would be admitted from the United States into Canada, was the price at which they will be placed in the hands of the consumers in the United States. He made that statement with regard to binders. Now, it is well known that there is a difference between the wholesale and retail price of binders in the United States, but the Controller of Customs will not admit a binder into Canada at the wholesale price at which these binders are sold by the car load in every portion of the United States. He won't do that, but he will admit a binder into Canada at the price at which it is placed in the hands of the user.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes; that was his answer last night. And, as a result of that, what has he done? By Order in Council the Government have decided that the duty on binders shall be

$20, no matter what the price is. Binders are sold by retail in the United States for $100, and so the department have placed the duty in Canada at $20. The Controller does not collect the duty on the wholesale price, but on the retail price.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not so. I took the prices that the manufacturers themselves gave to me, and I sent an officer there to verify them. Those were the wholesale prices. They, I may say, were the prices for last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. If hon. members will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns they will find that there were imported during the year into Canada, 755 binders, and that the duty paid on each was an average of $32. It will also be found that no binder was valued at less than $100. The hon. gentleman cannot pretend to say that $100 is the wholesale price of a binder?

Mr. WALLACE. The Trade and Navigation Returns cover three-fourths of the year under the old tariff, and only one-fourth of the year under the new tariff.

Mr. McMULLEN. The statements show that all the binders have been valued for importation into Canada, at not less than $100 each.

Mr. WALLACE. No; it shows that they were so imported under the old tariff.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year, I put a question on this subject to the Controller, and he stated that the prices on which the duty was charged on binders coming into Canada was the price at which they were placed in the hands of the consumers in the United States.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will turn up the question, and bring it to the attention of the House. Instead of placing the valuation of binders coming into Canada at the wholesale prices in the United States, the Customs Department prostituted their powers to meet the wishes of the manufacturers, and imposed duties at the retail prices, and not at the wholesale prices.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may ask the indulgence of the House while I express my own views with regard to the points raised respecting the moving of motions for the adjournment of the House. In order to make my own views more explicit, I beg leave to submit observations which were made by Speakers of the English House of Commons before the rule referred to by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) was adopted. In 1867, Mr. Speaker Denison made the following observations :—

Sir John Pakington made a personal explanation of an answer given by him on a former occasion, and being followed by Captain Vivian, who said he would move the adjournment of the House,

Mr. Speaker said the House had permitted a personal explanation to be made, but the right of moving the adjournment of the House was reserved for occasions on which questions of gravity were to be brought before it.

Then, on 3rd March, 1869, Mr. Speaker Denison spoke as follows : —

Mr. Newdegate moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose of explaining the case.

Mr. Speaker said he could not put the question without reminding the House that the privilege of moving the adjournment of the House upon asking a question, had been reserved, by the common consent of the House, for occasions of urgency. Unless that privilege were exercised with forbearance, the result would be fatal to the successful conduct of public business.

Again, in 1871, Mr. Speaker Denison said :

The House, when deciding that debates should not be permitted to arise when questions were asked, reserved cases of emergency, when a member might obtain the privilege of speaking by moving the adjournment of the House. That point was considered in the committee on the business of the House, and it was agreed not to disturb the existing state of the rule, but to leave it, in the hope that discretion would be ever used, and great forbearance practised regarding the business of the House; under that impression and with that understanding, the rule was maintained as it now stands.

Sir Erskine May, at page 356 of his "Parliamentary Practice," says :

The adjournment of the House had often been moved in putting questions, but such a course was generally reserved for occasions of urgency; and, if otherwise used, was met by the House with impatience and disfavour, and by grave remonstrances from the Chair. And, at length, the inconvenience became so great that the following standing order was made on 27th November, 1882.

And then follows the order, which the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has read, and which I need not repeat. In regard to our own rules, I may say that rule 30 of the House of Commons reads as follows :—

A motion to adjourn shall always be in order; but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding shall have been had.

Mr. Bourinot, in his work, refers to the moving of substantive motions for the adjournment of the House in the following terms :—

Substantive motions for the adjournment of the House ought to be reserved for occasions when it is necessary to discuss questions of gravity. They are not unfrequently proposed in the Canadian Commons with a view of bringing before it some question in which a member is immediately interested, and which he believes should be explained by himself with as little delay as possible. Consequently, we find they have been sometimes made for the purpose of giving a positive denial to certain charges made against members. In 1878, a member brought to the notice of the House, on such a motion, that certain Dominion officials were taking part in the provincial elections of Quebec. In 1891——

I am sure we will all remember this :

Mr. Laurier initiated in this way a long debate on the formation and policy of the new Administration, formed on the death of Sir John Macdonald, Premier of the Ministry, consequently dissolved ipso facto.

I may say with respect to my own parliamentary experience, which has extended over twenty-two years nearly, that I have never known any session during the whole of that term when this privilege of moving the adjournment of the House has been so frequently resorted to as it has been this session. Of course, it is for the House itself to determine whether the question brought up by an hon. member is of sufficient urgency to justify the course of moving the adjournment; but I submit, with all due deference to the House, that this right of moving the adjournment of the House ought to be reserved for occasions of greater gravity and urgency than those on which this motion has been moved during the present session.

Motion negatived.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). Mr. Speaker, an impartial observer of the discussion which has been going on in this House for the past two weeks must have arrived at the conclusion that there is a very great difference of feeling between the two parties as to the future of our country. Those upon this side of the House are bright and hopeful, those upon the other side dark and despondent. Sir, if I were engaging a man for the farm to-morrow, and had the choice of two, the one taking a hopeful and bright view of everything, and the other seeing everything dark, which do you think I would choose ? The man that would suit me best would be the one who took a hopeful view of the coming season. So it is with the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. They have been trying to toy with the electors of this country; but the people of Canada have made up their minds that they prefer a party who has had for a number of years a definite policy—and which for the last sixteen years the people have from time to time endorsed at the polls—in preference to a party which has upon almost every occasion changed its policy. The hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) stated the other day that the Reform party never changed its policy. The hon. member must have a short memory. In connection with this statement, I would like to read an amendment moved during the session of 1888 by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It reads :

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted).

That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

The hon. member, in support of this motion, used the following language. He said :

I am not greatly given to indulging in conventional formalities, but it is not in the spirit of conventional formality that I say that I rise on this occasion to address this House under a sense of grave and weighty responsibility. It is true, that I am fortified and encouraged in bringing forward this motion by the knowledge that in so doing I only voice the opinions of the representatives of the Liberal party in this Parliament; and furthermore, that I have every reason a man can have for believing that when I give utterance to their opinions, I also give utterance to the opinions of the vast majority of those who support us.

Further on, he said :

It has been made a grave ground, it has been attempted to be set up as an insuperable ground for objection, that, when you propose to enter into a treaty for unrestricted trade with the United States, you must thereby, of necessity, discriminate against English manufactures and the manufactures of all other countries except the United States. Now, that is true. I admit that.

To-day the Liberal party are putting forth the plea that they want free trade as they have it in England, and at the same time they are putting themselves in the position that they are giving everything away if they want to obtain closer trade relations with the country to the south of us. I take the ground, Mr. Speaker, that the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) the other day was entirely incorrect. Now, let me refer for a moment to the matter which has been under discussion this afternoon, and I do so because the constituency that I have the honour to represent is somewhat interested in that trade which has been referred to by hon. gentlemen. I may say that the fears which I had last year, when the changes were under consideration in our fiscal policy, have been to a certain extent realized. I was very much afraid then that the reduction was too great, and I now unhesitatingly say, and I say it as a farmer : That I am a believer, to some extent anyway, in specific duties. I say so because I believe that specific duties are the only effectual mode of shutting out certain manufactures of the

United States. The gentleman whose name has been under discussion this afternoon is, to my knowledge, a thoroughly practical man in his business. If, requiring an investigation, the Customs Department wanted an efficient man, surely they would scarcely take anyone but a man who had a practical knowledge of the business. Mr. Hawthorne, for a number of years, has been practically engaged in the business, and whilst it is true that, perhaps, he took strong ground last year against the reduction of duties, yet he has from that time to this manfully accepted the situation. He believed that American goods were coming into Canada at an undervaluation, and there can be no doubt that his investigation proved that, and proved it most conclusively. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is, that any hon. gentleman of the Opposition who has spoken upon that question can scarcely expect to make very many votes for his party if, when the election comes, he pays a visit to South Ontario, because the people of that riding already feel the effect of the reduced duty. I make the statement, that I believe a number of these reductions were made to a great extent, to satisfy the plea put forth by the farmers of Canada, but whilst the reduction pleased the farmers for a moment, they now find that to-day they are not buying a single article which they require, at a cheaper price than they could buy it for previous to the reduction. They are getting articles no cheaper, and the change of tariff has unsettled our manufactures. I will for a moment, Mr. Speaker, refer to some articles which come into daily use on the farm, and I will compare the prices at which they are sold in Canada with the prices at which they are sold in the United States. The following will give you proof that these articles are cheaper in Canada than on the other side. The price of each article in Canada and the price in the United States is given :

HARDWARE.

	Price in Canada.		Price in U. S.
Scythe snaths	60c. to 75c.	Scythe snaths	75c.
Hay rakes	10c. to 15c.	Hay rakes	15c. to 20c.
Wood cook stove	$11.00 to $20.00	Wood cook stove	$11.00 to $25.00
Milk cans, 30 gallons	$4.00	Milk cans, 30 gallons	$5.50
Horse nails	10c.	Horse nails	15c.
Horse fork, complete for 60-ft. barn, manilla rope	$22.00 to $25.00	Horse fork, single, $1.25 to $1.50 ; complete for 60-ft. barn, $13 to $16, but the American truck and fork are not nearly so good as the Canadian.	

HARNESS.

Lawn mowers	$4.00	Lawn mowers	$7.00
Barn door, rollers and track rollers, $1.00, track, 6c. ft.		Barn door, rollers and track rollers, $1.00, track, 7c. ft.	
Single	$10.00 to $20.00	Single	$12.50 to $25.00
Lt. double	20.00 to 40.00	Lt. double	25.00 to 50.00
Lumber	25.00 to 27.00	Lumber	25.00 to 35.00

IMPLEMENTS.

Best binders	$100.00 to $110.00	Best binders	$120.00 to $135.00
Reapers	60.00 to 65.00	Reapers	60 to 65.00
Mowers	40.00 to 45.00	Mowers	40 to 48.00
Horse rakes	22.00	Horse rakes	25.00
Seeders	48.00	Seeders	50.00
10-hoe drill	60.00	10-hoe drill	65.00
Randall disk harrow	22.00	Randall disk harrow	28.00

The statement made by an hon. member this afternoon that these articles are purchased as cheaply or more cheaply in Canada than in the United States, is a fair and honest one, and if a thorough investigation were made, that statement would be fully borne out by the facts. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three points in connection with the commerce of Canada which I would like for a little while to discuss. The first is the contention that any protective duty levied upon foreign imports must necessarily impose upon the consumers of the protected country an additional cost on the goods manufactured in their own country, equal to the duty levied and the profit charged thereon by the importers of similar goods. In 1893-94, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, we imported from the United States $21,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. In connection with this, I may say that a very large proportion of that was formerly imported from free-trade England. Now, the United States is, perhaps, the most highly protected country in the world, and in selling those goods, it would have to meet the competition, not only of free-trade England, but of the rest of the world, and, therefore, its prices, quality for quality, would have to be as low as those of its competitors, or else they would not be purchased in Canada. We do buy those articles, and, consequently, it follows that

the United States, under its almost exclusive policy, has succeeded in producing at as low a cost as the cheap-labour countries of Europe. Superior inventive skill, high-class machinery, and a thorough knowledge of the tastes and requirements of our country have enabled the United States to succeed in competition with the cheaper labour, the greater capital and the longer experience of England, Belgium, and other European countries. This is due wholly to its protective policy. It has given them control of the home market. They are able to compete in the supply of many articles, notably iron and steel, and all kinds of machinery, against the world. They have conclusively proved that protection does not involve burdens upon consumers. This is the result arrived at under the National Policy. Now, after a few years of protection, we claim that the home competition will reduce the cost of the larger part of home manufactures to as low a cost as if the same goods were admitted free of duty. The plea is put forward that the duty should not be maintained. But, take such a period as we have witnessed in the last twelve or eighteen months, when a great business crisis existed not only in the United States, but in some European countries, forcing manufacturers to sell their products in many cases at a great sacrifice. By continuing the duty, we steady our own market, and give our people the control of that market. Now, another point which I propose to discuss is the frequent contention that any duties levied on imports of agricultural produce must prove illusory, and be of no advantage to the Canadian farmer, because the price of his products is invariably regulated by the price ruling in England. To a certain extent, I am prepared to admit that the prices of our farm products are governed by English quotations: but the fallacy of that contention lies in the attempt to establish an invariable rule from general results. In connection with this, allow me to quote a few figures. In 1888-89, we imported, for home consumption, 15,124 bushels of wheat upon which we paid a duty of $2,268.41, and, in the same year, we imported 257,391 barrels of flour, on which we paid a duty of $128,696. In 1889-90 we imported 188,908 bushels of wheat, on which we paid a duty of $28,336, and we imported 167,039 barrels of flour, on which we paid a duty of $83,356. Now, it has been contended, time and again, not only in this House, but on many public platforms in the country, that the National Policy would never allow the price of wheat to go below $1 a bushel; but no advocate of the National Policy, either in this House or in the country, believes that that would be an invariable rule. What we did claim was, that in years of scarcity a duty would be of great service to us. Allow me, in this connection, to refer for a moment to a statement made yesterday by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), to the effect that protection might possibly be of some service to the farmers of England, because they did not produce all that the country needed. Would it not naturally follow that in years of scarcity a protective duty would also be of service to the farmers of Canada? Now, the price of wheat to-day is about 71 cents in Detroit, and 86 cents in Toronto, and the United States millers and dealers, in bringing wheat into Canada, found that its price was 15 cents a bushel higher here than in the United States, or they would have sent their wheat to the English market. They also found that every barrel of flour sent into Canada was 50 cents a barrel higher in Canada than in the United States. Now, I want to refer for a moment to oats. In 1889-90 we imported 351,965 bushels of oats, on which we paid a duty of $35,197. Now, will any one pretend to say that the farmers did not realize more for their oats than they would have done if there had been no duty? We had a duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats; and, in thus shutting out American oats, which are usually cheaper than Canadian it causes a great many more Canadian oats to be consumed in this country. In certain years, it is true, we did export some oats, but not as a rule. Now, I want to call attention to the beef and pork products. In 1889-90 we imported, of lard, bacon, hams and shoulders, pork, beef, prepared meats, pork in the carcase, and meats not otherwise specified, $2,213,936 worth, on which we received a duty of $418,421. In 1893-94 we imported of the same products, $730,360 worth, half of which was in bond in mess pork, and on this we received a duty of $196,525. In the same year we exported $4,093,564 worth. This was after the increased duty had been placed on those articles. I do not for a moment say that the increase in duty on beef and pork had raised the price in Canada by the extent of the duty; but I do say that the protective policy, by securing the Canadian farmer against glutted markets from American imports, has imparted such a stimulus to our trade that our farmers have not only been able to supply our own market, but, by gradual improvement in the quality of the products, have created for themselves a foreign market to the extent of over $4,000,000, besides supplying the home market with $2,000,000 worth of these products, the quantity imported in 1888-89. Now, the true design of protection is to supply the home market, and, after that, to look abroad for the sale of any surplus we have. The last point which I intend to discuss is the frequent assertion that the prosperity of Canada is so dependent upon free intercourse with the United States, that our fiscal policy should be framed, and the best efforts of our Government exercised in order to the adoption of such a treaty of reciprocity with that Government

as they may be willing to offer. In the section that I have the honour of representing, there can be no question about this. I do not wish to discuss the statement that under the old reciprocity treaty we were very prosperous. There were many reasons for that prosperity which I do not intend to state here to-day, because they have been stated so often before, but it is just possible that in that particular section we might not be injured by reciprocity with the United States. But I make this statement only from a local standpoint. I wish to say this, however, that I do not think that Canada is compelled to have a treaty with the United States, and I will give you my reasons. In 1893-94, Canada collected $1,634,524 in customs duties on raw products coming from the United States, half of which was on bituminous coal. Under reciprocity, that would be altogether lost. Have we not gone as far as it is respectable with the Government of the United States in trying to get closer trade relations? It is possible that the only thing that would suit them would be to give them control of our fiscal system, so that differences might arise between Canada and the mother country. It is possible, and I speak for certain sections outside of my own, that we might gain on horses, lambs, barley, beans, seed-peas, eggs, potatoes, hay and flax-seed. But we would undoubtedly lose on hog products, flour, wheat, oats, clover and grass-seeds. Comparing the two, there would perhaps be very little difference either way. But I would just, in connection with that statement, refer for a moment to the statement made the other night by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). He said that on certain articles the farmer had to sell, he had lost during the last three or four years $7,691,000. I scarcely wonder, after such a statement, that the hon. gentleman should keep continually preaching blue ruin. Upon cattle, he said, our farmers have lost $4,363,000, and they would gain $10 per head if we had free access to the American markets. But if you will turn up the statistical records, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the United States exported of cattle alone 360,000 head. The hon. gentleman went on in the same way with hogs, and then he took up barley. He said that the last year of the McKinley Bill, we raised 12,000,000 bushels, and sent 9,000,000 bushels to the United States. I thought it was 10,000,000, but I will not dispute with the hon. gentleman about a million bushels difference; and upon that, he said, we lost 18 cents a bushel. We lost this 18 cents, he claimed, because the United States charged a duty of 18 cents a bushel. Well, is that our fault? Have we not done everything reasonable and honourable to meet the Americans fairly upon that question? That is their business, and we have no right to quarrel with them. But let us look at that a little further. Last year we sent about 1,000,000 bushels of barley to the markets of the United States, but if we had sent 9,000,000, what would have been the result? They had sufficient with our million to supply their wants, but if 8,000,000 bushels extra had gone into that country, that would have completely broken their market. They would not only have been the losers, but we as well. The hon. gentleman went on to take oats and lambs, and I may point out to him in that connection that during the last season the Americans were shipping sheep and horses from the ports of Montreal to the markets of the mother country, and it does appear to me that we should upon all occasions not go into a market which is producing and supplying the same things as we do, but rather seek the market which requires all the surplus of the world. Let me go a little further into the discussion of the commerce of the two countries, and I will make this statement, at the outset, that Canada is in a better position to dictate terms to the United States than the United States are to dictate to Canada. Canada exported to the United States, during the year ending 30th June, 1894, $30,705,649. About $5,000,000 of that was sent to the United States market, not in bond, but shipped out again to other markets. We imported from the United States for consumption, $51,146,091. This shows that Canada imported 70 per cent more merchandise from the United States than the United States did from Canada. But let me go a little further into that question. Take the three years, 1889-90, 1890-91 and 1891-92. In 1889-90, we exported to the United States $32,416,156; in 1890-91, we exported $35,079,402; in 1891-92, we exported $29,452,540, or a total of $96,948,098. In those same years we imported from the United States as follows:—In 1889-90, $52,291,973; in 1890-91, $53,685,658; in 1891-92, $53,137,572, or a total of $159,115,202. So that we imported $62,167,104 more from the United States than we exported to the United States, or 64 per cent. It is said that it would be unreasonable to expect reciprocity from the United States in raw products, but Canada purchased from the United States $26,000,000 in raw products during 1893-94, while in the same year the United States purchased from Canada only $30,000,000 all told. This is convincing, to my mind, that we are not altogether dependent upon the people of the United States for a market, that we are under no particular obligation to the United States, and that if it comes to the pinch, they will have to bow the knee to Canada rather than the reverse. As regards the beet root sugar industry, it is proved that industry has not obtained the hold in Canada which a few years ago it was hoped it would, but its progress has at least been steady; and with the bounty given it, we may hope that that industry will extend throughout the province of Que-

bec, and even further west into Ontario. That is just another example of what the Government are doing to assist the farmers. Now, the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) yesterday pictured Canada in its darkest colours. The picture he drew was scarcely of the kind to induce the stranger who might come to Canada to settle here. He is somewhat different, however, from his brother, Mr. W. A. Charlton, M.P.P., who represents, I believe, one of the ridings of the same county. Here is an extract from an interview with the hon. gentleman :

"How do you find things ?"

"Improving. Everything is looking better. I am largely interested in lumbering, and that, too, is showing strong signs of revival."

"And you think the improvement general ?"

"I do. You see, we're like the sick man in the old country. He got so bad he couldn't get any worse. He either had to die or get better. Now, trade in Canada is getting better, and the outlook, as far as I can see, is good."

That seems rather the language of a Conservative, of a good National Policy supporter. Before I sit down, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance and the Government upon their hopeful tone for the future of Canada, because I believe, though the clouds may have lowered, and though we may to a certain extent have had adversity in some lines, still Canada is weathering the storm better than any other country under the sun. I venture to say that, with the hopeful Government we have controlling the affairs of this country, Canada must grow in prosperity year by year.

Mr. FLINT. I congratulate my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Smith) upon the tone of the first portion of his speech. It differs very materially as a whole from that of many of his colleagues on the other side of the House. Of course the hon. gentleman could not conclude without one or two of the old familiar touches which always tend to bring a little applause from the gentlemen who sit around him. When our hon. friends on the other side of the House touch upon the question of blue ruin, then, of course, they are upon their native heath ; for it is by reason of the blue ruin they talked that they got into power, and it is to be assumed that it is by trading upon that cry that they hope to keep gentlemen on this side of the House from attaining power in a short time. Who does not recollect the impassioned outburst of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when, raising both hands he shouted "Good heavens preserve this country from ruin, devastation and disaster if the Opposition should attain the Treasury benches ?"

The history of gentlemen opposite has been one of trading upon that sentiment of our common nature which detests a gloomy view of things ; and I protest that the allegation they make that gentlemen on this side have been decrying the country is one opposed not only to the facts, but opposed to the whole tenor of the arguments of the Liberal party from 1879 down to the present day. It is a pure burlesque of the attitude and principles of the leaders and of the rank and file of the Liberal party. It suits these hon. gentlemen when we criticise the claims, the impudent and absurd claims they make as to the progress and the prosperity of the country, to say we are condemning the country. We are only condemning the management, or rather the mismanagement and want of management of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I was amused to hear one of the hon. gentlemen, I believe he was a professional gentleman, who, in his speech, which was an able argument from the standpoint of the protectionist, stated that "we" had raised the export trade of the country from 1879 to 1892 by a certain number of millions. That is the line assumed by all these hon. gentlemen—that "we" the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways, and the Minister of Public Works and the rest, sitting together in council had, by some manipulation, increased the export trade of the country. The export trade of the country has increased to the benefit of all the various classes of the people, and under the blessing of Providence the country has in a certain degree, prospered, but it has been in spite of the policy which these gentlemen have adopted.

I had not the pleasure the other evening, of hearing the address of the Controller of Customs, as I had to be absent shortly after he began his speech. But I can easily picture it in my mind because, as I saw in the newspaper summaries next day, it was of the same character as other speeches of gentlemen opposite, and such as they have delivered for the last ten or twelve years. A Conservative speech will generally be found to be made up about as follows :—You will find about 30 per cent is abuse and misrepresentation of the mother country because she has adopted and adheres to a system of free trade ; about 30 per cent consists of gross misrepresentation of the trade and financial history of the country under the Liberal regime from 1874 to 1878 and abuse of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) ; about 30 per cent is made up of general criticism and misrepresentation of the present policy of the Liberal party, and the balance of 10 per cent is filled in according to the personal idiosyncracies of the hon. gentleman who happens to make the address. We all know the nature of the attacks upon the Liberal policy. One statement is that the Liberals have no policy, and in every mood and tense, and in almost every tone of ridicule and contempt the Liberals are pictured as men drifting without a policy. But within a few seconds the speaker will often turn to abuse or ridicule of the Liberals because they have too many policies. And upon this ground our Conservative friends always manage to grow

exceedingly eloquent. If they adhered to the facts, if they adhered to the record as presented by resolutions in this House or by the Liberal leaders from time to time or by the platform of the Liberal party as enumerated by those authorized to do so, they could not, and would not if they were honest men, say that the Liberal party had a variety of politics in regard to the trade and fiscal legislation of this country. One favourite observation of these gentlemen is that the Liberals have favoured unrestricted reciprocity, continental union, commercial union—and so they vary the phraseology, and attempt, but without success, to represent these as policies adopted at various times by the Liberal party and as policies which differ essentially and in detail from one another. I challenge and defy hon. gentlemen on the other side, from this moment and until this debate shall close, to show one line or syllable from any resolution placed before this House, any resolution adopted by an authorized body of Liberals, or any statement by any leader of the party in favour of commercial union with the United States as has been asserted. It is simply incorrect, and—I do not use the language as applying to any of my parliamentary colleagues—it is an absolute falsehood for any person to make such an assertion. There never was and, in the nature of things, there could not be any such proposition made or supported by a Liberal leader or by the Liberal party. It is true that the professions of the Liberals in favour of a broad scheme of reciprocity looked to the making of an unrestricted list of the articles covered by the negotiations, but this has been twisted so as to imply that the Liberal party desired the entire abolition of a revenue tariff between this country and the United States. It is a burlesque upon any policy ever laid down by the Liberals party or any of its leaders, so absurdly to misrepresent the schemes of unrestricted reciprocity. The very terms of the Opposition resolution of 1888, just read by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Smith), who addressed the House, I must say, in a very straightforward manner, would prove this statement to be true.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you mean to say you never advocated the absolute destruction of duties?

Mr. FLINT. I mean to say that no hon. gentleman in this House can point out one line in which the Liberal party ever advocated the total abolition of duties upon articles imported into this country from the United States through any system of reciprocity treaty. The whole contention of the Liberal party was that in entering into negotiations for reciprocity, the whole list of our products should be opened as subjects of negotiation. The very terms of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford, and which was quoted by the hon. member for Ontario would prove this conclusively; because in that resolution he said that unrestricted reciprocity was favoured by the Liberal party upon such terms and conditions as would be satisfactory to both countries. Point out where the Liberal party have ever indicated that the terms and conditions should involve the absolute destruction of our opportunities for raising a revenue. No line or statement looking in that direction can be found in the records of this country.

The second line of attack indulged in by our Conservative friends has been a persistent misrepresentation, or a pretended misunderstanding of the Liberal policy as enumerated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. They ask us in the most plaintive tone as to the details of a revenue tariff; they would like to know the exact percentage upon every article imported into the country if the Liberal party came into power. Hon. gentlemen, of course, are aware of the absurdity of the claim they make that such a proposition should be laid before this House, either by the leader of the party, or any other of its members. It is sufficient to state the general principles upon which the Liberal party base their claim to public confidence. What was the line of policy pursued by hon. gentlemen when they were in Opposition? It is true that during four or five years of the Mackenzie Administration there was a depression of extraordinary severity felt throughout the world, felt very severely in the Dominion of Canada, alluded to formally and officially in the Speeches from the Throne delivered at several openings of Parliament, a depression which, in the very language of the Minister of Finance in referring to the condition of affairs at the present time, reduced the prices of imported goods and reduced the values of property generally, and tended to embarrass the Administration of the country in the collection of a sufficient revenue to produce an equilibrium with the expenditure. During all that period the hon. gentlemen who were then in Opposition harped upon the depression from which the country was suffering, and deliberately charged the Administration of the day with being responsible for that depression, with being the cause of that depression, because they would not forthwith enact increased taxation as a part of their tariff policy. To the credit of the Mackenzie Administration be it said that, with but one or two exceptions, they steadfastly refused to increase the burdens upon the people of this country; they refused to increase the taxation beyond a sufficient amount to produce an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. They were pressed still further by the men then leading the Opposition to the Government, to place a still higher tariff upon the people in order to produce the prosperity which these gentlemen believed must be inevitably

produced by high taxation. What was the ground taken by the Minister of Finance of that day? I will not read at length from speeches delivered by him; but throughout all these debates upon the budget during those sessions, we find the tone of the Minister of Finance to have been hopeful and confident in the ability of the country to weather the storm, in view of the great natural resources of the country, and of the probability, nay certainty, that in a short time the depression would pass away and the people would be restored to a condition of prosperity through the natural course of events.

I find in the debates that on the 22nd February, 1878, the Minister of Finance, combatting the contentions made by his opponents that it was necessary to increase the taxation of the country, that it was necessary to prevent the importation of foreign goods as much as possible in order to retain the home market for our own manufacturers, used the language which I will quote; and I ask hon. gentlemen candidly to say whether this breathes an atmosphere of distrust of the resources of our country, or of the character of the people, or of the industries of this country; whether it breathes that "atmosphere of the ruin" of which our hon. friends are never tired of talking.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT said:

> Increased taxation, if carried to any considerable extent, might defeat its own object, not only by stopping the growth of this country, but also by the well-known fact that, if you raise the taxes above a certain point, you are almost sure to defeat yourself, either by diminishing consumption, or by encouraging smuggling, as we have more than once discovered to our cost. All things considered, therefore, I am disposed to advise that we should delay the consideration of the question whether it is desirable to impose any further taxes on the people or not, and I do this for these several reasons—first, because, in spite of all that is asserted to the contrary, it appears to me that there are signs of improvement in the general revenue and the general condition of this country; and, in the next place, because I believe that the receipts for the year 1876-77 were decidedly below the ordinary average; because the deficit being largely composed of the sinking fund, is not so formidable as may appear at first sight.

And so all through this address, and other addresses delivered upon the budget and cognate subjects throughout that session. With a far-seeing gaze, the Minister of Finance perceived that the era of depression was about to pass away, and he believed that so sound were all the circumstances of the country, so sound was the character of the people, so great were the natural resources at their disposal, that the depression would pass away and the country would regain its prosperity without having recourse to the drastic measures advocated by the hon. gentlemen then in Opposition. But not content with arguments of this kind calculated to depress the people still further than they were depressed by the circumstances surrounding them, the Opposition at that day called attention to the falling off in the export trade, which every person must see could not at all have been affected by the tariff, could not at all have been affected by any of the internal conditions of Canada; they called attention to the falling off in the revenue from imports, and to the enormous decrease in values, owing to the great depression existing all over the world, a depression which caused a falling off in the imports from the mother country into the United States and to all other nations of the world. These hon. gentlemen proceeded further and enunciated the policy which they intended to pursue in order to lift the country out of the condition into which they claim the Liberal Administration had brought it.

And so the hon. gentleman who subsequently became Minister of Finance in the Conservative Government, as well as the leading supporters, not only in the House but throughout the country, made this statement, and backed it up by repeated assertions of the same general character—I quote from the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, on 22nd February, 1878, in this House:

> The policy of the party with which I am allied is not to increase the taxation of the people, because we do not require so much money as hon. gentlemen opposite. What we ask is not an increase of taxation, but a readjustment of taxation.

This was followed by the famous telegram so frequently alluded to, which was sent by Sir John A. Macdonald to Hon. John Boyd, in St. John, and which was afterwards sent all over the country on the eve of an election, stating that he had no idea of increasing the taxes of the people, but that a Conservative Government would reduce the expenditure to the extent of one million or two millions a year, as compared with that the Mackenzie Government had demanded. A great deal was said at that time, a great deal has been said since, until hon. gentlemen opposite began to have deficits of their own, as to the terrible calamity which a deficit brought upon the country. When the Liberals were in power, struggling with all the courage they could muster against the depression in trade, and against the difficulties with which the people were contending, when one or two small deficits, less than one-third of those which we have had to meet in the full bloom and flower of the National Policy, those hon. gentlemen could scarcely find language strong enough with which to denounce the Administration of that day for not equalizing expenditure with revenue. It seems, however, that their tone was not always of that character, that their leaders did not always hold the same views regarding surpluses and deficits as they enunciated when deficits prevailed. In 1875 a Liberal Minister of Finance was able to announce to the coun-

try that he had a surplus. This fact, which should have been, in the ordinary course of legislation, a very gratifying one, was not received by the critics of the Government of that day with very hearty applause. We all remember the observations made by the then Dr. Tupper, when a surplus of $935,000 was reported by the Finance Minister of the Liberal Administration. Dr. Tupper said :

> The Minister of Finance says we have a surplus of half a million. I say the Government have no right to have a surplus. If they have, they should endeavour to get rid of it, and the best way to do so is that pursued by us and by the Government of Great Britain—by lightening the taxes on the people.

So we find the whole policy, as enunciated from time to time, by the Conservative party when in Opposition, and upon which, presumably, they obtained a certain amount of confidence from the people, was this : In the first place, that it was not a sound policy to have a surplus, that revenue and expenditure should, in the main, be kept about even ; in the second place, that if the tariff was to be readjusted, it was to be so readjusted that there would be no increase of taxation. I think all political economists, and all constitutional judges will say, following history as demonstrated by the financial statements of the motherland, that a sound principle was laid down by Dr. Tupper when he said that the Government ought not to have a surplus. Every dollar of taxation taken out of the pockets of the people, which Parliament has not voted and fairly considered, every dollar of taxation taken out of the people which is not forthwith applied to some useful and desirable public service is unjustly and improperly taken from the people, and is liable to be improperly and extravagantly expended, and on this ground it is an unsound principle in financial legislation to provide for large surpluses.

But hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, having enormously increased the taxation of the country, having surpluses running up to two, three or four millions a year, violated every principle of sound financial economy, and brought about that result which every impartial observer must admit would, of necessity, be brought about when such a state of things existed, that is an improper and increased expenditure, an era of wild extravagance and corruption which necessarily flows from payments into the exchequer for the expenditure of which Parliament has made no provision. The consequences have been such as we have seen. We have seen enormous taxation placed on the people. We have seen enormous surpluses taken out of their pockets to be spent in the manner I have attempted to describe, and the results that have flowed from that will tend to mar the prosperity of this country throughout the whole of its future history.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior, and Parry Sound Railway Company. —(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, and to change the name of the company to the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Northrup.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order being called for second reading of Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway Company, Limited, (Mr. White, Shelburne),

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not printed, apparently.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is distributed.

Mr. FORBES. I sent for a copy of the Bill several times to-day, and could not get it.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is marked on the Order paper as being printed in English.

Mr. FORBES. I sent for it a very short time ago, and could not get it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman take the objection that the Bill is not printed in French ?

Mr. FORBES. Yes.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had referred to some of the principles laid down by the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite when in Opposition, upon which they were building up claims to the confidence of the people of the Dominion. I had alluded to one proposition laid down by them—which has been esteemed a sound proposition in the mother country, and, I believe, by all

political economists—that is, that in the main a Government should make its revenue about equal to its expenditure ; in other words, that there should be, as a rule, no very large surplus at the disposal of any Administration ; that every dollar possible should be left in the pockets of the people, who can administer their own money much more to their own advantage than can any committee of Parliament sitting as a Cabinet.

Of course, this principle would be, to a certain extent, modified by circumstances over which no legislature could have control. A sudden and unexpected rush of imports in one direction or another might give the Government temporarily a surplus for which they had not calculated. Another principle laid down in all the speeches of the leaders of the Opposition of that day was that deficits were disadvantageous to the true interests of the people, and to the best interests of a fair administration ; and we can all recollect with what volubility and earnestness those gentlemen inveighed against the one or two deficits which befell the Mackenzie Administration owing to causes over which it is now admitted the Administration could possibly have had no control.

Had those hon. gentlemen, on their accession to power, carried out in spirit the principles which they had laid down when in Opposition, much of the illogical and absurd line of argument which they have carried on from that day to this would have been obviated, greatly to the benefit of legislation and sound political education in this country.

They were, however, entrusted with power ; and we found that in both of those particulars, all their promises, as well as their prophecies were repudiated by the event. They came into Parliament and boasted from time to time of the enormous surpluses which their tariff had rolled up, and placed at their disposal—surpluses which brought about the evils to which I have alluded. I find, on glancing over the financial reports, that the total volume of the surpluses which this Administration has rolled up by means of excessive, unnecessary, ill-advised, unfair, and partial taxation, amounted to $27,862,361.

But their boasted panacea for financial reform was a failure, equally in the other direction ; and, although they had ridiculed and contemned the Administration of their predecessors for an occasional small deficit, which a calm investigation at the present day shows was entirely beyond the control of any Administration, those gentlemen had deficits aggregating over $18,000,000, leaving a net surplus up to 1895, of $9,786,471. Now, according to any reasonable principle of financial administration, and according to the principles laid down by Sir Charles Tupper, when leading the Opposition in these questions, they should have had a very small surplus indeed, making all allowance for the increase of taxation, and for the change in the trade of the country, caused by the very good times which the previous Finance Minister, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) predicted in his very able review of 1878.

The whole history of the Conservative party when in Opposition was a history of promises and prophecies. They denounced, in the strongest possible terms, the Administration of the day, and the tariff of the day, as being the cause of the depression in trade, the cause of the exodus of the people from the country, the cause of many of the evils which are admitted to have existed during the latter part of that disastrous period. They promised, if entrusted with power, on the principles which they had laid down when in Opposition, and during the campaign of 1878, that they would have no surplus ; in other words, that the taxation, unforeseen circumstances alone being excluded from consideration, would about equal the expenditure. They promised that they would bring about a reciprocity of trade with the United States, upon which both political parties were at that time, and upon which both profess to be at the present time, a unit. They promised, if entrusted with power, that they would not increase the taxation, although there would be a readjustment in the line of protection, which might possible benefit a certain portion of the community. They were, however, very guarded in the use of the word protection during all the years previous to the election of 1878. At the present time, hon. gentlemen are very forward and very strong in the use of that word, and in the use of the arguments with which that principle is supported. Previous to 1878 they were so guarded that you could hardly find that word in any of the speeches either of the leaders or their supporters. As far back as 1876, when it was anticipated, owing to the falling revenue, that the Government of that day would be obliged to impose some increase of taxation in order to bring about an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, they were severely denounced by the financial critics of that time for the proposition to increase taxation for that purpose. Sir Charles Tupper referred to it as " the thin end of the wedge of protection." Their expenditures were described as being excessive and extravagant, and Sir Charles Tupper, and those who followed him, went into details to show that it was so in almost every particular that was under the control of Parliament. They promised a positive reduction of at least $2,000,000 per annum in that expenditure. They promised that millions of capital would be introduced into the country, as a result of the readjustment of the tariff, and of the encouragement that would be given

by that readjustment to manufacturing enterprises.

So strongly did they make promises upon this point that in 1882 Parliament was dissolved expressly for the purpose of receiving a verdict from the people as to whether the protective principle should prevail; and it was formally announced in the Speech from the Throne that capital seeking investment was waiting the decision of the people on that question. The leading men in the party, and notably the one who subsequently became Finance Minister, put the amount of foreign capital waiting the adoption of protection for investment at $200,000,000.

The people were led astray by these extraordinary promises made apparently in good faith. These gentlemen stated that if the country adopted their policy of protection, that policy would keep the people at home, create a home market, and make this country an immense hive of manufacturing industries. As an adjunct to that, they promised, in the strongest possible terms, that our extraordinary large volume of imports would be decreased to the benefit of the home market.

In 1879, Sir Leonard Tilley, one of the ablest leaders of the party opposite, made this statement in Parliament in introducing his Budget:

> Regarding the matter as I do, I think it is to be regretted that the volume of imports has not been materially reduced. I look upon the large imports ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large balance of trade against it, as one of the causes of trouble with which we have to contend, one of the difficulties that it is our duty to remedy. They have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large, showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment, that they ought to be still further diminished. Under these circumstances, it appears to me that we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of imports from all parts of the world.

The very thing which brought about the deficits that Mr. Mackenzie had to struggle against, and which gave rise to the denunciations showered upon him by his opponents, was one of the things which the new policy was to remedy. I find, on looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the excess of imports over exports since confederation amounts to the sum of $527,578,888. I find that the excess of imports over exports since the adoption of the National Policy—that excess which the National Policy was to check—has been $247,500,000. Now, all the contentions of the partisans of this policy have been falsified by the event. They have placed enormous duties upon the imports; they have checked imports to the full extent of the powers with which Parliament vested them, and yet the excess of imports since 1879 over exports has been $247,500,000, proportionately equal to the excess under the Mackenzie Administration. A brief examination will show not only that the practical result has falsified the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite, but also that the position they took is entirely unsound. Great Britain is the richest and most prosperous country in the world, and yet the excess of imports over exports in that wealthy country, in 1892 alone, was £132,000,000 sterling. The average excess of imports over exports for the last ten or fifteen years in the mother country has been over £100,000,000 a year; and yet we find a party in this country laying down seriously the proposition that a large excess, or any excess, of imports over exports is detrimental to prosperity. I leave that phase of the question to the consideration of any who choose to study these suggestive figures.

Hon. gentlemen opposite promised that their policy of protection would check imports The result, however, shows that the imports not only have not been checked, but that there has been a large excess of imports since the National Policy was adopted. They promised also that their policy would keep the population in the country. They complained bitterly about the exodus. They taunted the Mackenzie Government with having caused the exodus by its policy, but the exodus then was much smaller, in proportion to the population, than it has been at any time since. That has been abundantly demonstrated in this House. I will not ask you to go with me through the census returns because the figures have been very fully discussed already. Yesterday we had the benefit of a speech from the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) in which he demonstrated, to his own satisfaction, the benign results of a policy, which only a short time ago he bitterly denounced and claimed had been the cause of the depopulation of the country. Although I cannot take the hon. member for Bellechasse as a leading representative on the other side, yet so recently has his change of opinion taken place that I think we can refer to a statement made by him as throwing some light upon this subject. After the census returns had been published, that hon. gentleman, then a follower of Mr. Laurier, in a formal speech upon the financial situation, referred to the success of the National Policy in that particular in these words:

> The Hon. Mr. Blake, who is a glory to his country, who is pure, who has no stain on his past record—equal in that respect to our present worthy leader—the Hon. Mr. Blake will tell you that the present state of things, if endured much longer, will corrupt all population to the very bones; he would tell you that it is time, if you do not want to demoralize the population of Canada completely and for long generations, it is time to do away with the entire administrative system as at present conducted, so as to cut the corrupt tie that exists between the heads of departments and the officers of the departments; he would tell you that it is time to pass the sponge everywhere, to put in high places new men with new principles; and he would tell you, that under our system of constitutional government, it is not good for any country that the same party should remain too long

in power, and recent events have fully exemplified that principle.

The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) says that we are rich because we have a surplus of $4,009,000, and the people are prosperous. Mr. Speaker, what is this surplus? It is the balance unexpended of the money that is paid into the treasury by the people, that is the surplus. Does that prove that the people are prosperous?

Now we come to something that the hon. member for Bellechasse could speak of as within his own knowledge, and it is upon this point I wish to quote him more particularly that in the portion I have already read:

I know that in my section of the country the people are not prosperous. I represent a rural constituency, and I know that a great many houses are closed and their owners have gone to the States. Look at the city of Quebec, where I live. Quebec West has diminished in population, and the two other divisions of the city have very slightly increased. Is that a sign of prosperity? Is it because a few contractors receive public money, is it because a few hundreds of manufacturers make millions of money? Is it because some of the public employees supplement their salaries with large bonuses and testimonials and presents of all kinds—is that the reason that the people are prosperous? Surely, you will not pretend that the million of people who have left this country are all fools, and that, if they had been prosperous here, they would not have remained. Here is a fact that confronts you at first glance. The census returns prepared by the officials of the Government prove to us that over a million of people have left this country. And why? Is it not because they could not live here during the ten years just past, when the hon. gentlemen have been telling us: We are happy, we are prosperous, Canada is rich, Canada is increasing in wealth and in population? The contrary has been proved to us.

This is a quotation from an hon. gentleman now supporting the Administration, from an hon. gentleman who stood up here last evening and for a long time endeavoured to prove that the National Policy, as administered by the hon. gentlemen had been a success. What I have quoted is not given as a matter of opinion, but as a matter of personal knowledge, as a matter of proof within his own knowledge—and, being a legal gentleman, he knows the value of proof—that a million of people had left the country in consequence of the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. And so out of the mouths of their supporters as well as from the official reports with which they furnish us, this claim is demonstrated to be, like the others, false and misleading.

The whole line of policy adopted by hon. gentlemen, in their efforts to retain power has been discredited. I will not allude to the extravagant prophecies made as to the settlement of the North-west; I will not allude to the extravagant claims for the various undertakings to which they have committed Parliament, but I will show, if possible, from the public records to what an enormous extent they have violated the promises upon which they obtained power, promises which they could have carried out consistently with their other declarations. It is admitted that the defeat of the Liberal party was caused by the depressed condition of the country, by the denunciations of their opponents, and the extravagant promises those opponents made of reform. The hon. gentlemen came into power with an enormous majority to carry out the terms upon which they claimed the indulgence and confidence of the people. Very shortly after they obtained power, the predictions of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) came true; the depression, which had begun to pass away while he was still in power, passed rapidly off; the labours of the husbandman were abundantly blessed by Divine Providence; general confidence was restored, the markets of the world improved, and our export trade in the great natural products of the country, the products of the farm, the forest, the fishery, and the mine, found profitable sale in the mother country, and in foreign lands. The returns gave the people of the country considerable money to spend in the improvement of their condition. In addition to this, the increased taxation which was at once imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, placed in the exchequer large sums of money, available to be expended upon various public works. In addition to that, the enormous borrowing powers of the Government were exercised without stint, and money from this source flowed in to the exchequer of the country. The consequence was that there was a large expenditure by the Government, and a considerable increase in the expenditure by private people.

Now, the claim has been made, and is constantly made, that it was the National Policy that brought about the largely increased exports of the country. It seems to me that if ever there was a proposition which bore upon its face its own condemnation for absurdity, this is the proposition. It is an accepted principle of economics that, in regard to the great natural products of the country, the markets of the world, the demand of the market in which the surplus is sold, furnishes the criterion of profit or loss. And Canada sold enormous quantities of these natural products. Was the increased price of fish and the increased draft of fishes from the sea, running to many millions of dollars' worth, the result of taxes imposed upon imported manufactures? Was the increased product of the soil, and the increased price of our agricultural staples caused by the tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite forced upon the people of this country? Certainly not; this improvement would have happened if hon. gentlemen had never existed. This improvement would have happened under any Government: and I think it has been abundantly demonstrat-

ed that if the taxation had been kept at a lower and fairer rate the profits reaped by the people would have been greatly enhanced.

Now, the export trade of the country has been recorded, ever since the establishment of the Dominion, under certain heads, and I wish to call the attention of the House to a liberty which, I think, has been improperly taken by the compilers of our statistics, in their arrangement of the statistics of the export trade. Of the thousands of people in this country who receive the Statistical Year-Book and from it seek to glean the trade and financial history of the country, how many are able to tell what are the exports of manufactured goods, and what are the exports of products of the forest? The Statistical Year-Book was a very useful publication as first issued, and might still be the same if it had not fallen into the hands of those whose object is to make it a campaign document. Up to 1891 it gave under the head of "Exports, manufactures," the same statement of exports of manufactures as contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns. In 1874, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the export of manufactures were $2,353,663. I have not gone into details, but I presume the figures are substantially correct, and that the proper items have been included to make up this total. Up to 1890, according to this Year-Book, these returns were given as laid down by the Trade and Navigation tables; but in the year 1891 the student of the Statistical Year-Book finds that our exports of manufactured goods were $22,916,431; while turning to the Trade and Navigation tables he finds the figures I have already given. In 1875, the manufactured goods exported from the country, as given in the Trade and Navigation tables, were $2,293,400; turning to the Statistical Year-Book we find that the manufactured goods exported are valued at $20,025,925; and so on, through all the years from that time to the present. Take as an example the year 1878; according to our Trade and Navigation tables, in that year the exports of the products of the forest were $19,511,575; and the exports of manufactured goods in that year were $4,127,735. But turning to the Statistical Year-Book we find that nearly $13,000,000 had been taken from the exports of the products of the forest and added to the total of exports of manufactured goods, thus increasing the volume of the exports of manufactured goods in that year, according to the Year-Book, from $4,127,735 to $17,780,776; while the exports of the forest fell, according to the different way of arranging these returns, from $19,511,375 to $5,912,139. Now, I contend that this method of arranging the statistics, however it may be reconciled to some technical principles upon which the statistician may elaborate his tables, is confusing, misleading and unfair, and the student of our trade economy is not placed in a position in which he can really judge of the effect of the National Policy. It would be necessary for him to go through the Trade and Navigation Returns during the whole history of confederation in order to form any reasonable opinion. The only conclusion I can come to with regard to this is that the statistician, following out the plan that seems to be adopted in that book, and seeing the enormous increase in the exports of the natural products of the forest, by taking certain wood products from the list given as exports of products of the forest and adding them to manufactured products, has swollen up an apparent testimonial to the advantage of the National Policy. If these figures are dissected it will be seen that the National Policy has had no such effect as that which they would seem, on a superficial view, to indicate. Now, if the Statistical Year-Book was consistent with itself, perhaps there might be some reason for allowing these statistics to pass. But the Year-Book is not even consistent with itself. I find upon examination of that work that on page 462 an enormous volume of exports is classed as products of the forest, which on page 474, are classed as manufactured goods. On page 662 is given a list of products of the forest exported from the country which includes basswood, butternut, hickory, sleepers, knees and futtocks, railroad ties, masts and spars; while on page 474 these very articles are classed as manufactured goods. Now, they cannot reasonably be classed under both heads at the same time. They are either properly and legitimately to be considered as manufactured goods, and manufactured goods the production of which is fostered and increased as a result of the National Policy, or the figures are of no utility whatever. Now, one page here shows ashes and pearl ashes are classed as products of the forest. The volume of imports of those articles amounted to $120,000 in the Trade and Navigation Returns, but in the Year-Book they are classed as manufactures. Basswood, butternut, hickory, of which the exports were $25,000, are classed in the Year-Book as manufactures; while in the Trade and Navigation Returns they are given as products of the forest. Deals, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, were exported to the value of $7,762,275, and they are properly classed as products of the forest in the Trade and Navigation Returns; while in the Statistical Year-Book these articles to the same amount are classed as manufactured products, and a claim is inferentially made to the advantage of the National Policy as encouraging manufacturers to that extent. Deal ends, $295,478, undergo the same process. Joists, scantlings, knees and futtocks, masts and spars, staves, bolts, laths and pickets, planks and boards, to the value of $9,640,638, in the

Trade and Navigation Returns are given to the public as products of the forest; while in the Statistical Year-Book they are placed under the head of manufactured articles. Shingles, $755,813, are classed as products of the forest in the Trade and Navigation Returns, but as manufactured goods in the Year-Book. Shooks, boxes and other articles of that kind, are classified in the same way, $119,212. Sleepers and railway ties, $214,892, are in the same category. Let us see how this representation works for any given year. Take the year 1893, for instance. The Trade Returns tell us that in that year we exported $26,539,910 worth of products of the forest; but the Statistical Year-Book tells us we exported of products of the forest in that year only $5,592,893; and they carry somewhat over $21,000,000 into the class of manufactured goods out of a total of $28,462,031 of manufactured goods. The effect of this arrangement would show, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that our exports were $7,693,929.

Now, we can imagine the ingenuous youth of the country, we can imagine even older persons anxious to see how the country is progessing in regard to the National Policy—we can imagine them in a country schoolhouse addressing the electorate and showing the enormous export of manufactured goods, and rolling out the figures, $28,462,031, thus completely demolishing their opponents who have not, perhaps, the advantage of having the Trade and Navigation Returns at hand to show that that list is padded by taking over into a wrong column an enormous mass of goods which have always rightly been considered to belong to the class of products of the forest. I presume the rule upon which this change of base has been made by the statistician, so far as I can gather from the returns themselves, is this: that wherever human labour has been applied to any extent to some natural products, such as animals and their products, or the products of the forest, he calls it a manufactured article. The tree that is just cut down, with the limbs lopped off, he might consent to leave under the head of a product of the forest; but if a slab is sawed off and it becomes a piece of square timber, then he calls it a manufactured article. So he goes through the whole list, and twenty-one or twenty-two million dollars worth of this class of articles he calls manufactured goods. He might as well call dried codfish a manufactured article. There is a much larger proportion of human labour applied to that product, in proportion to its value and size, than is applied to most of the articles which are in these tables. He might as well apply this rule to almost everything on which human labour has been expended and call it a manufactured article. He could by carrying out this proposition to its legitimate conclusion swell the list of manufactured articles exported to many millions of dollars more than it has been extended, and thus prove the great value of the National Policy, of imposing taxes which have no more relation to the export trade than has the blowing of the north wind. There is no doubt that the natural tendency of high taxation on manufactured goods has been to increase the cost of production, to prevent the development of our natural export trade in manufactured articles, because the cost has been increased, the value has been increased and our ability to compete in foreign markets has thereby been greatly lessened. The other evening the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) referred to cheese as a manufactured article, and he did so calmly and deliberately, and this member of the House is a gentleman of considerable thought, whose addresses are always received with that consideration which his high character entitles him to receive; yet in a formal address on the benefits of the National Policy he undertook to class cheese as a manufactured article. On the principle laid down by the statistician by which manufactures have been swollen from seven millions to twenty-eight millions, that is perfectly correct, but the principle will not be accepted by the House and the country as a fair means of calculating the development of our manufacturing industries. The benefits of low taxation during the Mackenzie regime and the blessings of providence resulted in great improvement, and I am happy to say, an almost permanent improvement in the growth and development of the great natural resources of the country. These resources are so great as to be almost unlimited, so extensive as to call for the highest powers of eloquence on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite were not created by them; and because we pretend to say that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been to increase the cost of production on those articles and thereby diminish the opportunity the people have to make wealth out of them, they affirm that we are running down the country. It is not so. There are no hon. gentlemen who have greater confidence and faith and a more wholesome belief in the natural resources of Canada than have the Liberal party in this House. It is because we see those resources fritted away, it is because we see the opportunity to gain wealth and prosperity lost by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite that we attack it and endeavour to show its failures, inconsistencies and improprieties.

The Conservative party declared they would not increase the taxation of the country; but they did increase it enormously. The average taxation from 1874 to 1878 was $18,989,668 per annum, or an average per head of $4.81. They said in one breath this was excessive and in another breath they said it was not enough. But when it came to a more definite declaration of the views they held, they insisted that

not the application of this principle they would not increase the taxation, but would readjust it. The actual taxation during the 16 years from 1879 to 1894, the result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, was to draw from the people through the custom-houses and Excise Department, $428,814,301. Had the people paid the same rate per head during all those years as they paid per head during the five years of the Liberal Administration, namely, $4.81½, there would have been $356,028,961 taken from them. In other words, the actual amount taken from the people from 1879 to 1894 by those hon. gentlemen, more than would have been taken under the Mackenzie Administration, was $72,785,725. And this was done under a policy which was pledged not to increase the taxation of the country.

To put it in another way: The Mackenzie Government would have taken $72,785,725 less if they had been in power during the last sixteen years. The average annual increase made by hon. gentlemen opposite in the amount of taxation was $4,549,108 over the rate of the Mackenzie regime. But this does not tell the whole story. They blamed the Mackenzie Government for deficits during their career. Had the Mackenzie Administration taxed the people on an average per head as those hon. gentlemen taxed them in 1894, a year in which they boasted of reductions made in taxation and when the Government professed to give the people the benefit of reduced taxation by many millions of money which they had previously taken from them, the average taxation from customs and excise would have been $5.55. Had Mr. Mackenzie been allowed by Parliament and the people to tax them during his five years of office at the rate of $5.55 per head, he would have obtained $107,358,036; but he actually levied $4.81 per head, which gave him $94,948,340, showing that had the rate of taxation which prevailed in 1894 been allowed to Sir Richard Cartwright during his five years of office, there would have been $12,402,496 more than he did obtain, and taking out the deficits for two years in which he had deficits, he would have had a net surplus during those years of $9,737,958. This proves conclusively that had the Liberal Government given away to the temptations that were held out to them to increase the taxation on the people, even during the years of depression, it would easily have swamped the deficit and resulted in the enormous surplus of $9,737,958.

But, Sir, let us run through some of these intervening years and see what the taxation that these hon. gentlemen have imposed would have given to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as Finance Minister. I have referred to the first period of their rule, and I will now take the period from 1882 to 1888. The average taxation of the Conservative Government during these five years produced $112,109,089, the average rate being $5.79 per capita. If Mr. Mackenzie had had that taxation during his term of office, he would have had a net surplus of $14,486,211. Take the next five years, form 1888 to 1893. If Mr. Mackenzie had been allowed to have taxed these people an average of $6.21 per head, as these gentlemen opposite taxed the people of the country, he would have a net surplus, between 1874 and 1878, of $22,504,003, which shows the enormity of the offence which the Conservative Government were guilty of receiving the confidence of the people in 1878 upon the basis of not increasing taxation, and proceeding to enormously increase it, afterwards boasting of the surpluses which it gave them.

I think I have shown, Sir, that the policy which the Conservative party has adopted has done nothing whatever to increase the substantial prosperity of the people. That increase resulted entirely from the profits of their export trade. I have shown, too, that the present Government have violated the promises which they made in regard to the keeping the expenditure within the limits of the expenditure of the Mackenzie Administration, for I have proven that they did enormously increase the expenditure, and thus violated that promise.

I may have occasion before I resume my seat to allude more in detail to some of these particulars, but at the present time I will take up another point of the argument invariably made by hon. gentlemen opposite. One of the points always made by every ministerial speaker, at any rate, during the latter portion of the discussion upon the benefits of the National Policy, has been to attack the operations of the revenue tariff in the mother country. They claim to be pre-eminently the party of patriotism and loyalty; but they find no language too contemptuous with which to speak of the policy of the statesmen of England. Although the hon. the Minister of Justice is not present, some of the remarks which I will make upon that point are directed to observations made by him in this House; observations which seem to have been followed up by Government speakers and by Government organs throughout the country, as a safe line on which to prejudice the people of Canada against the reforms which are favoured by the Liberal party.

It is well known that all the governing classes of Great Britain strongly support what is called a free trade policy, but which might more properly be called the revenue tariff policy of the mother country. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes try to make capital out of the assumption that the Liberal party, while favouring the free trade principle upon which Great Britain collects a revenue, favour a tariff precisely like that of the United Kingdom. This assumption is misleading to the last degree. It is the principle we are discussing, and

not the application of this principle to the intricate details connected with a tariff. These must be governed by the varying circumstances of the two countries. The principle of the tariff in the mother country is the principle of a revenue tariff.

Referring to that, and referring to the admitted fact that agriculture in the mother country is to a large degree depressed: all the opponents of the revenue tariff dwell with great gusto and infinite humour upon the condition of the agricultural classes in the old country. They upbraid England for her ignorance of political economy and for her stupidity in not seeing the way to true wealth and true grandeur by adopting the policy advocated by Canadian Conservatives. I will not pause, Mr. Speaker, to point out the effect upon this country if the statesmen of Great Britain listened with any idea of following the advice of these gentlemen, because we all know what that would result in as regards the producers in this country. But, dwelling upon the distress in agriculture in the mother country, and upon her adherence to the principles of a revenue tariff, they are never weary of intimating—although they are careful never to give the figures—that Great Britain is declining, that she is weakening financially, that she is losing her power, her force and her influence in the world, by adhering to this revenue policy. What an utter absurdity, in the face of the trade and financial returns of the motherland! Look abroad at the protected countries of the world in this year of grace 1895, and you will see every one of them with enormous deficits in their national exchequers: France, Germany, the United States, and Canada—all of them struggling with financial difficulty, owing to the embarrassments brought about among their people, and in their revenue resources, in consequence of the restrictive tariffs which they support, and which they pretend to enjoy. But go to free trade England, and there you find the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this very year announcing a substantial surplus with which to carry on the services of the country.

Coming back to the speech made by the hon. Minister of Justice, I think no one in this House and no one who read it in the country, could have been otherwise than amazed that one enjoying a proud distinction received from his Sovereign, should have descended to use the language which he did in regard to the mother country. He said:

> We are considering the Great Britain of 1894, but he (Mr. Davies) gave us statistics of Great Britain in 1886, and the hon. gentlemen themselves scorn and deride all suggestions that her foreign trade was being interfered with. Let him read a statement from the speech of any public man, Liberal or Conservative, in the motherland to-day, who will say for one moment, that the hostile tariffs surrounding that country in every quarter of the globe have not been successful in forcing her out step by step from the position of vantage which she once had in the various markets of the world. What is the whole policy of the motherland to-day?

And here is a sentence which I commend to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially to those loyalists among them who profess to be the only citizens who are true to the red cross flag:

> Driven from the civilized markets of the world steadily, and every year finding their output to those markets decreasing, they spend millions on their navy and millions on their army to force their wares and their goods and their merchandise into the uncivilized markets of the world, which they are endeavouring to occupy, to settle and to control, driven there by the deadly effect upon them of the tremenduous competition coming from the protectionist nations in the rest of the world.

I was proud when our eloquent leader, although belonging, by birth, to another race, on the spot rebuked this foul slander on the people of the mother country. "Driven from the civilized markets of the world, Great Britain is spending millions on her army and her navy to force her merchandise on the uncivilized nations of the world,"—was ever a fouler slander uttered against Great Britain than that contained in these words? It is not only unpatriotic, but it is manifestly untrue. In every market of the world where England controls, every nation has the same privilege as the mother country. She sets up no protectionist barrier in favour of her own merchants and her own manufacturers. She may civilize those countries and give them sound, healthy government; but as soon as she sets up her own administration, she says to all the world: "Come in and compete with us in a fair, free, and open market." Hon. gentlemen opposite can point to no instance in the whole history of the mother country where she has forced her trade on any civilized or uncivilized nation by means of her army and navy. The soldiers and sailors of England have a nobler work than that to perform. They have a work to perform under the aegis of the British flag, of giving good government, wholesome and equal laws and equal privileges, to all the people who choose to live or trade under the protection of that flag. What has been the result of the free trade policy of Great Britain upon her finances at home, and upon the prosperity of her people? Hon. gentlemen quote isolated cases, from agricultural reports, and other sources, of individuals here and there who advocate protection on grain and other agricultural products as a possible relief or remedy against agricultural distress in Great Britain; but they are not able, and never have been able, and I challenge them to-day, to quote from one leading public man, Conservative or Liberal, in the mother country, who has any responsibility resting upon him, one line or syllable in favour of the adoption of a protective tariff for Great Britain. I hold in my hand extracts from

an address delivered by the great unionist leader in England on the 1st of April, 1895, when addressing a manufacturing club representing one of the largest associations in the mother country, he referred to this question. I think the words used are alone a sufficient rebuke and a sufficient reply to all those absurd claims put forward from time to time on the other side of the House as to the attitude of England on this question. Addressing the Birmingham Jewellers' and Silversmiths' Association, Mr. A. Chamberlain said—this is from the London "Times":

I find that there are a number of people who, under the present condition of trade, are coming to the conclusion that our free trade policy has been a failure, and who would, therefore, be ready to go back in the direction of protection. This opinion is not to be treated lightly. It ought to be carefully considered.

I noticed, a very few days after the report of this speech appeared in the London "Times," that that portion of the speech was quoted by the Montreal "Gazette" with a great deal of gusto, while the concluding portion, containing the words which follow, was studiously omitted. He went on to say:

I will only lay before you two reasons why I differ from those who desire to abandon it. My first reason is this: In times past in this country, when England was under protection, and in foreign countries to-day which are also under protection, notably in the United States and in France, trade is even worse than it is here.

And he might have added, Canada.

My second reason is a little more complicated, but I think I can make it clear to you. We cannot maintain by ourselves, by our own efforts alone, the vast population that is crowded within the limits of our territory. We depend upon our foreign trade. But if by any means, by protection or any other, you shut the door upon foreign goods, you may be quite certain that the result will be that there will be fewer English goods that will go abroad.

This is sound doctrine, and it should be taken to heart by every student of political economy in the Dominion of Canada. He went on:

Bear in mind that depression in trade is not a new thing in this country. We have had depression in trade very great and extending over very long periods, at different times in our history. Why, the other day I was reading a most interesting work entitled "A Social History of England," and I happened to come across a description of the state of things in the reign of Henry the VIII.; and the complaints made at that time of the state of trade and the social conditions which were brought about by the depression of trade, might be made at the present moment by any one of us.

That is very close to the halcyon period referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and looked back upon with feelings of pain and regret by the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Montague). After describing that period, Mr. Chamberlain goes on to say:

Here is the point I want to put to you. In the time of Henry VIII., when people were complaining of the crowded population and want of employment, how many people do you think then were in England? Less than 4 millions. Now, with 30 millions in the same territory, after all, our condition is better than it was then, and the reason is mainly owing to the fact that in the interval our foreign trade has reached such enormous development. Therefore, I say that clearly the policy and duty of this country, the necessity for this country, is to take every opportunity of extending and developing that foreign trade, and especially of securing new markets, which are also free markets, for the introduction of our goods.

The state of agriculture in England has been put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite as one of the causes for a growth, or pretended growth, of the protectionist sentiment in England. Now, there are some 36,000,000 people in the British islands, and it would be only fair to assume, if the agricultural industry is depressed that there would be some, and perhaps very intelligent men, who would look to protection as a remedy; but no political leader or economical leader, no great writer or thinker, can be quoted as favouring this policy, even to assist the distressed agricultural element in the mother country. Mr. Goschen, the Ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, a Conservative and a man of great financial ability, is reported in the "Times" of 20th April, as having referred to the condition of things in England, in these terms:

The propertied classes, who are they? Thank God, the times are past when property belonged to a small portion of the community. Why, the working classes have become capitalists, to a certain extent, and £121,000,000 are in the savings banks, representing the thrift and the accumulated savings of the working classes. Do I speak simply of savings banks? No, in friendly societies, in building societies, in a vast number of other forms. I am glad to say that the working classes have shown that they are able to take their position side by side with capital in promoting trade and industry. I would like to ask those who view with disfavour anything having relation to capital, what they think of the foreign trade of the country, which could not be conducted, as it is now, with that smoothness which brings to our shores food in plenty and the material for our industries, without capital?

Take the agricultural interests alone. I hold in my hands the "Times" report of the council meeting of the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture—a body representing all the agricultural interests of England, containing members of Parliament and men eminent in agriculture and in legislation concerning agriculture. After a long sitting and the hearing of an elaborate and voluminous report of the committee appointed to consider the causes of depression in agriculture, the council came to certain conclusions. No less than twelve or thirteen points were laid down and carefully considered by

the council and committee. They refer to local taxation and the system upon which it should be levied, the railway rates, currency reform, the readjustment of the beer duty and the rules with regard to brewers, the conditions of tenancy, the marking of foreign meats and produce, the adulteration of food, the tithes rent charges, but in not one instance is the remedy of protection suggested or hinted at as a means of improving the condition of agriculture. In not one instance is the imposition of foreign corn and produce suggested. It is easy to quote here and there a suggestion by some obscure person—obscure in public life if not in his own particular locality—of a protective duty, but we cannot find any thinker or statesman responsible to the world and to posterity for his opinions, who would suggest the suicidal remedy of protection in the mother country in order to build up the manufacturing interests. The other day a report was published in the London "Times" from Mr. Aubrey Spencer, who was appointed by the Royal Commission on Agriculture, to examine into the question. The "Times" of the 10th April, 1895, has an editorial on the subject from which I quote the following:—

> We printed on Saturday an abstract of a very instructive report prepared by Mr. Aubrey Spencer for the Royal Commission on Agriculture. This report is no very pleasant reading for the land-owners and agriculturists. * * * The main causes of the depression appears to be the continuous fall in the prices of farm produce, which has not been accompanied by a corresponding reduction in the cost of production. And the cause has been intensified by a succession of unfavourable seasons. Complaints are heard of high rates, heavy tithes and an excessive land tax, but such complaints are, perhaps, rather the signs of the depression which undoubtedly prevails, than a correct diagnosis of the cause. * * * As for remedies, Mr. Spencer has no panacea to suggest. * * * As the rise and fall of prices are beyond the farmer's control, while the cost of production is, to some extent, within his own control, it seems obvious that it is in this direction, if any, that a practical remedy must be sought. * * * * The farmer has the remedy in his own hands. * * * Old methods are being superseded, and he must either learn new methods or succumb. Great as is the interest of the country in the welfare of its agriculture, its interest in the welfare of its international trade is much greater.

Then the "Times" goes on to indicate the lines upon which agricultural reform ought to be based, and in not one is there the slightest indication that an import duty upon foreign corn or products would be in the slightest degree in the interests of the farmers. If the revenue policy of the mother country had been so disastrous, some indication of it would be seen in her trade returns. Some of these returns are very instructive reading, and I think the time is opportune for placing in available form some of the results of an examination into British statistical reports.

Mr. FLINT.

Take the growing wealth of the country as represented by the income tax. In 1871, the amount of property taxed to income was £131,802,902. This has grown steadily from that date to 1891, the last return which I find available, to £587,251,084. One penny on the income tax in 1871 produced £1,654,277. One penny on the income tax in 1891 produced £2,214,000. This shows an enormous increase in the value of property taxed to income, but there may be some property taxed to income which might possibly escape taxation; and the return might not give a fair representation of the whole growth of the wealth of the country. But there is another return. I find that when in 1877 the profits from the foreign and colonial investments of the mother country were £28,200,000, in 1891 they had run up to £55,200,000. There has been a steady and progressive development from £28,000,000 in 1877 to £55,000,000 in 1891, showing that whatever may be the depressed condition of a few industries caused by the peculiar condition of things, the substantial wealth of the country is steadily growing.

Take the British import trade, and let us see how that has been affected by this terrible, narrow-minded policy which the Conservatives of this country bewail as the result of the stupidity of English statesmen. In five years, from 1855 to 1859, Great Britain imported £169,000,000 on an average. In the next five years she imported £235,000,000 on an average. In the following five years she imported £286,000,000. In the next five years she imported £346,000,000. And in the ensuing five years she imported £375,000,000. And from 1880 to 1884 she imported £408,000,000. And in the year 1891, £435,000,000. It is true that 1891 represented about the highest mark. There was a falling off in the imports in 1892 and 1893, owing to the depression that has been referred to by various speakers. But the import trade of the mother country, by five year periods, has grown in an enormous ratio. This import trade must represent growing wealth, growing means of purchasing the goods of foreign countries, and a growing development of the whole country, notwithstanding individual cases of depression.

Let us take the exports of Great Britain. We find that her exports, from 1816 to 1842, when this magnificent policy, calculated to hasten the development of the resources of the country and make it great and prosperous, the policy of protection, was in full swing, averaged £40,000,000 sterling. The export trade reached its highest limit under protection in 1842, when the exports amounted to £50,000,000 sterling in round numbers. Free trade, as it is established in Great Britain, reached almost its full development in 1848 or 1849, and in the five years up to 1852 the export trade had grown to £72,000,000. In 1853, it was £98,000,000; in 1854, £97,000,-

000; in 1856, £115,000,000; in 1857, £122,000,000; in 1859, £130,000,000. The mind begins to grow bewildered in contemplating the significance of these vast sums. Take the period from 1860 to 1866, and we find that Great Britain exported no less than £149,500,000. In 1866, the last year of that period, the total was £189,500,000. In 1870, the exports had reached £199,500,000, and in 1872, £256,000,000. The average exports from 1875 to 1879 were somewhat less than in 1872, but they were still larger than in 1870. From 1880 to 1884, the exports were £234,000,000 on the average. In 1890, Great Britain exported £262,530,000. In the following year there was a falling off, and there has been a slight decrease in succeeding years, the total in 1891 being £247,235,000. This shows that, up to the beginning of the latest period, up to the world-wide depression that has affected every country under the sun, which affected the value as well as the volume of goods, England had advanced, as regards her export trade, by leaps and bounds.

But they tell us that Great Britain is being driven from the various markets of the world, and is compelled to resort to her army and navy in order to force her goods upon the barbarians of Africa and the untutored natives of the South Seas. Of course, these statements have already been refuted by reference to the facts of history.

But let us glance at the export trade of the United Kingdom with various foreign countries for successive periods. In 1840, Great Britain exported to the colonies £34,000,000. In 1860, the exports to the colonies had grown to £89,000,000; in 1874, to £161,000,00; in 1885, to £170,000,000, and in 1891 to £192,000,000. Does this look like destruction of the motherland through her free trade principles? Does this look as if she was being forced from the markets of her colonies or from the markets of the protectionist nations of the world? Let us glance at Great Britain's trade with the United States, where she has to force her goods over a protective barrier and to compete with the protectionist manufacturers of the country, and see how she has survived in the struggle and what headway she has made in the competition in the years that have passed. In 1860 Great Britain exported to the United States £68,000,000 worth of goods. By 1874 that had increased to £95,000,000, and in 1885 to £118,000,000. In 1891, she exported to the United States goods to the value of £146,000,000, and in 1892, £150,000,000. Does this look as if England was decaying, as if she was being trampled under foot by protectionist nations? No; the figures are all in favour of the contrary view. Now, consider the exports to France. In 1860, Great Britain exported to France goods to the value of £31,000,000, but in 1874 she had more than doubled this amount, the total being £74,000,000. In 1891, France took £68,000,000 of British goods, and in 1892, £65,000,000, and at about that figure the trade has remained ever since. So, notwithstanding the enormous protection France has placed upon her import trade, she received English goods to an amount 100 per cent greater than she did in 1840, when Britain was a high protectionist country, and France had comparatively a low tariff. In exports to Germany we find much the same record. In 1860, British goods were exported to Germany to the value of £34,000,000, and in 1892 this had grown to £55,000,000. When we consider the exports to other than those I have mentioned—the colonies, the United States, France and Germany—the figures are so vast that it is almost absurd to give them with any idea that we can understand their full significance. Out of a total export of £375,000,000 in 1860, Great Britain sent to countries other than those I have mentioned £153,000,000. This certainly was a great triumph over her rivals in the markets of the world, but it was eclipsed by the record of 1874, when she exported to these countries £270,000,000. In 1885, though many countries had raised higher their tariff barriers in their endeavours to shut her out, she placed with them goods to the value of £245,000,000, and in 1891 this export had grown to £283,000,000. Tell the members of this House that England is declining because she will not accept the panacea prescribed for her by the gentlemen on the other side! English statesmen understand their business far better than gentlemen opposite seem to have understood their business of building up Canada.

Britain's shipping tonnage in 1894 amounted to 3,096,342. Under this foolish policy of free trade, so much decried by gentlemen opposite, she increased her tonnage from the figures I have given, in 1894, up to 8,541,838 tons in 1893. And to-day, owing to the wise policy adopted by her statesmen in 1843, Great Britain owns over one-half the tonnage of the civilized world. The consequence is that she is reaping the fruit of her wise policy in every port under the sun and from every nation in the world. All peoples are paying tributes to her merchants, and adding to her power and influence by reason of the wise statesmanship that has signalized her administration. But during all this time, even while sustaining an exceedingly expensive army, the finest for its numbers in the world, while sustaining the most powerful navy in the world, she has reduced her debt by many millions of pounds sterling.

In 1860, the debt of Great Britain was £812,904,106. But while sustaining this army and navy, while pushing her peaceful trade in every portion of the globe, civilizing nations in every clime and under every sky, still she reduced her debt in the 34 years up to 1894 by no less han £148,740,965. In her savings banks her working people, in the period from 1855 to 1859, had £35,900,000 sterling, an enormous sum of money, representing thrift, industry

and a certain degree of prosperity. But in the period from 1860 to 1864, the average was £42,800,000. In 1865 to 1869 this had grown to £47,000,000. From 1870 to 1874, the total was £58,900,000, and from 1875 to 1879, to £72,300,000. And so it advances, until in the five years from 1885 to 1889, it reached nine figures, being £101,219,378. In 1892, the savings of Great Britain deposited in the savings banks of that country amounted to £118,238,528, and in 1893 they had reached the splendid total of £122,841,248. This was a larger amount per head by a large percentage than the people of Canada have under the National Policy. The importation per head of the people of the mother country, showing the amount that they consume of the goods supplied from the rest of the world, is the largest of any people under the sun. In 1892 her imports per head amounted to $56, her exports to $29, and her total trade was $93 per head; while in Canada our total trade per head is about $49; showing that the mother country, with all the difficulties she has to contend with, without the unlimited natural resources we enjoy, trading over all portions of the world, has a trade amounting to $93 per head, against the trade of the people of Canada of $49.27 per head.

The total trade of the United Kingdom with foreign countries increased steadily from seventy-nine millions in 1854, to one hundred and seventy-six millions in 1890; to the British possessions it increased from thirty-seven millions in 1854 to eighty-seven millions in 1890; to the United States, it increased from nineteen millions to thirty-two millions during the same period. Her total export trade in manufactured products increased from one hundred and sixteen millions to two hundred and thirty-six and a half millions; showing that the mother country is sound and healthy to the core, that the principles laid down by her statesmen at the time that she was brought so low through an adherence to a false economical doctrine, have placed her where she ought to be, and where she will be so long as she upholds this policy, the foremost of the civilized nations of the globe.

Sir, I think I have disposed of the claims that are made against the policy of the mother country, and now I will call the attention of the House to some peculiarities of our own country. Every step taken by hon. gentlemen opposite has been prefaced by extraordinary promises, wild prophecies, and predictions of extraordinary success if their policy was carried into effect. Perhaps in no particular has the country been more thoroughly misled than in the promises made in regard to the iron and steel duties. And here I will venture to make an assertion of an opinion which has pressed itself for the last eight or ten years upon my own mind. I do not know to what extent it is shared by others, but it has seemed to me, from a careful study of the speeches by which this policy was heralded, and by which it has been supported, that the prime object of the Conservative party has never been protection, but it was to obtain an enormous revenue with which to carry on some ulterior purpose, and that they have adopted protection merely as a catchword, as a means of holding certain classes under their influence, or within their power. I think that the whole indications of the trade and financial returns point in this direction; but under the plea and guise of protection, they have really been grasping at the revenues of the people in order to further some selfish, personal or political ends. Otherwise they would have carried out some of their promises, they would have reduced the enormous taxation from time to time when they found that their predictions were not realized. But the appetite grew by what it fed on, and the men behind the throne, the men who were nursing the infant industries, never believed they had sufficient money from the people, and they never will let go their hold until they are compelled to do so by an outraged and indignant people.

The iron duties were increased enormously over the ordinary protective duties in 1884, followed up by a still further increase in 1887. In introducing the policy of increasing the iron duties, Sir Charles Tupper, in one of his speeches, made these remarks, which are only a sample of his addresses upon the same line during the discussions on this subject:

> The moment anthracite coal is free, we shall have blast furnaces at Coubourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston. * * * I believe that at no distant day you will have in the province of British Columbia an iron industry built up which will compare favourably with any other industry in this country. * * * Now, Sir, by the adoption of this policy, you will give permanent employment to an army of men—numbering, at least, 20,000 men, increasing our population from 80 to 100,000 souls, and affording them the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity.

Now, this was certainly an extravagant prediction, but at any rate, based upon it the legislature gave them the power they asked, and from time to time increased the bounty given for the production of and the import duties on iron and steel. The result, although it has to a certain extent increased the production of pig iron, has been enormously oppressive to the industrial and productive classes of this country.

I find that the total amount of dutiable iron and steel goods imported into Canada between 1874 and 1877, both inclusive, was $35,283,256; while the free goods of the same class imported in those years, was $25,733,836; making a total of $61,017,692, upon which a duty was paid of $4,191,668. The average of dutiable iron and steel imports per annum was $8,820,814, and of free imports of the same class, $6,433,459, the total being $15,254,423, the duty averaging $1,047,917 per annum. The rate the people of this country

paid as duty upon that class of goods, was 11¾ per cent. and on the total goods, 068½ per cent. Let us look at the result of the imports of this class of goods between 1891 and 1894, when we had the full fruit of the policy which was to bring about such beneficent results. Our total imports of dutiable iron and steel goods during that period amounted to $38,846,092, as against $35,283,256 between 1874 and 1877. Free goods fell off enormously, being only $9,012,093, between 1891 and 1894, as against $25,733,836 in the former period. On a total import of $47,890,185, in the latter five years we paid a duty of $10,848,249, or an average on dutiable goods of 28·10, and on the net total, 22·85 per cent. Nearly eleven millions were collected in duty on forty-seven millions, as against four millions on the sixty-one millions of iron and steel imported between 1874 and 1877. These figures alone are very significant. Had Mr. Mackenzie placed on iron and steel importations during his regime the duty that was placed by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last five years, he would have had an enormous net surplus derived from this one class of articles alone. On the whole the average increase of duty on steel and iron and manufactured goods represented an increased revenue of $800,000 per year paid into the exchequer, which would have wiped out the deficits which occurred during the Mackenzie Administration, and would have given a large sum of money to be expended on public works and for other useful public services.

But what has been the result of this increased taxation? It has fostered combines in every department connected with the iron and steel industry. There is not a free man in Canada to-day when it comes to purchasing anything into which iron and steel enter as an important part of its manufacture. The country is under an abject and absolute slavery, because every seller is bound by obligations, under severe penalties, not to sell an article, except at a rate fixed by a powerful combination, and the consequence is that to-day the whole consuming population of Canada is held down under the iron hand of one of the most powerful and unscrupulous corporations ever known in this country, or, perhaps, ever known in any part of the civilized world. The people are paying into the treasury of that corporation millions every year in order to build up that industry—to what extent? To-day we have but four furnaces in the Dominion of Canada, and we were promised in 1887, that we would have 20,000 men employed, giving a population of 100,000 souls subsisting on this industry, while we have less than 500 men employed, showing a falling off of 19,500 men from the extravagant prediction made by the gentleman who introduced and supported this measure. There never was, and never can be, a more ignominous failure on the part of a public policy than the failure of the iron duties to accomplish the objects which they were levied to secure.

Again, there was to be no increase in expenditure. The finances of this country were to be administered more cheaply. There was to be no increase in taxation, there was to be no increase on the burdens of the people. There was to be a reduction in all the items of expenditure controllable by Parliament. Almost vindictive attacks were made by Dr. Tupper and his colleagues on the expenditure of the Liberal Government, and the inference was conveyed, if the actual promise was not made in Parliament that the expenditure would be reduced. At all events that promise was made on the hustings subsequently.

Let us see how the Conservative party carried out that promise to reduce the expenditure. The average expenditure from 1874 to 1878 was $23,708,043, the average expenditure from 1890 to 1894 was $36,700,514; the average increase, taking the last five years with the five years of Liberal Administration, was $12,992,471, or 54·23 per cent. The average controllable expenditure from 1874 to 1878 was $12,377,854; the same expenditure from 1889 to 1894 was $20,631,977, or an increase of $8,254,123, being at the rate of 66⅔ per cent. The increase by the Mackenzie Administration over its predecessor was an average of only 46 cents per head, although that Government was saddled with enormous obligations for which they were not responsible. But the Conservative party promised to reduce the expenditure, or at least to keep it stationary, and Mr. Mackenzie did reduce it somewhat during his term of office, the average being $6 per head during his administration as compared with $7.54 between 1889 and 1893. Again, with respect to the increase of debt. The average debt during the Mackenzie regime was $124,496,447. The average debt from 1890 to 1894 was $240,867,545, an increase of $116,371,098, or 93 per cent.

The increase of the amount of interest on the debt was not less than 50 per cent. The net debt per head from 1874 to 1878 was an average of $40.63 as compared with $60.22 from 1889 to 1893, showing an increase of $19.59 per head, or an average of 48·21 per cent. The average increase of taxation was 58·27 per cent, the increase of customs taxation 67·40 per cent, and the increase of taxation per head 35·23 per cent. So it was in every particular, as regards the expenditure, the controllable expenditure, the charges and other items. The charges on revenue increased 77 per cent, miscellaneous or "other expenditures," 84 per cent; Civil Government, 57·78 per cent; legislation, 39 per cent: taxation, 58·27 per cent; while our population increased only 26 per cent. These results are clearly shown by the following tables:—

TOTAL EXPENDITURE.

1874 to 1878, average	$ 23,708,043
1890	$ 35,931,031
1891	36,343,568
1892	36,765,894
1893	36,814,053
1894	37,585,025
	$183,502,571

Average, $36,700,514 ; average increase, $12,992,471 ; per cent, 54·23.

CONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURE.

1874	$ 13,060,518
1875	12,588,345
1876	12,386,013
1877	12,029,974
1878	11,844,421
	$61,889,271

Average, $12,377,854.

1889	$20,707,241
1890	$ 20,314,622
1891	20,655,528
1892	20,854,203
1893	20,362,092
1894	20,973,439
	$103,159,884

Average, 1890-94, $20,631,977 ; increase, $8,254,123 ; per cent, 66⅔.

EXPENDITURE—PER HEAD.

1874	$ 6 10
1875	6 10
1876	6 20
1877	5 86
1878	5 76
	$30 02

Average, $6 per head ; increase over previous period, 46c. per head.

1889	$ 7 79
1890	7 52
1891	7 50
1892	7 50
1893	7 42
	$37 73

Average, $7.54 ; increase over 1874-78, $1.54 per head ; increase, 25⅔ per cent per head.

INCREASE OF DEBT.

1874	$ 108,324,965
1875	116,008,378
1876	124,551,574
1877	133,235,309
1878	140,302,069
	$ 622,482,235

Average, $124,496,447.

1890	$ 237,533,212
1891	237,809,030
1892	241,131,434
1893	241,681,039
1894	246,183,029
	$1,204,337,744

Average, $240,867,545 ; increase, $116,371,098—93 p.c.

INTEREST ON DEBT—AMOUNT.

1874	$ 5,113,573
1875	5,749,903
1876	5,601,996
1877	6,079,542
1878	6,443,109
	$28,988,123

Average interest, $5,797,624.

1890	$ 8,574,570
1891	8,506,909
1892	8,677,558
1893	8,656,722
1894	8,994,788
	$43,410,547

Average, $8,682,109 : increase, $2,884,485—50 p.c.

DEBT PER HEAD.

1874	$ 36 90
1875	39 02
1876	40 82
1877	43 52
1878	42 89
	$203 15

Average per head, $40.63.

1889	$ 60 75
1890	59 74
1891	59 85
1892	60 28
1893	60 48
	$301 10

Average, $60.22 ; increase per head, $19.59—48·21 p.c.

TAXATION PER HEAD—CUSTOMS.

	Average.
1874 to 1878	$3 44
1889 to 1883	4 65

Increase per head, $1.21—35·23 p.c.

EXCISE PER HEAD.

	Average.
1874 to 1878	$1 32
1889 to 1893	1 55

Increase, 23c.—17·42 p.c.

TOTAL TAXATION—CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—PER HEAD.

	Average.
1874 to 1878	$4 81½
1889 to 1893	6 21

Increase per head, $1.40—29 p.c.

CUSTOMS TAXATION—AMOUNT.

1874	$ 14,325,192
1875	15,351,011
1876	12,823,837
1877	12,546,987
1878	12,782,824
	$ 67,829,851

Average, $13,565,970.

1889	$ 23,726,784
1890	23,968,954
1891	23,399,301
1892	20,501,059
1893	20,954,003
	$112,550,101

Average, $22,510,020 ; increase, $8,944,050—67·40 p.c.

CHARGES ON REVENUE (Exclusive of Railways and Canals).

1874	$ 2,468,376
1875	2,732,795
1876	2,895,896
1877	2,949,617
1878	2,918,464
	$13,965,148

Average, $2,793,029.

1889	$ 4,770,038
1890	4,820,741
1891	4,947,804
1892	5,088,190
1893	5,145,521
	$24,772,294

Average, $4,954,459 ; increase, $2,161,430—77 p.c.
Increase of five years, $10,807,146.

MISCELLANEOUS (OTHER) EXPENDITURE.

(Year-book, pp. 701-702.)

1874	$ 1,943,146
1875	1,654,522
1876	2,015,757
1877	1,566,858
1878	1,633,944
	$ 8,814,227

Average, $1,762,845.

1889	$ 3,400,299
1890	2,955,872
1891	3,283,761
1892	3,127,770
1893	3,489,207
	$16,256,909

Average, $3,251,382 ; increase, $1,488,537—84 p.c.
Increase, $7,442,682.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT—EXPENDITURE.

(Public Accounts.)

1874	$ 883,686
1875	909,265
1876	841,995
1877	812,193
1878	823,369
	$4,270,308

Average, $854,061 ; decrease, $60,217.

1890	$1,308,846
1891	1,334,201
1892	1,325,087
1893	1,367,570
1894	1,402,279
	$6,737,983

Average, $1,347,596 ; increase, $493,535—57·78 p.c.
Increase, $93,433.
5 years' difference, $2,467,675.

LEGISLATION.

1874	$ 572,273
1875	627,230
1876	596,006
1877	618,035
1878	748,007
	$3,161,551

Average, $632,310.

1890	$ 932,187
1891	596,486
1892	1,302,876
1893	867,231
1894	698,007
	$4,396,787

Average, $879,357 ; increase, $247,047—39 p.c.
Increase, $1,235,236.

TAXATION (AMOUNT).

1874	$ 20,129,185
1875	20,664,878
1876	18,614,415
1877	17,697,924
1878	17,841,340
	$94,948,340

Average, $18,989,668.

1889	$ 30,613,523
1890	31,587,072
1891	30,314,151
1892	28,446,157
1893	29,321,367
	$150,282,270

Average, $30,056,454 ; increase, $11,066,786—58·27 p.c.
Increased taxation, $55,333,930.

POPULATION.

1874	3,825,305
1875	3,886,534
1876	3,949,163
1877	4,103,271
1878	4,078,924
	19,843,197

Average, 3,968,639.

1890	4,792,605
1891	4,847,197
1892	4,903,969
1893	4,961,528
1894	5,021,476
	24,526,275

Average, 4,905,255 ; increase, 1,036,616—26 p.c.

1878	4,078,924
1894	5,021,476
	942,552

RECAPITULATION (1874-78 and 1890-94).

		Per cent.
Expenditure	Increase	54·23
Controllable expenditure	"	66⅔
Charges on revenue	"	77
Miscellaneous (other)	"	84
Civil Government	"	57·78
Legislation	"	39
Expenditure (per head)	"	25⅔
Debt (per head)	"	93
Interest on debt	"	48·21
Total taxation (per head)	"	29
Customs (per head)	"	35·23
Excise (per head)	"	17·42
Taxation (amount) total	"	58·25
Customs taxation	"	67·49
Population	"	26

Was there ever a more complete demonstration as to the difference between promise and performance? Could there be any official figures showing a more complete failure on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to carry out the promises they made to the country, to carry out the honest, fair and reasonable expectations of the people.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, hon. gentlemen opposite from time to time, speak of the progress and advancement of this Dominion. These statements remind me of a story told of a darkey during the Southern war. He was a servant of a colonel in the Southern army, and when he came from the front he was asked how things looked there. He said: "I don't want to demoralize our people; but I can tell you our army is advancing backwards and the enemy is retreating forward." We can apply that to the hon. gentlemen opposite. In all their trade and financial experiments, they are advancing backwards. Now, Sir, in contrast to that, we have the plain simple declaration representing the views and aspirations of the Liberal party. We have not merely the declaration itself, but we have it backed up by the whole history of the party, and the whole history of their attempts at relieving the people from the enormous burdens thrown upon them by the administration of affairs by the Conservative Government.

We have a declaration which favours reciprocity with the United States, a declaration which favours a revenue tariff with the elements of protection taken from it; and, although hon. gentlemen opposite may pretend that they do not know what a revenue tariff means, every gentleman on this side of the House can tell them. It means, in the first place, a just and honest tariff, it means, in the next place, a low tariff. It implies a reduced expenditure, it implies fair and equitable adjustment of the burdens which must be borne by the people, and it implies an honest and economical administration of the affairs of the country. It precludes any Administration which shall come into power upon principles of that kind, from throwing away and squandering money, either upon political or commercial favourites. It precludes the idea that the Administration of the day will submit, for one instant, to any of those robberies which have characterized the maladministration of affairs by the present Government.

Under a Liberal Government, there will be no extravagant expenditure, there will be a low, uniform, and just tariff, there will be no Curran bridge steals, there will be no St. Mary's bridge frauds and humbugs, there will be no Sheik's Island Dam business, and no money wasted on Little Rapid Locks. There will be no money thrown away upon contractors under conditions not nominated in the bond, and under conditions unknown to the people of this country, but which are well known to those who administer the election funds of the present Government. I trust that when the people of this country see in their full enormity the exactions and burdens laid upon them under the guise of building up a trade and prosperity which does not exist, they will replace this present incompetent Administration by one that will do justice to all classes of the people.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, as this is an interesting debate, I would like to offer a few remarks, and I will try and make them as brief as possible. I will not deal with quite so many figures as my hon. friend (Mr. Flint), and I will confine my remarks as closely as possible to the question before the House. I will first investigate, Sir, the effects of the National Policy, and I shall inquire what its effects are on the prices of farm produce. I shall inquire if the National Policy has increased the price of manufactured goods, I shall inquire if the National Policy has destroyed Canada's credit in the London money market, and I shall inquire, too, if the National Policy has reserved the home market to the people of Canada. If I succeed in showing that the National Policy has not increased the price of manufactured goods, if I succeed in showing that the National Policy has, at least, secured the home market for our farmers, if I succeed in showing that the National Policy has not injured Canada's credit but improved it; then, Sir, I am entitled to claim that the National Policy is deserving of the support of the people of this country. We must presume, in the first place, that the policy of our friends of the Opposition is a tariff for revenue only, or free trade as it is in England, or a tariff without a vestige of protection. That, at all events, is their policy for the time being, although we do not know what it may be in the near future, as it changes very frequently. I shall also try to consider how this tariff bears upon the farmer, the wage-earner, the artisan, and the manufacturer, and I will try to show how the tariff bears on the agriculturists, the largest class in this community. In a speech delivered in Charlottetown in March last by the hon. the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), he tried to make out that the National Policy had no effect on the price of the farmers' produce, that it did not raise the price of his potatoes, or his pork, or his oats, or anything of that kind, and in the course of his remarks, he said:

> There was indeed some pork imported into this country, but chiefly for the use of lumbermen.

Now, let us consider, for a moment, this question of pork, and see what the importations to this country have been. In 1891, we find, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the importations of pork and pork products amounted to 22,221,114

pounds. We exported, in the same year, 7,621,924 pounds, showing that it took 14,600,000 pounds of foreign pork to fill up the supply in our home market. Under increased protection in 1894 we imported pork products to the amount of only $361,140 and exported them to the value of over $2,000,000. Now, Sir, that being the case, my contention is, that the National Policy secured to the farmers of this country a home market to the extent of at least 14,600,000 pounds of pork. I can, therefore, claim that the National Policy has benefited the farmers of this country to that extent. Let me also look for a moment at the other farm products imported into Canada. Here is the record for 1878, under the tariff for revenue only of the Liberal Government, compared with 1892, under the present Government:

	In 1878.	In 1892.
Butter	$ 23,773	$ 50,013
Lard	211,949	50,554
Bacon	219,293	93,802
Beef	31,709	94,070
Pork	637,845	483,773
Apples and pears	90,769	80,367
Vegetables	57,683	140,666
Oats	351,365	1,867
Rye	77,398	269
Corn	3,535,579	862,455
Wheat	6,510,131	67,678
Flour	1,853,620	153,229
Total	$13,901,114	$2,076,742

We therefore imported $11,824,372 worth of farm products less under the National Policy than were imported under the tariff for revenue only of the Opposition. In other words, if the tariff for revenue only of the Opposition had been in force since 1878, we would, in all probability, have continued to import nearly $12,000,000 worth of products which the farmers of our own country now furnish under the National Policy. I think, Sir, that this, of itself, is sufficient to show that the National Policy is in the interests of the farmers of this country. Not only that, Sir, but to show that the Government have the interests of the farmers of the country at heart, I may mention that they have established experimental farms throughout the country for the assistance of the farmers, and they have appointed a dairy commissioner to assist the cheese and butter industry—and I may say, speaking for our own province, that the dairy commissioner has accomplished wonders there. An industry that did not exist under the former Administration has been brought into existence by the present Government through the protection which their policy has given the farmers, and that industry has been brought into such prominence that the people of Prince Edward Island, as the dairy commissioner said the other day before the Committee on Agriculture, now manufacture the finest cheese in the Dominion of Canada. The present Government have promoted the interests of the farmers in other ways. They have subsidized lines of steamers from the maritime provinces to the West Indies, which are building up a commerce in agricultural produce and fish which is in the interest of the farmers and fishermen of the lower provinces. That West India market is growing, year after year; and, while we have a near-by market to some extent in the city of Halifax, it is always relieved by the quantities which these subsidized steamers carry from that port to the West Indies. In that way, the West India trade tends to keep the market steady, and the prices better than they otherwise would be. One thing we are accused of by the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition is that we have increased the city population and decreased the rural population. Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the building up of the city population is building up increased markets for the farmers of this country, and every person from the rural population on being transferred to the city, who was a contributor to what the city required, becomes a consumer. In that way the National Policy has built up cities, towns and villages, and every city and town and village that has been increased in population under the operation of the National Policy has been increasing the markets of the farmers of this country. The Government are accused of spending large sums of money. Well, I think every progressive Government must spend money in a new country like this, in whose future we have such hope and confidence. It may be here mentioned that when the present Government came into power, we had no transcontinental railway; we had no steamship lines with Asia or Australia; we had no steamships subsidized to the West Indies; we had no Sault Ste. Marie canal; we had none of the branch railways that penetrate almost every section of Canada, and one of which we hope to see almost constructed in our province. The Government has certainly aided railways and built and deepened canals. In doing this they were doing what was beneficial to the country, and what strengthened the credit of Canada in the markets of the world. Now, Sir, let us inquire for a moment if the National Policy has increased the price of manufactured goods, as was predicted, and as is still, to some extent, maintained by the gentlemen of the Opposition. We all know, Sir—everybody in Canada knows—that there never was a time when manufactured goods were as cheap in Canada as they are at present. There never was a time when the necessaries of the poor man could be purchased with so little money; there never was a time when the purchasing power of a dollar was as great as it is at present. Everything you eat, everything you wear, everything you require, made in this country, is cheaper now than it ever has been heretofore. In fact, it is scarcely

necessary that I should spend any time in proving a self-evident proposition, because everybody in this country knows that what I say is a fact.

Mr. BORDEN. How is it with reference to the prices in other countries now ?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I am looking at things as they are in our own country. It is all very well to speak about the prices in other countries, but we know that the things we have in our own country are cheaper than ever they were before. Let us take a glance for a moment at the financial standing of this country and contrast it with our standing under the Liberal rule. When the hon. member for South Oxford went to London to raise a loan, he got £90 for his £100 bond bearing 4 per cent interest, and then he had to present the silver side of the shield to the financiers. When the present Minister of Finance went to London on a similar mission, he got £97 10s. for his £100 bonds and only paid 3 per cent, and he could have got many times the amount he required. This improvement in the credit of Canada and reduction of the cost of carrying its national debt, augmented as that debt has been by the extensive public works carried out by this Government, is due to the progressive policy of this Government. And the effect of these heavy expenditures on public works has simply been to add 18 cents per head per annum to the taxation of the population. The events of the past few years have increased confidence in Canada. So firmly established is our position that during the depression in 1893 the financiers and legislators of the United States were looking to us as an example to follow in amending their financial laws. We also find in leading English newspapers that Canada is quoted as a country which has escaped in a remarkable manner the storm of depression that swept over other countries. Glance for a moment at the effect of the National Policy on the wage-earners of this country. In 1891, according to the census, the Canadian manufacturers paid wages amounting to $2,102,000. The boot and shoe manufacturers paid in wages $4,916,000, harness and saddlery manufacturers, $1,000,000, leather manufacturers, $1,522,000. Here, in those very few items, we find that the wages paid amounted to $7,500,000. My contention is that under a tariff for revenue only, this amount will be taken from the income of the people of this country. We also paid wages in other industries as follows :—

Smelting	$ 851,000
Rolling mills	2,225,00.
Foundries and machine shops	5,152,000
Wire works	331,000
Tin works	463,000
Tin smelting, smithing	1,265,000
Agricultural implement makers	1,112,000

Here is an amount of $12,000,000 which the wage-earners of Canada would be sure to lose under a tariff for revenue only, or free trade as it is in England, or a policy from which every vestige of protection is taken. We should consider for a moment the effect of the loss of the very large amount of wages now received by the wage-earners of this country. The effect of it would be ruin to the artisan, the tradesman, the farmer, and the manufacturer. The wage-earner would be ruined by depriving his employer, the manufacturer, of the home market, which is now assured him by the National Policy and exposing him to the combined attacks of foreign manufacturers. As the hon. member for South Brant has said, we are living alongside a country whose manufactures have been fostered by protection until they have been enabled to challenge supremacy with Great Britain in some of the articles in which Great Britain excels. If that was true in 1876, when the hon. member for Brant gave utterance to that opinion, it must be true to a still greater extent now. The farmer also would be deprived of the home market which the wage-earners of this country now give him. The tradesmen would also suffer in the same way, as the wage-earner would be deprived of the means wherewith to patronize them. Thus all classes would be made to feel the dire results should we unfortunately adopt a tariff for revenue only or a tariff from which every vestige of protection is removed. The logical result of such a step would be an invitation to the farmers of the United States to come and take the bread out of the mouths of the farmers of our own country. The Opposition say in effect : We have taken down the barrier that prevented you from taking charge of the market in this Canada of ours ; we have removed every vestige of protection. Bring your pork which is selling to-day in Chicago at about $12 per barrel to Montreal where the price now is $16 to $18. You can bring it in here and destroy the home market which the National Policy had preserved for our own farmers. You will be able, under the tariff for revenue only, to bring in your oats which are selling to-day in Chicago at 28 cents per bushel, and 25 cents per bushel September delivery—you can bring them into this country where oats, owing to the National Policy are selling at 42 cts. in Montreal, 45 cts. in Halifax, and 38 to 40 cents in Prince Edward Island. You can bring in your wheat which you are selling to-day at 65 cents in Chicago to Toronto where the price is 85 cents. They say in effect to the people of the United States : Come with the wealth of your vast prairies, come with the surplus products of your long established manufactories—(the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) says they have been fostered by years of extreme protection)—come and possess this land which we throw open to you under a tariff for revenue only. Come and cut down the prices of our farm products which have hitherto been upheld by the National Policy.

Come, they say, we give you the opportunity under our new platform. They say in effect to the manufacturers of cotton goods who have been protected for years: Come; we will take down the barriers that now preserve the home market of the cotton manufacturers of this country and that have enabled them to build up their factories; come in with your surplus products; we give you the opportunity under our new platform. They say in effect to the American manufacturers of woollen goods: Combine and contribute a small percentage of your surplus, bring it over to Canada and sell it at slaughter prices, destroying the manufacture of cloths that has been built up in this country under the National Policy. Come and possess these markets that we throw open to you under a tariff for revenue only. They say also to the manufacturers of farm machinery, wagons and furniture; Contribute a small percentage of your surplus, and when we establish a tariff in Canada from which every vestige of protection is eliminated, come in and possess the market we have thrown open to you and destroy the Canadian industries which the National Policy has built up. Four years ago we were told by our Liberal friends that they were going to have the full run of the American markets under the policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. These fads—I suppose I may call them so—have gone to an early grave, unwept, unhonoured and unsung. Now, they are going to remove every vestige of protection under their tariff for revenue only. But what about reciprocity? Reciprocity, as everybody knows means the mutual interchange of commodities by any two countries to such an extent as may be agreed upon. They tried to humbug the people of this country a good deal about this cry of reciprocity, but I think they will not be able to do it much longer. If they introduce a tariff for revenue only, or free trade as it is in England, or a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken, they will have nothing to offer the Americans with a view to bringing about such a desirable event as reciprocity. Now, Sir, I think I must read to you an extract from the speech of the hon. member for South Brant which applies so well to the question of reciprocity from the standpoint of a tariff for revenue only. Speaking in this House, in 1876, the hon. member said:

> I am not one of those who believe in erecting a wall so high that you cannot trade with any other country, but I must admit that I am in favour of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what I see going on in this country. We live beside a country with a population ten times greater than ours, whose industries have been fostered by protection until they are enabled, even in some articles in which Britain excels, to challenge supremacy with her. While that nation has erected against us and other countries a hostile tariff, we have our hands bound, and give them a free and unrestricted right to trade in our markets. Fancy a commissioner, delegated by this Government and sanctioned by the British Government, sent to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. The question might be asked, what he desired. He replies: "I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our mines, our forests and our fields." Then the United States commissioner might ask, "What will you give us in return?" Our representative replies, "The free use of our markets for similar products of your country." The astute American would naturally say, "We have that already; I do not see that you offer anything." We must remember that we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up a new reciprocity question. I need not remind this House, that the great lever we had before in negotiating a reciprocity treaty, is ours no longer.

And, Mr. Speaker, I contend that when these gentlemen introduce a tariff from which is taken every vestige of protection, they will have nothing to offer, should they go to look for reciprocity, that the words of the hon. member for South Brant are even more true to-day with respect to this matter than they were when they were uttered in 1876. We do live alongside a country whose industries have been fostered by many years of protection, and extreme protection at that, and we require to keep our weapons in our own hands in order that we may have something with which to negotiate a reciprocity treaty should the Americans see fit at any future time to change their minds, and offer to enter into negotiations for such a treaty. And I cannot help thinking, Sir, that the hon. member for South Brant, as well as many other gentlemen of the Opposition, if they were frank with the people of this country, and frank with this House, would admit that what the hon. member for South Brant said is as true to-day as it was in 1876 when he uttered it. Now, Sir, we have had free trade advocated by the Liberal party; we have had unrestricted reciprocity advocated by the Liberal party; we have had commercial union advocated by the Liberal party, we have a tariff for revenue only and a tariff from which is to be taken every vestige of protection, advocated by these gentlemen. You would suppose, Sir, that when the hon. gentlemen attack the policy of the present Government they would think proper to show where it bears heavily upon any class in this country, that they would be prepared to show what article in our tariff is too high, what article in our tariff requires to be reduced. But, instead of that, they are content to deal in generalities. They find that the question of free trade, which they advocated at one time, is played out. They find that unrestricted reciprocity would not take with the people of this country, as neither would commercial union. They now bring forward a tariff for revenue only, which may mean, which does mean, nothing at all. They say in effect to the

farmers of this country when they advocate a tariff for revenue only, or a tariff from which every vestige of protection has been taken: You have too much protection on your oats, on your pork, on your beef, on your butter, and on your cheese under the National Policy. We are in favour of a tariff for revenue only, for free trade as it is in England, of a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken. The Liberal-Conservative party now give the markets of our own country to our own people under the present tariff, and we shall stand or fall by it. I would ask these hon. gentlemen, I would ask the people of this country, if a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken, will establish a new cheese factory in this country, or a new creamery? Will it cause a new mill to be built? Will it give work to an additional workman? Will it bring a new customer to a merchant's store? Will it help any one to earn a dollar? No, Mr. Speaker, I contend, on the contrary, that it will take wages from the people, it will take trade from the people, it will take a home market from the people, it will take trade from the merchants; and if hon. gentlemen opposite carry their policy to its proper conclusion, it will take from the farmer the protection that he enjoys from a paternal government, who looks after his interests by the establishment of experimental farms, creameries, dairies, and so forth. The Liberals declare that a tariff for revenue only will increase the importations of manufactured goods; but it will be to the displacement, of course, of those that are manufactured in our own country. How will this benefit the Canadian workman? How will this benefit the Canadian wage-earner? How will this benefit the farmer? A policy that brings in the manufactured goods of another country to the displacement of those that are manufactured in our own country, will close up the factories in our own country, and will deprive the farmer of the home market, will deprive the wage-earner of the employment which is now given by the manufacturers in this country. Now, Sir, let us consider the tariff in force in 1878 under a Liberal Administration, and see how it affected the taxation of the people. We find that between 1882 and 1894, inclusive, the Government of this country took off duties on tea amounting to $10,053,697; they took off duties on coffee amounting to $478,827; they took off duties on coal amounting to $4,058,808; on tin, amounting to $1,152,025; on sugar (1892), $4,500,000; on billstamps, $1,845,000; on newspapers, $685,000; amounting, altogether, to $23,773,357, which was taken off the tax-payers of the country on these items between 1882 and 1894. The Liberals say that we have increased the taxation of the country since 1878 by $14,000,000 per year. Let us inquire for a moment if that is the case. The revenue collected during the last year of Liberal rule was $22,375,000: the amount of revenue collected in 1894 was $36,375,000, showing an augmentation of 60 per cent, or $14,000,000. Now, the Opposition try to make the people believe that this is increased taxation, although nothing could be further from the truth. One third of this $14,000,000 is received from railways and canals, interest on investments, patent fees, public lands, &c. From this source there was derived in 1894, $8,795,000: from the same source there was derived, in 1878, under Liberal rule, $4,533,000. Therefore, we have gained, from this same source, over $4,000,000, not a cent of which constitutes increased taxation. In 1878 the taxation within the country under Liberal rule, on liquors and tobaccos was $4,858,600: in 1894 the same taxes yielded $8,381,000. Here, again, on these articles we have a gain of over $3,500,000. I am sure this is a taxation that meets with universal favour. We can consider this subject from two or three standpoints. The actual amount of customs collections in 1878 was $12,782,800; in 1894 it was $19,198,100: or a difference of $6,415,300. It is important to observe here, in the first place, that this larger revenue does not by any means imply a corresponding increase of taxation. The percentage of duty on the total value of goods entered for consumption in 1878, was 14·3. If the same rate were applied to the total importations of 1894, it would have produced, on $113,093,983 worth of importations, a revenue of $15,867,085, or within $3,331,000 of the sum actually collected. The simple fact is, therefore, that instead of the taxation being increased $14,000,000 annually since 1878, it has not been increased one-fourth of that sum. Let me show you now, the way our taxes are levied at present, as compared with the manner in which they were levied in 1878. My contention is that any increase in taxation has been put upon the luxuries imported into this country and not on the necessaries of life, as will appear by the following table, showing the amounts collected in 1878 and 1894, respectively:—

	1878	1894
Ales and porter	$ 43,863	$ 65,061
Spirits	1,000,864	2,086,559
Wines	207,566	309,339
Tobacco	188,550	287,703
Patent medicines	29,744	62,973
Perfumery	5,953	10,280
Playing cards	4,014	10,013
Plate glass	14,467	66,668
Gold and silver manuf'res.	41,476	79,418
Silks and satins	240,669	743,402
Jewellery	46,404	51,124
Totals	$1,829,570	$3,772,540

On the articles I have named, it will, therefore, be seen that the Government collected customs duties, in 1894, of more than double the amount that they obtained in 1878. These articles are practically all luxuries. While we are sorry, of course, to see a

large increase in the importation of spirits. I am sure the temperance people, as well as others in this country, will make no objection to the increased taxation under this head. Now, I contend that the increase has not been put on the poor man or on the wage-earner, but it has been put on those articles which may be called luxuries. A word or two with respect to protection as it now prevails in all parts of the world. It was promised when free trade was inaugurated in England that before very long all the nations would follow England's example; but not a single nation has free trade as it exists in England. Austria adopted protection in 1879; Russia adopted it in 1877 and 1881; Germany put up her walls higher in 1879; France increased her tariff for purely protection purposes in 1882; Spain did the same in 1877 and 1882, and is now further considering it; Greece adopted a high protection tariff in 1885; Switzerland in 1885; Sweden and Norway followed suit in 1887 and 1888; Italy began protection to her agricultural products last year; Victoria had an election last year and out of 79 members 65 protectionists were returned. There is the sweepout of tariff reform, free traders in the United States only a few months ago. It looks as if Lord Salisbury was correct when he stated that "we live in an age of a war of tariffs, that every country has its weapons, and that we cannot fight unless we have our weapons too." The Liberals say never mind the experience of ages and every civilized country with the exception of England, but let us throw away our weapons and adopt free trade as it is in England. The Liberal-Conservatives say our own and the experience of other countries teach us that we should stand by a defensive tariff. Let us hold our own markets until other nations are willing to reciprocate by opening theirs. Which think you is the more desirable? The people of this country are too intelligent to vote for throwing away their means of defence in accordance with the policy of the present Opposition who favour throwing away our only weapon of protection. Let us look at the Liberal record. Their record, while in charge of the Federal Government has been so damaging in the eyes of the country that they have not been able to obtain the confidence of the people for the past seventeen years. There is a saying: "Tell me the company you keep and I tell you what you are." It is very true and very true as applied to our Liberal friends. Let us judge them by their Liberal friends in the local governments of this country. In Ontario the Grits came into power in 1871. This is their record of economy: Annual expenditures, 1871, $1,816,784; 1893, $3,903,195; provincial debt, 1871, nil; 1893, $1,401,598. In Quebec the Grits began their last innings in January, 1887. Here is the record of Grit economy: Annual expenditure, 1886, $3,032,607; 1891, $4,095,520; provincial debt, 1886, $19,068,023; 1891, $25,842,148. In Manitoba the Grits obtained control in 1888, and here is their record of economy: Annual expenditure, 1887, $520,190; 1893, $632,000; provincial debt, 1887, $2,229,106; 1893, $4,398,250. In New Brunswick: Annual expenditure, 1882, $614,236; 1892, $696,000; provincial debt, 1883, $1,268,272; 1893, $2,752,297. In Nova Scotia: Annual expenditure, 1883, $541,000; 1894, $863,000; provincial debt, 1882, nil; 1893, $3,167,000. As regards Prince Edward Island, I am ashamed to give the figures to this House. A Conservative Government was in power for thirteen years, and they conducted the affairs of that little province practically without taxation and left office with the province having a trifling debt. When the Liberals came into power they soon incurred a debt of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Besides, they put taxation on lands, they imposed a succession tax, they raised the fees in the public offices and taxed the people in many ways; but notwithstanding this increased taxation and inducements held out to the people to purchase public lands on terms never previously offered, the province is head over ears in debt and will in the near future have to resort to further taxation. These, Sir, are the effects of Liberal rule in the province of Ontario, in the province of Quebec, in the province of New Brunswick, which has a Liberal leader, although it is a coalition Government, in the province of Nova Scotia, in the province of Manitaba, and in the province of Prince Edward Island. The people of Canada will judge of the Liberal party in this House by the company they keep, and judging them by that standard, it will be a long time before the electorate give them a chance to rule the destinies of this country. Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition say: We want a change; but that change, in my opinion, will never come while they continue their policy of "advocating everything by turns and nothing long." That change will never come while they continue to advocate "a tariff for revenue only," or "free trade as it is in England," or "a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken;" because such a policy and such a tariff is detrimental to the best interests of the great mass of our people, the farming community. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other night intimated that the manufacturers of Canada "have nothing to fear from the Liberals," but I can assure him that his party will never get into power until they come out and say, as the electors of this country have already said on four different occasions: "We believe after all, that the National Policy is the policy for this new country." I prophesy that one of these days the Liberals will declare "It is no use

of our fighting further against the National Policy, because we have been fighting against the vast majority of the electors." I am here reminded of a story I once heard of a comfortable farmer who was riding into town on his well-kept, well-groomed, and well-fed horse. He met a city dude coming out, with a raw-boned, disreputable looking nag, and the city man reined up and said to the farmer: "I say, Mr. Smith, how is it that you always have your horse in such good condition; I have tried Derby Condition Powders, and I have tried Sheridan's Condition Powders, and I have tried sawdust and bran, and I have tried various other condiments, and yet my horse is in bad condition." And the old farmer answered him by asking: "Did you ever try hay and oats? I think this story is very applicable to the present condition of the Opposition. They have tried unrestricted reciprocity, they have tried commercial union, they have tried reciprocity, they have tried a tariff for revenue only, they are now trying free trade, they are wanting to try a tariff from which every vestige of protection is eliminated; but they will have to try protection, or else they will never sit on the treasury benches. I think, Sir, it would suit them better, and they would be more likely to find favour with the electors, if as a body they advocated protection, as so many of them, individually, have already done in regard to some pet industry in which they are interested. If as a party they turn their attention to protection, and if they criticise the Government in respect to economy of administration or something of that kind, they would then have a better chance of obtaining their desire to get into power. I am sure, Sir, that the wrench they would receive to their sensitive nerves by changing from their present position to becoming protectionists, would not be so severe as the wrench it would give them to take up the question of economy of administration, judging from their past records, and the records of their party in the local governments. I feel sure, Sir, that many of these hon. gentlemen of the Opposition who are now listening to me, will live to thank me for the good advice that I have just given them, and which advice I believe they must adopt before they can ever expect to reach the treasury benches.

Mr. SEMPLE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to: and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 92) to amend the Insurance Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to explain the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill is not an important one. In the Act that was passed last year, a certain time was set for the production of the reports of the companies, and no distinction was made as to whether the companies were foreign or Canadian. It came out in practice that it was absolutely impossible for English companies doing business all over the world and holding their yearly meetings, in some cases, after the date which had been fixed in the Act for filing reports, and, in most cases within too short a time before that date to comply with the law and forward reports. Consequently matters came to such a pass that the Treasury Board had to allow those companies to continue under license, not to revoke their licenses, even though they had failed to comply with a condition which operated forfeiture of license, and, now, to ask the House, in the first place, to amend the Act as regards the date at which these reports shall be in from these companies, and in the second place, to legalize the licenses which we did not feel it was prudent for us to revoke.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the provision in this Bill with regard to the time of sending in the reports?

Mr. FOSTER. It fixes a later date so as to allow of these reports coming in after the annual meetings and before the date fixed in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 93) respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty known as the Markland mortgage.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object of this Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. The object of this Bill is to enable the Government to discharge a mortgage on certain property in Kingston, which has been for a long time in a position where we have been unable to sell it or realize from it. The mortgage was given in the year 1858, by the Hon. George H. Markland,

in the city of Kingston, in the province of Ontario. The property was sold under the mortgage in the year 1862. This Bill is to give power to convey the property so sold and to discharge the said mortgage so far as they can be conveyed by Her Majesty, upon the payment of a certain sum of money—I think about 50 per cent of the original claim. During all this time that the Crown has been unable to give a mortgage, the properties, which are not important, have been deteriorating.

Mr. LAURIER. What! Deteriorating?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The wood has actually been wearing out although the National Policy has been in force for the latter part of the period. It is the opinion of the department—in which I coincide—that the sooner we get something for this and discharge the mortgage, the less loss we shall ultimately sustain.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not stated as to the origin of the debt which this mortgage is intended to cover, nor has he stated who are the debtors.

Mr. FOSTER. I will explain that fully on second reading.

Mr. LAURIER. It would be hardly sufficient for the hon. gentleman to explain it then, we should have the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. All the papers will be brought down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If property is deteriorating as rapidly as the hon. gentleman seems to think, it would be well to get this mortgage sold as soon as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. And whilst you have some ready money in hand.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries in Canada, for the year ended 30th June, 1894.—(Mr. Curran.)

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to further amend the Post Office Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to prevent the carriers of Her Majesty's mail through the country—but not the railway or steamship companies—from carrying intoxicating liquors in their vehicles from place to place and thus violating the by-laws that are passed in the different municipalities. There is another clause suggesting that this provision be embodied in the contracts for carrying the mails.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. WELSH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Government to an article in the Montreal "Gazette" of to-day in relation to the Chignecto Ship Railway. It is as follows:—

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. Provan, M.P. for Blackfriars division of Glasgow, and managing director of the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, appeared before Council yesterday and asked for an extension of two years for the completion of the road. The Government guaranteed a subsidy of $170,000 a year for twenty years after the completion of the work. Mr. Provan explained that about three millions and a half had been expended, and about a million and a half more was needed. This amount had been subscribed by the shareholders, and the work would be completed, if the extension of time asked for was given. Mr. Provan said that it was through no fault of the company that the work was not completed within the time required by the charter. That was caused by the failure of the contractor, Mr. Meigs who was largely interested in contracts in the Argentine Republic at the time of the suspension of Baring Bros. The Government promised to consider the matter. It will be remembered that Mr. Provan and Mr. Ketchum, the engineer of the railway, were here last summer, and went up to Muskoka to see Sir John Thompson about this matter, but did not, so far as is known, succeed in getting any promise from him.

I call the attention of the Government to this matter, and desire to say that it is a serious matter, one that will affect the taxpayers of this country to the extent of about $3,000,000, if this wild-cat scheme is carried out. I think it would be much better if it were stopped. However, I ask the Government if this account is correct, and if they intend to renew this contract for a further term. We have had this Chignecto Railway project before Parliament for nine years, and I have denounced it for nine years as a wild-cat scheme. If the matter was brought before Parliament, I think the members from New Brunswick——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to make a speech on this matter.

Mr. WELSH. All right.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the paragraph which was read, the question was not very definite, but I will give the information that I think the hon. gentleman wished. It is true that Mr. Provan has been here, and has laid the case before the country and before the Government. The Government have not yet made its decision.

I.C.R.—BURNING OF SHEDS AT RICHMOND, N.S.

Mr. STAIRS. I desire to call the attention of the Government to a despatch in the morning paper announcing the destruction

by fire of the Intercolonial Railway sheds at Richmond, near Halifax; and to ask the Government what report they have had from the officers of the department in relation to the matter. I hope that prompt measures will be taken to provide the necessary facilities at Halifax, so that no interruption of trade may take place.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that I got word to-day of the loss by fire of the Intercolonial shop and railway buildings at Richmond, on yesterday, 19th May. There were destroyed a large warehouse, a sugar warehouse, a large cattle shed, a large wharf, an elevated pole trestle, 11 box cars, one refrigerator car, three platform cars, and other property. I have not yet come to any decision what steps to take, but immediate steps will be taken for the purpose of carrying on traffic as usual.

Mr. LANGELIER. Any insurance?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no insurance on any of the Government property along the Intercolonial Railway.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that Thursday and Friday next are holidays, and I desire to know whether it is the intention that the House shall resume again on Monday next?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter about which we might have a little conversation. Last week the leader of the Opposition will remember that I had a short conversation with him as to what time we might fairly expect to come to a vote upon the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford. My understanding with him at the time, after a little casual conversation, was that it would be possible to come to a vote on Tuesday of this week. So far as I am concerned, I have been working with that end in view, and I have gone so far as to intimate that I thought a vote would be had on Tuesday evening. Hearing that the same definiteness did not exist on the other side, I yesterday addressed a note to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition: and in reply he stated that the understanding was not at all definite with him, and he found some difficulty in promising that the vote should be taken on that evening. I would like to ask him now whether he thinks it will be possible for us to take a vote before we separate? It is immaterial to me whether it is Tuesday or Wednesday; but if we separate on Wednesday, it would be of great moment, I think, for the despatch of business in this House, if we could come to a vote upon the question we have been debating for 10 or 12 days now, before we separate for the holidays that are to come: and for my own part I should be willing to sit up late in order to do that. We have been adjourning at a very reasonable hour, under the impression that business would be forwarded just as much; but whether it is or not, I think we are all prepared to sit a little late to-night and to-morrow night, and, if necessary, to have a session Wednesday morning, so that we might get a vote, if possible, before we adjourn. I would like my hon. friend's view on that.

Mr. LAURIER. I have a distinct recollection of the conversation which I had with my hon. friend not more than eight days ago with regard to this debate, and I told him at the time that perhaps we might expect a division to-morrow. I must say, however, that my expectations have not been verified at all. I look upon it as absolutely impossible to have a division to-morrow, and very improbable to have it on Wednesday. It may be, however; we do not know. But I must say to the hon. gentleman that he is not at all correct in stating that the House has sat until reasonable hours. I do not object that the House should sit later this week, and that we should also sit until a reasonable hour in the morning, or till about midnight. As to a sitting on Wednesday morning, I do not think we could agree to that at all. It is impossible for me to say whether we would be in a position to come to a division before the adjournment; that will depend altogether upon the course which the debate takes to-day and to-morrow and the day after. There is no disposition on this side of the House to protract the debate any longer than is absolutely necessary to allow every member who desires to do so, to speak upon this most important question. I can say no more than that, and can make no binding promise. I may say that it is not my intention, nor the intention of my hon. friends, to put any obstacle in the way of coming to a division. But the hon. gentleman has not answered the question I put, as to whether he intends to resume on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I could ask the hon. gentleman to go any further than he has gone in relation to the course of the debate, but I take his answer to mean this, that if possible we should come to a vote before we separate, and I think the House will be quite willing to sit later than usual to-night and to-morrow night, in order to bring about a vote if possible. In reference to the other question, as we shall adjourn on Wednesday, it is for the members of the House to say whether they would rather come back on Monday or on Tuesday. Monday is private members' day, and it is for the members of the House to say whether they desire to sit on the following Monday or not. We could return after the recess and sit on Monday night at eight o'clock, or on Tuesday at three o'clock; I will not be prepared to go any later than Tuesday at three. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition might express

his opinion as to whether the House should meet on Monday or not.

Mr. LAURIER. I think, with a view to accommodate those hon. members who reside at a distance and enable them to go home, the best way will be to come back on Tuesday.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the House will adjourn from Wednesday until 3 p.m. on Tuesday.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the James Maclaren Company (Limited).—(Sir James Grant.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Canada Insurance Promotion Association (Limited).—(Mr. Choquette.)

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order being called for second reading of Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

Mr. FLINT. As a large portion of my constituents are interested in this Bill, which is an important one, I call attention to the fact that it is not printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

SUGAR IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, How many pounds of sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour and of refined sugars, as classified under item 392 in schedule "A" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, were imported between the 27th day of March and the 3rd day of May, 1894, both inclusive? How many pounds of sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour and of refined sugars, as classified under item 392 in schedule "A" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, were imported between the 27th day of March and the 3rd day of May, 1895, both inclusive?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The quantity of sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour and of refined sugars, as classified under item 392 in schedule "A" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, entered between the 27th day of March and the 2nd day of May, 1894, both inclusive, was 70,677 pounds. 2. The quantity of sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour and of refined sugars, as classified under item 392 in schedule "A" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, entered between the 27th day of March and the 2nd day of May, 1895, both inclusive, was 352,181 pounds.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. How many pounds of sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard and other qualities of sugar, classified as free goods under item 708 in schedule "B" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, were imported between the 27th day of March and the 3rd day of May, 1894? 2. How many pounds of sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard and other qualities of sugar, classified as free goods under item 708 in schedule "B" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, were imported between the 27th day of March and the 3rd day of May, 1895, both inclusive?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The quantity of sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard and other qualities of sugar classified as free goods under item 708 in schedule "B" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, entered between the 27th day of March and the 2nd day of May, 1894, was 20,528,021 pounds. 2. The quantity of sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard and other qualities of sugar classified as free goods under item 708 in schedule "B" of the Customs Amendment Act of 1894, entered between the 27th day of March and the 2nd day of May, 1895, both inclusive, was 85,519,717 pounds. I may add that there are certain cargoes in regard to which free entry is asked, but on which duty is claimed by the Customs Department.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the quantity?

Mr. WALLACE. I did not mention the quantity. Probably sixteen or seventeen millions of pounds.

INDIANS TRANSFERRED FROM OKA TO MUSKOKA.

Mr. FRECHETTE (for Mr. Gironard, Two Mountains) asked, 1. What is the number of Indians transferred from Oka to Muskoka since 1872? 2. What is the extent of land occupied by them? 3. What has been the cost of their removal and of establishing them? 4. How many Indian families left Oka for Muskoka, during the years 1893 and 1894?

Mr. DALY. 1. 142. 2. 25,582 acres were purchased from the provincial government as a reserve for these Indians, 4,171 acres of which are held by different Indians under location tickets. There is no information of record as to quantity of land occupied by Indians who have not received location tickets, but the acreage so held must be small. 3. $1,625.03. 4. Two.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AS BROKERS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Are collectors of customs allowed, with the knowledge and con-

sent of the Government, to act as brokers in the custom-house where they are collectors ?

Mr. WALLACE. They are not, either with the knowledge or consent of the Government, except along the boundary in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, at which points they are specially instructed to assist the settler in making settlers' effects entries, but no charge of any description is allowed.

ISLAND OF ANTICOSTI.

Mr. FAUVEL asked, To which electoral district of the province of Quebec is the island of Anticosti attached ? Has the list of voters been revised there at the last revision ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The island of Anticosti is attached to the electoral district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and the lists have been revised during the present year.

MILITARY SCHOOL—SEWAGE.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, Do the Government propose to take immediate steps to prevent the discharge of sewage from the military school, in the city of London, into a small creek known as Carling's Creek ?

Mr. DICKEY. The Department of Militia and Defence has been inquiring into the effect of the discharge of the sewage in question, but is not yet in possession of sufficient information to deal finally with the matter.

SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, QUEBEC.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is James Patton, the present supervisor of cullers at Quebec, the person the Government intend to appoint as chief inspector of cullers ? If not, whom ? What is the age of the said James Patton ? Is the said James Patton a practical culler of timber, deals and staves, and is he capable and competent to cull timber, deals and staves ? Has the said James Patton passed his examination for culler ? If so, on what date, and has he taken out his commission, and on what date, and has he taken his oath of office as a culler ? Did the said James Patton ever perform the duties of a culler ? If so, when and where ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Mr. Patton is the person whom it was intended to appoint as chief inspector of timber; should the Bill now before the House become law. 2. Mr. Patton's age is sixty-five. He is a practical culler, and has a very thorough knowledge of all classes of lumber. 3. Mr. Patton passed his examination as a culler in 1844, before the Board of Examiners, constituted under the Cullers' Act. 4. The department is not aware of any commission having been issued to Mr. Patton, but his examination is recorded in the Minute Book of the Board of Examiners. 5. He took the oath as supervisor of cullers, as required by the Act. 6. Yes, for upwards of thirty years—so the department is informed—in Quebec.

ASSISTANT RECEIVER GENERAL, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Who has been appointed Assistant Receiver General at St. John, N.B.? When was he appointed? What is his salary ? What length of service had he in the Civil Service before his appointment ? What salary was the late Assistant Receiver General drawing at the time of his superannuation ? How many years was he in the Civil Service before he reached the salary paid him as Assistant Receiver ? What is the salary of the present incumbent ? Is the present Assistant Receiver General a relative of the Finance Minister ? What is his relationship ? What is his age ? Is it customary to put these officers at the maximum salary after a few months' service ? What amount of superannuation allowance is to be annually paid the recent Assistant Receiver General ?

Mr. FOSTER. The person who has been appointed Assistant Receiver General at St. John, N.B., is Mr. H. Douglas McLeod. He was appointed on the 1st of February, 1893. His salary is $2,200. He was eight months in the service before his appointment as Assistant Receiver General. The salary of the late Assistant Receiver General at the time of his superannuation was $2,200. He was twenty-five years in the service, before the salary paid him as Assistant Receiver General was $2,200. The age of the present incumbent of the office is fifty-six years. In answer to the question : " Is it customary to put these officers at the maximum salary after a few months' service ? " that depends upon circumstances. As a rule it is not. The superannuation allowance of the recent Assistant Receiver General is $1,540.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Finance Minister overlooked my question with regard to the relationship.

Mr. FOSTER. I did overlook that, yes. I am not yet certain that my relationships are so important, that the fact that such and such a person is a relation of mine or not, is worthy being recorded in " Hansard."

PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is S. J. Jenkins, who is drawing a salary of $1,400 a year, the Jenkins who also is drawing $600 as private secretary to the Minister of Finance ? Is the said Jenkins related to the Minister of Finance by marriage or otherwise ? If so, what is the relationship ?

Has the Finance Minister an assistant or joint private secretary? If so, what is her name? Does she work in the department? If not, where does she work? Is she a relation of the Finance Minister's family? What is her salary?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. S. J. Jenkins, who is drawing a salary of $1,400 a year is the Mr. Jenkins who is also drawing $400—not $600—as private secretary to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance has an assisrant or joint private secretary, who is receiving the other $200 of the $600, the amount of the allowance. As private secretary to the Minister she is doing private secretarial work for the Minister, and her salary, as I have said, is $200. With reference to the other part of the question, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has any desire privately to sit under my genealogical tree, I will give him an opportunity any time he requires it.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the Department of Public Works aware that the Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island, requires repairs, and that if said repairs are not attended to immediately the breakwater will sustain serious damage? Has the Government engineer made a report recently of the state of the breakwater?

Mr. OUIMET. The attention of the Public Works Department was called in March, 1892, by the Department of Marine, to the fact that the Tignish breakwater required repair, and during June and July of the same year, the sum of $350 was expended thereon. Since that time the Department of Public Works has not been made aware that this breakwater is in danger of sustaining serious damage, and there has not been any report made on its state since 1892.

LITTLE RIVER ST. FRANCOIS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether work has been done within the last year or two in Little River St. François, in the county of Charlevoix? If so, what work, what has been the cost, and under whose direction has it been done?

Mr. OUIMET. During November, 1894, a number of boulders were removed from the channel of the Rivière St. François, which is frequented by schooners at high tide. The expenditure amounted to $101, and the work was done under the direction of Mr. L. Danglade, acting under instructions from Mr. U. Valiquet, assistant engineer of the department.

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION EXPENSES.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, How much has the Columbian Exhibition at Chicago cost the Dominion of Canada, to date? Have all the accounts and bills been received and paid? If not, what further sums will be required to settle all accounts and just demands?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The amount already paid in connection with the Columbian Exhibition is $243,019.57. All accounts that have been approved have been paid, and it is not expected that any further appropriation will be required.

COST OF TORONTO DRILL HALL.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, What was the original estimate of the cost of the drill hall at Toronto? Has that estimate been exceeded? If so, by how much? Is the building now completed? Are there any claims for extras? If so, how much are they? Do the Government intend to pay them? Who were the contractors for this work, and the amount of their several contracts?

Mr. OUIMET. The original estimate of the cost of the drill hall at Toronto was $282,350. The estimate has not been exceeded. The building is completed, and has been in occupation for some time. A few inside fittings and the fencing are now on hand and will shortly be finished. The department has before it and under consideration claims for extras amounting to $17,942.94. The Government intend to pay to the last cent all legitimate claims. The contractors for this work were as follows:—Excavation, Davis & Sons, price 25 cents per yard, amount paid $2,200; main contract, Col. John Stewart, $240,000; heating and ventilation, Bennett & Wright, $6,665; fittings for armouries, &c.: Dominion Key Board and Art Manufacturing Company, $7,035; gas fixtures, Keith & Fitzsimons, $673.50; locks and hardware, Peterborough Lock Manufacturing Company, $1,576.63; in all, $258,150.13.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. SEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few remarks on the important question now under discussion. If I failed to do so, I would not be properly representing the large number of people in the important constituency which I have the honour to represent. I do not intend to speak at great length, knowing the desire of the House that the debate should be brought to a close as soon as possible; yet there are many important questions involved in this discussion in which the country takes a strong interest at the present time. In my constituency, according to the census, there are not only farmers, but also a number of manufactur-

ers. While a few of the latter are benefited by protection, I think the majority would state that the protection has rather been an injury to them than a benefit. The farmers do not want protection; they believe it is of no use to them; although it has been tried for a number of years. We do not find the farmers coming to this House in large numbers, flooding the lobbies and asking for increased protection. They say they have more protection than they want, and the sooner it is abolished the better it will be for them. Only a short time ago I had placed in my hands a petition from a farmers' association known as the Dominion Grange. That petition, which was presented to this House, reads as follows:—

The agriculturists of Canada are large purchasers of goods, and it is their interest to procure them at the lowest prices. That the imposition of heavy customs duties enables home manufacturers to charge high prices, which enrich themselves without adding anything to the national treasury. That this increases the price of living, while the duties upon agricultural products do not increase the values of those products to any considerable extent, as the prices of the bulk of them are controlled by prices in foreign markets.

We, therefore, ask that the tariff be reduced to the lowest basis consistent with the requirements of the revenue.

From past experience we know that the Dominion Franchise Act has been found to be both cumbersome and expensive, and liable to gross irregularities and errors.

We, therefore, respectfully ask that some other system be adopted which will ensure greater accuracy, more simplicity and less expense.

We desire to enter our most strenuous protest against subsidizing a line of steamships to Australia. As the products of that country are similar to the agricultural products of Canada, but are produced at a very much less cost, this would be a blow at our home market, and taxing ourselves to destroy our interests.

The Patrons of Industry, another farmers' organization, have also spoken on this subject. They insist on tariff for revenue only, so adjusted as to fall upon luxuries and not upon the necessaries of life, and they say they are in favour of reciprocal trade on fair and equal terms between Canada and the world. I am glad, Sir, to know that the deliverances of these important bodies of farmers agree exactly with the platform of the Liberal party. An attempt has been made to show that the Liberal party are in favour of free trade as it is in England. We deny that. Two years ago a convention was held in the city of Ottawa, attended by Liberals from every part of the Dominion—not only members of Parliament and ex-members, but by other representatives from the people. That convention did not decide for a tariff as it is in England; but the trade platform laid down was this:

That the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

It is evident, Sir, that we cannot have free trade as it is in England. Our conditions are quite different. We have borrowed large sums of money in England, and, as the wise man has said, "the borrower is servant to the lender." We have borrowed abroad $207,000,000, on which we have to pay interest every year; so that we occupy a very different position to that occupied by the people of Great Britain. The hon. Finance Minister, in his Budget speech made a comparison between the present Government and that of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie—the one representing a protective policy, and the other tariff for revenue only, as far as possible. The more the comparison is made, and the more it is studied, the better it will be for the Liberal party of the Dominion. What a change altered circumstances make. For years, in every session of Parliament, at all political meetings, it was stated that the hon. member for South Oxford was a failure as a Finance Minister, that it was because of his incapacity that deficits existed. But the present Finance Minister, by the position he now takes, and the statements he makes, —and his followers endorse all he does and says—virtually takes it all back. He virtually admits that he has been mistaken. Deficits, he now says, are caused by not enough of taxes being levied. His followers applaud their level-headed Finance Minister, as they are bound to do, no matter how much the position he takes in his Budget speech contradicts all they have said in the past concerning the management of the finances of the country by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I shall present figures to show the great difference in the expenditure of the present Government compared with that of the Mackenzie Government. Take the records of the Mackenzie Government and taxation levied during their term of office:—

1874-75	$ 20,664,817
1875-76	18,614,415
1876-77	17,697,924
1877-78	17,841,938
1878-79	18,476,613
Total	$ 93,295,768

Compare that expenditure with the expenditure of the last five years:

1889-90	$ 31,587,071
1890-91	30,314,151
1891-92	28,446,157
1892-93	29,321,367
1893-94	27,579,203
Total	$147,247,949

Or an average of $29,449,589 against an average of $18,659,153 in Mr. Mackenzie's

time, being an average increase of $10,790,436 in one year, or an increase in the five years of $53,952,181. While the expenditure increased at this enormous rate, our population was almost at a standstill. From 1871 to 1881 it increased only 19 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891 the increase was only 11 per cent, so that there is no proportion between the increase of taxation and the increase of population. But the present Government, from what we know transpired last session, is a Government that exists for the benefit of the manufacturers. The manufacturers seem to control this country. Previous to last session, the Government felt bound to yield to the force of public opinion to the extent of sending out some of its members to find from the people what they wanted. The prompt answer was: We want reduction of taxation, and the Government resolved to try and do something to please the masses. Therefore, the Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, made many changes. But all these changes disappeared, and the tariff was brought back to near its former condition at the representations of the manufacturers. I will just read from the report of the secretary of the Manufacturers' Association a few extracts which will bear out what I say:

> The object of the association was to devise ways and means to prevent their industries being crushed out of existence by unfair competition of those in other countries engaged in similar industries, and that the association has been a strong factor in Dominion politics ever since, is the best evidence of the necessity for its existence; and we congratulate ourselves that in Sir Mackenzie Bowell we have a Premier who is in close touch and sympathy with us, and in whose hands our interests will be safe. We are assured by him, and by his colleagues, that in the future, as in the past, protection to Canadian industries will be inscribed upon the banner under which they will fight the political battles of the country.

What has been done for the manufacturers, or what the Government has enabled them to do, may be gathered from the census returns:

Capital invested	$353,836,817
Value of manufactured products	475,455,705
Cost of raw material	$255,983,219
Wages paid	99,762,441
Total	$355,745,660

Therefore, $353,836,817 capital invested in one year makes a clear profit of $119,710,045, or between 33 and 34 per cent. It must be borne in mind that many manufactories which existed long before the National Policy was established are still in existence, and doing good work without receiving any benefit from protection. Some of the manufacturers, however, under the National Policy, must have made enormous profits. We know that the manufacturers of coal oils make a profit of 110 per cent. The value of coal oil brought into this country was $420,575, and the duty was $466,163. The Government had come to the conclusion to do something. They knew it was necessary, and they came before the manufacturers and asked what could be done—how much reduction should be made. The Government knew that tariff reform was wanted, and in this opinion were no doubt confirmed by the reports of certain members of the Government, and the Controllers who had visited different parts of the country and found a general desire that the tariff should be reduced and that combines and monopolies should be checked and prevented taking such large sums of money unjustly from the toiling masses of this country. At a meeting held in Toronto the Government sounded a note of warning, when a member said they were prepared to cut of the mouldering branches. But very little was done in that direction. In the speech made by the Controller the other evening, he said the increase in the duties in the last ten years was only 1 per cent. I figure out the difference in duty, and find that 2·72 per cent is the difference between the tariff in 1893 and that now in operation. So that it does not make very much difference, after all the great effort to make a reduction. Further, the organ of the manufacturers says:

> It was evident, however, that some changes in the tariff were imperative, and that, if they were not inaugurated by the friends of protection, the Government could not survive, and that the enemies of protection would accede to power. It was under these circumstances that the Tariff Committee entered upon their labours, having the counsel and assistance of many of the most experienced members of the association, the result of which was an embodiment of their views in a communication to the Finance Minister (a copy of which is here before you), which elicited from him a kindly letter, in which he alluded to it as a well-prepared brief, in which all the matters therein discussed had been done full justice. Perhaps it might be going too far to even surmise the effect these recommendations of your Tariff Committee to the Minister may have had in the final arrangement of the tariff; but it is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes that were made in the tariff along the lines suggested in the recommendations, and that, in many instances, the language used is substantially identical.

It goes on to say:

> The association has just reason for congratulating itself upon the influence it possesses in assisting to mould public opinion in the matter of affording tariff protection to our manufacturing industries, and in shaping the laws of the country in comformity thereto. There never was a time since the formation of this association, twenty years ago, that its influence was stronger or more pronounced than now. The personnel of its membership, now greater than ever before, is of the highest standard, and composes a glorious array of patriots, who are making this Canada of ours the one of the most important nations

of the earth, and the brightest and most valued jewel in the British Crown.

United and harmonious as they have always been, it is of the utmost importance that, as members of this association, our manufacturers should continue to hold together and to work together for the perpetuation of the great cause they have in view—that of protection. No other body of men better comprehends the true interests of Canada—no other body is more concerned in her prosperity.

And again—and this is the last I will read from this report:

It is pleasant to contemplate that the outlook for the maintenance of the National Policy is much brighter now than it was even a year ago. In Sir Mackenzie Bowell we have a man at the head of our national affairs who is a sturdy and devoted adherent to our existing system, and who, having the courage of his convictions, will hold his way steadily in the course he long since helped to mark out, and as an association, and as individuals, no doubt your best and most earnest support will be given to the Government as long as the Government adhere to the principle of tariff protection to Canadian manufacturing industries.

Now, Sir, it is evident from these facts that the manufacturers have been granted their wish, that the Government have helped them to carry out their aims to their entire satisfaction. And the manufacturers, as I have said, have been able to make a profit upon the capital invested in their works of between 33 and 34 per cent. I am sure, Sir, that if the farming community could prosper in that way they would be prosperous indeed. If the average farmer having a capital of about $6,000 invested in his lands, building, farm implements, &c., and if he could clear $2,000 a year, we might all rejoice. Even if he could make $1,000 yearly the beneficial influence would be felt in every city, town, village and hamlet in this great Dominion, for the farmers would spend the money and all classes would receive the benefit. It would help all branches of trade, and there would be work for all. People would not then be leaving the country, as they are doing, to seek some better place. In the past very little attention has been paid to the farmer's interest. We know that deputations have come here and asked in vain for the small favour of the removal of the duty on binding twine. It was reduced by half, making the duty 12½ per cent. The effect of that was to reduce the price of binding twine, and the farmers now ask that the whole duty be taken off as it has been in that highly protected country the United States. Binding twine is necessary for the farmer before he can get his grain into the barn: it is his raw material, just as different articles are the raw material of the manufacturer. But all the efforts of deputations that have come here have been fruitless, all remonstrances have been in vain. The same is true of another important article much used on the farm—that is wire for fencing, which is necessary for the farmer in order to protect his fields from animals that otherwise would break in and destroy his crops. But, although these two articles, barbed wire and binding twine yielded to the public revenues last year only $21,000 the placing of them on the free list was denied the farmers. There is still another thing respecting which the farmer is at a disadvantage and in respect of which even the Canadian manufacturer seems to be at a disadvantage—I refer to agricultural implements. The freeing of these from duty would be a great gain to the farmers, especially to those in Manitoba and the North-west. But that fact was not regarded by the present protective Government. I understand that the large and enterprising firm, the Massey-Harris Company, was about to open an establishment at Suspension Bridge to manufacture for the foreign trade. They are all right in their operations, so far as the home market is concerned, for the Canadian farmers must bear the burden of these protective duties: but they cannot compete with other manufacturers for the foreign trade without a reduction in the tariff on the raw material. I understand that, as the Massey-Harris Company were on the point of establishing their works in the United States, the Government gave them a rebate of 99 per cent on the iron and steel imported by them and used in manufacturing articles to be exported. Consequently, the farmers of this country are at a disadvantage, and had to pay 20 per cent more for the goods turned out by the Massey-Harris Company than the foreign consumer has to pay. The reasons for this will be apparent from the following table of relative prices in Toronto and Buffalo:—

	Toronto.	Buffalo.
Pig iron (long ton).....	$16 50	$10 50
Bar iron, per 100.....	1 60	1 00
Galv. barb wire.....	2 87½	2 00
Wire nails	1 90	1 00
Coil chain, 3-8.....	4 25	3 40
Cut nails	1 45	0 80
Sleigh shoe steel.....	2 50	1 30
Horseshoes, per keg.....	3 60	3 00

I have no doubt that this firm, which is able to compete with the American manufacturers in Australia and other neutral markets, if they could import their raw material free of duty, would be able to hold the Canadian market against all comers. If this were done they would be in the same position as the Canadian farmer, who has to compete with the whole world. But it was said, Sir, and said in this paper which I shall read, that the object of these iron duties was to encourage the manufacturer of steel and pig iron in Nova Scotia. Well, Sir, if that was the object, it has helped that province very little, for in the last census it is shown that the increase of population in that province in ten years has been less than 10,000 souls. This comes far short of

the prophecy Sir Charles Tupper made in this House, that, if the iron and steel duties which he proposed were adopted, an industry would be created in this country which would employ 20,000 hands, making with their families an increase of 100,000 in the population in a short time. Sir, that prediction is very far from having been fulfilled. As I said before, the interest of the farmers received very little attention, because they do not come here and fill the lobbies as do the manufacturers. Some of the members of this House seem to be of the opinion that the tillers of the soil are of very little account. I will read to you the opinion on that subject of an hon. gentleman who spoke in this House last session :

Some of the farmers in the country seem to think that they are going to receive great benefits from the Wilson Bill, if its various provisions are crystallized into law. I have my doubts about that. I admit that it might be a good thing for this country to have the 5 cents duty taken off eggs which the farmers send into the United States ; it might be a good thing for this country, perhaps, if the duty on potatoes were brought down from 25 to 15 cents a bushel ; I admit that it might be a good thing for our farmers if the duty should be lowered on various other articles that they are able to export into the United States. But the events of the last few years have proved one thing conclusively, to my mind, and that is that it is not for the ultimate good of the Canadian farmer that the raw products of his farm should go freely into the United States market. The farmer is a peculiar being. With him sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof. Far be it from me to say anything derogatory to their intelligence, but I say that the farmer of this country, if he can raise enough from day to day to keep him, is generally satisfied.

It is one of the finest traits, it is one of the finest incidents of agricultural life, that a man is satisfied with little ; it is one of the finest features of agricultural life, that the man who lives on a farm, and digs his living out of the soil, is satisfied with what the soil will give him. He is not avaricious, he does not want the world and all its belongings—like some hon. gentlemen whom I see on the Opposition side of this House.

I supposes the extract voices the opinion of a large number of members. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that by making certain statements they will be able to induce the farmers to vote for them when the election comes around. We know that the farmers have been accustomed to follow the old rut in politics, and they have been accustomed to say : I do not want any change, my relations voted that way, I have voted that way, and I will continue to do so. I am glad to know, however, that they are beginning to think and to judge for themselves. They will not be content always to remain hewers of wood and drawers of water. They have a stake in this country ; their farms are mortgaged for the large debt of the country, and they have an interest in the good government of the country. I think it would be well if they read at first hand everything that is said and done in this House, and paid no attention to what is said by the party newspapers ; if they did this for a short time we would see a great change take place in the opinion of the agricultural class. Now, there was a quotation made the other evening by an hon. member, which I beg leave to quote again, as it is short. I wish to compare it with another statement, showing the difference between Great Britain and the United States in their respective trade policies. Now, last session the Minister of Justice used the following language :—

Who will say for one moment that the hostile tariffs surrounding that country in every quarter of the globe have not been successful in forcing her out, step by step, from the position of vantage which she once held in the various markets of the world ? What is the whole policy of the motherland to-day ? Driven from the civilized markets of the world, steadily, and every year finding their output to those markets decreasing, they spend millions on their navy and millions on their army, to force their wares and their goods and their merchandise into the uncivilized markets of the world, which they are endeavouring to occupy, to settle, and to control, driven there by the deadly effect upon them of the tremendous competition coming from the protectionist nations in the rest of the world.

The reason I quote that is that I may compare it with another statement which I find in the New York " Herald," as follows :—

NEW YORK " HERALD."

Old England, by means of her free trade policy, is now enabled to import annually 1,700,000,000 pounds of cottons (mostly from the United States), out of which she manufactures yarns and piece-goods of the value of $500,000,000. Of this total production of cotton goods she exports and sells annually in foreign markets an amount valued at about $325,000,000. Nothing but our " protective " tariffs prevented the United States from reaping the vast profits which our free trade rival reaps from the manufacture of American cotton. Of course, we can never hope to do this while our " protective " system is retained. The very means we have adopted to shut out foreign manufactures from our markets have necessarily shut us out of the markets of the world. We can never sell freely to other countries from whom we refuse to buy freely.

That is the difference, that is the true reason of Great Britain's greatness, that is what gives Great Britain control of the markets of the world. It is by means of her trade policy that she has been able to bring most of the nations of the earth into tribute, by loaning them large sums of money upon which she receives interest from them. It is estimated that the interest which Great Britain receives from other countries upon money she has loaned them, amounts to no less a sum than £50,000,000, or $250,000,000 annually. Where is the country that can compete with Great Britain who receives that amount of money yearly taken from the earnings of the labour of other countries ? She has reached her present proud position by pursuing a free trade policy, by which she is enabled to trade

without obstruction with every nation of the world. Her population has increased, her army has increased, her navy has increased, there is progress on every hand. On the other hand, we see countries like the United States, which show many evidences of prosperity for a time; then we heard about thousands of her people being out of employment and armies of tramps, and industrial depression, all because of protection. This trouble overtook them when the time came for them to pay back some of the money they had borrowed. Our hon. friends opposite like the appearance of protection, but they do not like its effect. We hope to see better things in this country when it shall have abandoned the protective system. We have heard a good deal about our credit being good. Well, Sir, we can join with hon. gentlemen opposite in congratulating ourselves that our credit is good. But it is not a wise plan to stretch our credit to the utmost limit. We should not do like the old farmer who only began to curtail his expenses after the farm was gone. It is best to take a look ahead of us before it is too late. I do not think that any country can become permanently prosperous upon borrowed money. Things may run smoothly while the expenditure is going on, but there will come a pay day when we shall have to pay the money we have borrowed. Looking over the Public Accounts, we see there has been an increase in the public debt of $4,500,000 since last session. There were subsidies voted durnig the dying hours of that session, when members were preparing to return to their homes, to the enormous sum of $4,661,000. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated there are about twenty millions of obligations to pay under this head. That being the case, the outlook is serious. It will be remembered that last year a large deputation visited Ottawa and interviewed the Government with respect to the improvement of the Trent Valley Canal. Members of the deputation made full representations to the Government, and explained that they approved the Government's policy. Some of the Ministers replied that they would require something more than moral support. I suppose that was the reason that, notwithstanding the failure of the canal to the present time, a contract has been given amounting to $429,000, for further works. The expenditure on construction prior to confederation (1867) was $309,371.31; ditto from 30th June, 1879, to 30th June, 1893, $1,079,112.56; from 30th June, 1893, to 1st March, 1894, $3,382.32; total, $1,391,822.19. Cost of maintenance, 1892-93, $12,926.07; cost of staff, 1892-93, $3,739.86. Total revenue, 1892-93, $888.95. During the last two years, the amount of expenditure on the canal and charges to management was $8,822, as compared with the small revenue of $2,175. These facts show that the expenditure is unnecessary and not in the best interests of the country. They have also another important canal, the Tay Canal, the cost of construction of which amounted to $476,000. During the last two years the receipts reached $262.70, they being $126.94 in one year, and in the following $135.76. During these two years no less than $5,000 were expended for repairs and cost of management. In regard to bonuses to railways, $4,661,160 are to be spent over the country. When we bear in mind that other subsidies were expended, and an instance is known where a president who received large subsidies gave to an election fund $25,000, it is evident that something was expected from the large expenditure voted last session. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the course of this debate, have declared that the United States afford no market for our agricultural products. If hon. gentlemen opposite will, however, study the official returns they will find that there is an excellent market in the neighbouring republic, and they will learn that our farmers are of the opinion that it is the most profitable market available. A return covering twenty years, shows a larger amount of trade between Canada and the United States in eight years than between Canada and Great Britain; and for the other twelve years the trade was greatest with Great Britain. In 1889, trade between Canada and the United States was within 11 millions of the whole amount of trade between the Dominion and the rest of the world. That occurred the year before the McKinley tariff came into force. I have heard hon. members opposite declare that the people of Great Britain wanted a protective tariff, and they have cheered such statements made in this House. How can it be supposed that the people of Canada would like a protective tariff in Great Britain as they found it in the United States.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. What had the farmers of Canada to do with the McKinley tariff?

Mr. SEMPLE. If a protective policy was adopted in England, it would be on similar lines, and the farmers would not favour protection. The farmers of Canada were injured by the McKinley tariff, and they would not like to be injuriously effected by having a McKinley tariff both in the States and Great Britain. To those who say there is not a market for the farmers of Canada in the United States, I would say, consult the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1894. For the benefit of those hon. members who think so, I will read to the House figures to show the products of farmers that find their best market in the United States, and returns to show the products of the farmer which finds in Great Britain the most profitable market:

Horses, the produce of Canada, exported to the United States—			
One year old and under	No.	445	$ 43,464
All other horses over one year old	"	4,945	437,061
Total number		3,490	480,525
Exported to Great Britain—			
Horses under one year old	No.	2	$ 1,000
Over one year old	"	3,508	399,661
Total number		3,510	409,661
Sheep, the produce of Canada, exported to the United States—			
One year old and under	No.	55,725	$ 156,017
Over one year old	"	152,122	486,214
Total number		207,847	642,231
Exported to Great Britain—			
One year old and under	No.	1,088	$ 4,409
Over one year old	"	16,493	158,666
Total number		17,581	163,075
Barley exported to the United States	Bush.	493,551	$ 216,493
" Great Britain	"	97,971	44,269
Total bushels		591,522	260,762
Beans exported to the United States	Bush.	216,512	$ 262,037
" Great Britain	"	327	700
Total bushels		216,839	262,737
Potatoes exported to the United States	Bush	635,959	$ 193,917
" Great Britain	"	3	2
Total bushels		635,962	193,919
Poultry exported to the United States			$ 52,000
" Great Britain			4,534
Vegetables exported to the United States			$ 94,765
Cattle, the produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain	No.	80,531	$ 6,316,373
" " " the United States	"	219	3,139
Some were sent to other countries, making total amount received for cattle exported			6,498,111
Hay exported to Great Britain	Tons.	175,559	$ 1,700,409
" the United States	"	87,847	753,575
A considerable quantity was exported to other countries, making total exported		276,806	2,601,188
Butter exported to Great Britain			$ 949,319
To the rest of the world			165,393
Total			1,114,712
Cheese, the produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain			$ 15,439,198
To the rest of the world			48,993
Total			15,488,191
Eggs exported to Great Britain			$ 503,533
" the United States			199,638
Total amount from exports to different countries			714,056
Wheat exported to Great Britain, the produce of Canada	Bush.	9,090,310	$ 6,012,122
" " not the produce of Canada	"	4,085,134	
Pease exported to Great Britain	Bush.	2,413,600	$ 1,580,220
" the United States	"	335,409	329,568

Oats exported to Great Britain	Bush.	1,738,666	$ 642,471
" the rest of the world	"	1,080,036	434,280
Total bushels		2,818,702	1,076,750
Indian corn, not the produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain	Bush.	7,240,245	$ 3,480,139
" the produce of Canada " "	"	711	646
Green apples exported to Great Britain	Brls.	184,856	$ 569,156
" the United States	"	87,160	221,187
Clover seed exported to Great Britain	Lbs.	60,518	$ 447,009
" the United States	"	3,576	21,361

Until last year our best market for hay was found in the United States. The reason we exported more hay to Great Britain last year is that there was a good crop in the United States, and a scarce crop in Great Britain. However, last year was exceptional in that respect. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the figures given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the best market for the Canadian farmer, for his horses, sheep, barley, beans, potatoes, poultry, and vegetables, is the United States; and his best market for cattle, hay, butter, cheese, eggs, wheat, pease, oats, apples, and clover seed is to be found in Great Britain. Canada received, last year, from Great Britain, $68,538,856 for the amount of exports sent to that country, and from the United States she received $35,809,940 for the goods she sent there. Now, Sir, it is quite plain, from that, that we need both markets for Canada, and, in order that our farmers may get good prices, and in order that this country should prosper, we should have both markets. The Minister of Finance told us in his Budget speech that it is likely we would have more prosperity in this country. I agree with him in that, but I believe that when that prosperity does come we shall see more of the produce of this country sent to the United States market. The signs are encouraging already in our increased exports there. The duties levied under the McKinley tariff were almost prohibitive, but notwithstanding that, during the years that tariff was in force, we did a very large trade with the United States. We received $750,000 for the hay shipped to that country during last year, and it must be borne in mind that there was $4 duty charged on every ton of hay that went there. If the crops are as good, we may, therefore, expect better prices. There is also reason to expect that barley may increase in price. Last year we only received $216,000 for Canadian barley sent to the United States and Great Britain, but in 1889, the year before the McKinley tariff came into effect, we received no less than $6,400,000 for the barley we sent to the United States alone. This year the amount that we received for the sale of eggs in the United States and Great Britain is only a little over $700,000: whereas, before the McKinley Bill came into force, we received $2,156,725 for eggs sold to the United States, being a larger sum than we received for the wheat and oats sold to the different countries in the world. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when these facts are considered, we see the intimate trade connection which this country has with the United States, and we find, also, that the depression existing in the United States has been very detrimental. I know that two years ago, the farmers received for lambs $4 and $4.25 each, whereas the highest price received last fall was $2.50. If things in the United States improve, there will be more money there, and they will buy more goods from us, because the reason our trade has fallen off with them is on account of the depression. I wish now to refer to some statements made in a speech by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith). I know that hon. gentleman, and I am sure that he would not make extravagant statements such as have been made by members of his own party in this House. He is a practical farmer, and he has endeavoured not to go too great a length in exaggeration. He said:

> All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is, that any hon. gentleman of the Opposition who has spoken upon that question, can scarcely expect to make very many votes if, when the election comes, he pays a visit to South Ontario, because the people of that riding already feel the effects of the reduced duty. I make the statement, that I believe a number of these reductions were made to a great extent to satisfy the plea put forth by the farmers of Canada, but whilst the reduction pleased the farmers for a moment, they now find that to-day they are not buying a single article which they require, at a cheaper price than they could buy it for previous to the reduction. They are getting articles no cheaper, and the change of tariff has unsettled our manufacturers.

The change in the tariff made last year only amounted to a reduction of 2·72, compared with the tariff of 1893. The reduction was so very small that it could hardly be expected much difference would be felt by the farmers, or that they would derive much benefit from it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) in another part of his speech, said:

> Now, it has been contended, time and again, not only in this House, but on many public

platforms in the country, that the National Policy would never allow the price of wheat to go below $1 a bushel; but no advocate of the National Policy, either in this House or in the country, believes that that would be an invariable rule. What we did claim was, that in years of scarcity a duty would be of great service to us, but that only helps a few, and a large number suffer thereby.

To carry out that idea the hon. gentleman quoted the difference in price of wheat in Chicago and in this country, and he found that the difference amounted to 15 cents a bushel in favour of Canada. Had that taken place last winter, about January or February, it would have been of great advantage to our farmers. But at present they have sold nearly all their wheat. I venture to assert that in the county I represent, where there is one who has a bushel of wheat to sell, there are twenty who have to buy their flour. In that county they generally raise oats, and sell their oats and buy flour. So that the high price of wheat to-day is of no advantage to the farmer who has no wheat to sell. If anything could be done that would make the market steady all the year round, that would be an advantage. But it is poor consolation to the farmers to tell them that prices have gone up, when most of the things they sell are out of their hands. Now, I wish to touch just for a moment upon a remark that was made by the hon. Controller of Customs in regard to pork, in order to set that matter right, because our hon. friends opposite have come to be very ingenious in the way they present their arguments, and the hon. Controller presented this one with great skill. The hon. gentleman said the price of heavy mess pork in Toronto was $15.75 a barrel, and in Chicago $12.02 to $12.12, it would cost 40 cents per barrel to bring from Toronto to Chicago, the duty is $4, and so the Canadian farmer gets $3.25 of the $4 duty on the article of mess pork. When I heard that statement I was curious to find what was the price of live hogs. I went to the reading room and consulted the "Mail-Empire," and found that the price of live hogs in Buffalo was $4.90 per cwt., live weight; in Chicago, $4.70; in Toronto, $4.80, and in Hamilton, $4.75; so that the price in all these places was nearly the same. Probably in Toronto only a few barrels of pork were sold, while in Chicago large quantities were sold. But, at all events, when the farmers are getting no higher price for their hogs in Toronto than in Chicago or Buffalo, and there is such a difference as $3.70 in the price of mess pork, the difference must be due to the combines; therefore, they cannot be getting their share; there must be a combine in pork that forces up the price in Toronto, and I do not consider that that would be to the general advantage; it would only put more money into the pockets of the gentlemen forming the combine. A great many of the arguments put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite are devised as ingeniously as that argument. Now, it has been paraded as a great advantage to the farmers of Canada to stop the importation of such a large quantity of wheat as came into Canada during the time of the Mackenzie Government. I cannot see the point of that argument. Any person who consults the Trade and Navigation Returns will see the exports of wheat, the produce of Canada, and the exports not the produce of Canada. I am glad that at that time our enterprising exporters and merchants were enabled to make profits by purchasing wheat at Chicago and sending it through to Liverpool. In 1878 there was a profit made by those who handled wheat in this way of 37 cents a bushel. They also handled a large quantity of indian corn, on which they made a profit of 20 cents a bushel. This was a benefit to the people of Canada. I remember the circumstances very well. Only a small quantity of wheat came into the country for consumption, but in return a larger quantity was exported to the United States. I remember farmers teaming ten, twenty, thirty or forty miles to the city of Toronto and selling their wheat to American buyers on the wharfs. The wharfs were so crowded that sometimes the farmers had to wait four or five hours before they could get their wheat delivered, so great was the quantity exported to the United States; and it is a well-known fact that when the American vessels went away, there was a drop in the price of wheat of three or four cents a bushel. This year 7,000,000 bushels of corn, not the produce of Canada, have been exported, and this has been brought through Canada and shipped to Great Britain, while only 711 bushels of Canadian corn has been exported. The great majority of the farmers of this country would prefer to be able to import corn free of duty, because it would enable them to feed their stock cheaper, and sell their stock at a greater profit. So that it would help them if corn were brought in free. This is the opinion of the most intelligent farmers in my riding. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) asked if the Liberal party would put a tax on raw materials. I do not know what they would do if they were in power, but the Conservative party have put a tax on raw material, that is, on sugar, and I do not know under the circumstances that they have done wrong; because when a revenue has to be raised, I think it is just as well to raise it from raw sugar as anything else. All the money raised by that tax will go into the public treasury, and none of it would flow into the hands of the manufacturers. Speaking of the deficit of $4,500,000 this year, there was not one hon. gentleman on this side of the House who accused the Finance Minister of incapacity because of that deficit. But when the Mackenzie Government was in power and there was a deficit under the then Finance

Minister, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the staple argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, heard from every platform, was that he was incapable, because he had a deficit. They should take this charge back, because we know that our present Finance Minister has had a deficit this year nearly as large as the total of the deficits of four or five years under the Mackenzie Administration. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) claimed that protection would ruin the city of Quebec. I wonder how Quebec managed to exist before there was a National Policy. Probably just as well as it does now. He closed with an appeal on behalf of Uncle Thomas, now the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy). He contends that that hon. gentleman did not act for himself, but for others It will be remembered that, in 1891, the hon. gentleman was instrumental in assisting contractors to make a profit of $950,000 out of contracts amounting to less than $3,200,000, which led to a parliamentary investigation. Now, however, he is paraded as a martyr. We are told that he did that for the good of his party. He appears to have been a scapegoat. He was not, however, led into the wilderness, but to a substantial building on the banks of the Ottawa Canal, his friends were unceasing in their efforts in his behalf, he was not allowed to put in the full term allotted him by an impartial judge, and now that the people have re-elected him, no doubt he is entitled to his seat, for he appears to be satisfactory to the electors where he has been elected. The greatest sinner can be forgiven, and there is no reason why an exception should be made in the case of the hon. member for Quebec West.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not intend to discuss all the subjects to which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has drawn the attention of the House. He has complained of the present Administration for its expenditure ; he has complained of the subsidies which have been granted to railways ; he has complained of the increase of our debt, and of the deficit last year. I do not intend to discuss all these points, as they have already been discussed by those that have preceded me, and no doubt will be again by those who will follow. The hon. gentleman also gave us his version of the policy of the Liberal party. That is a question upon which there seems to be a very great deal of uncertainty, and I regret to say that the hon. gentleman did not throw very much additional light upon it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is the uncertainty—in the resolution or on the platform ?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). In both. The resolution does not agree with the platform; and nearly every gentleman opposite who addresses the House had a different version of the resolution. The hon. gentleman himself has a different version from any given in the course of the discussion. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken devoted the greater portion of his remarks to the condition of the farmer. He told us that the farmers did not want the National Policy, that it was no advantage to them, and that it had failed to meet the expectations of its promoters. I shall ask the indulgence of the House while I devote a very short time in answering the arguments of the hon. gentleman on that point. It will be remembered that the underlying principle of the policy of the present Administration was this, that the great bulk of the goods required by the masses of the people in this country could be manufactured in this country as well as imported from abroad, that it was desirable that this end should be accomplished, and that the best way to bring about this result was to impose a protective tariff upon agricultural products, and those classes of manufactured goods the manufacture of which was adapted to the conditions of the country, and the character and genius of our people. We have had upwards of fifteen years' experience of the operation of this policy, and the experience of those fifteen years furnishes us abundant proof that, in theory, the policy is sound, and that in practice its operation has been successful. In this general scheme, one of the principal objects was that the farmers of this country should have the privilege of supplying the markets of this country, and for this purpose a protective tariff was imposed upon agricultural products imported from abroad. That it has had the desired effect is proved by the fact that the imports of agricultural products have, year by year, decreased, until, at present, they are utterly insignificant. Now, the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House said this was no advantage to the farmers. I presume, although he did not give us his reasons for making that assertion, that they are the same as those which were given the other day by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman said that when any country produced a surplus which was exported abroad, the prices received abroad fixed the prices in the home market, and that any imposition of duties did not increase the price in the home markets. That argument was answered by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) the other evening, when he gave us the market prices for wheat at present, and pointed out that the effect of the present duty on wheat was to give the Canadian farmer fifteen cents per bushel more for his wheat than he could obtain if wheat were imported free of duty from abroad. I was somewhat amused at the answer of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Semple) who has just addressed the House. He told us that the farmers

derive no advantage from the fact that wheat was higher here at present than in the United States, because they had no wheat to sell—that the farmers in his neighbourhood raised oats. That may be true, but there are, nevertheless, a large number of farmers in the country who do raise wheat, and have it to sell, and those farmers are at present obtaining fifteen cents more for their wheat than if it were imported free of duty from abroad. What is true of wheat this year may be true of oats or potatoes or of some other agricultural product next year or some subsequent year. The principle is this :—That, while the theory which my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) laid down is, in the main, a sound one—that where there is a surplus for export the imposition of a duty upon the article does not increase the price at the time in the home market—yet as a matter of fact, in the different lines of agricultural produce, occasions frequently arise—almost every year—in which, in some particular line there is a scarcity in the market. That scarcity may result from failure in the crops or from other causes, but, almost every year, the market at some time becomes bare in regard to some class of agricultural products ; the demand is greater than the supply ; and when that condition of things arises, the farmer gets the benefit of the increased price which the duty gives him. I think that under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman will have great difficulty in persuading the farmers that they have derived no benefit from the duties imposed on agricultural products. They have not been very successful in their attempts in this direction in the past, and I do not think they will meet with much greater success in the future. The principal object of the protective policy of the present Government was to stimulate the growth of manufacturing industries in the country. That it has been successful in that object appears to me to be too evident to admit of discussion. The figures given in the last census returns show how very rapid has been the growth of manufactures in this country during the ten years which these census returns cover. These figures have already been presented to the House ; but they are so important that I shall ask the privilege of reading them again. The increase during the ten years in the number of establishments was from 49,000 to 75,000 ; increase in capital invested from $164,000,000 to $354,000,000 ; increase in number of employees from 254,000 to 370,000 ; in wages from $59,000,000 to $100,000,000 ; in cost of raw material from $179,000,000 to $256,000,000 ; and in products from $309,000,000 to $476,000,000. The only criticism of these statistics which has been offered and which appears to me worthy of notice is that of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that they were not reliable because the enumerators had included among the industrial establishments a number of establishments in which only one or two persons were employed, and which could not properly be classed as manufacturing establishments. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) answered that argument when he pointed out that the classification of these establishments showed that the increase in the number of small establishments had been no greater in proportion than in the larger ones. The classification of the different industrial establishments of the country shows an increase in those having an output of less than $2,000 to be 55 per cent, in those having an output of from $2,000 to $12,000, to be 23 per cent ; in those with an output from $12,000 to $25,000, to be 29 per cent ; in those having an output of from $25,000 to $50,000, to be 26 per cent ; and in those with an output of $50,000 and upwards, to be 69 per cent ; and the average of all 53 per cent. These census returns, if they needed any corroboration are corroborated by the Trade and Navigation Returns, which show the enormous increase that has taken place in raw materials imported from abroad, augmented by the increase of raw materials that have been produced at home. However, I merely refer to this matter of the increase of the industries of the country, and I shall not dwell upon it, for it seems to me too self-evident to admit of discussion. I wish to devote a little attention to the theory which has been advanced by my hon. friend opposite, to the effect that the protective duty which has led to this great increase in manufactures in Canada has proved prejudicial to the great masses of the people, because it has increased the prices of manufactured products, while that increase in prices has not been paid into the public treasury. The answer which the advocates of the National Policy make to that theory is this :—That, although, under a protective policy, the cost of manufactured goods may be somewhat enhanced—not to the full amount of the duties imposed, but while they may be somewhat increased for the time, while these manufactories are in the early years of their existence—another principle, the principle of home competition, comes in and eventually reduces the prices to the same level that they would reach if they could be imported from abroad. These are the two opposing theories, and in order to ascertain which of the two is correct, we can only appeal to the experience of the past ; and then leave the question to the judgment of this House and to the good sense of the people of the country to say which of these theories is most nearly correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How does that work, may I ask the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am asking for information. I ask the hon. gentleman how his theory works out, when it is proved that these factories or industries enter into a combine ?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I will come to that presently. We might appeal to the experience of the United States under a protective policy, it could be shown from the history of that country that under the protective policy the principle of competition has come in, and that the manufacturers of that country are supplying the people with goods in all the leading lines of manufacture of as good quality and at as cheap prices as the same goods can be obtained in any country in the world. The experience of Canada during the fifteen or sixteen years' operation of the National Policy proves the same thing. Take, for instance, the woollen manufacture of the country. The woollen manufactories of Canada are furnishing the people of Canada with a class of goods that are in every way suited to the people's wants, they are furnishing us with woollen yarns and flannels and tweeds which are durable, which are well suited to our climate and which are in every respect as well suited to the wants of the people as any that can be imported from abroad. Any one who has watched the progress of this industry must have observed that there has been, during recent years especially, a very marked improvement in the quality of the goods produced, and that there has been at the same time, a very marked reduction in the price at which these goods are sold. That has been the result of the introduction of improved machinery, the adoption of better methods and efforts that have been put forth in different ways to reduce the cost of manufacture, and the consumers in Canada have derived the full advantage from every reduction that has been affected in the cost of manufacturing these goods. The same is true with regard to cotton goods, with regard to the different lines of leather goods, boots and shoes, hats and caps, with regard to different manufactures of woodenware, and indeed of all the leading industries of the country. Hon. gentlemen endeavoured to illustrate their theories by referring to the sugar refining industry. The hon. member for South Oxford made the statement that the protective duty given to the sugar refineries of Canada increased the price to the consumers by the amount of that duty ; that upon the import of sugar at the present time, this would amount to a tax equal to about $2,000,000 which the people of Canada pay, and not a dollar of which goes into the public treasury. That argument has been answered in former discussions in this House, by comparing the prices in the United States and in Canada, showing that the people of Canada were paying no more for their sugar than the people of the United States. Taking the cost of raw material and the cost of manufacturing, and assuming them to be the same, the refiners of Canada have no larger profit than the refiners of the United States. Previous to the adoption of the National Policy, our sugar was purchased in the United States after it had been refined ; since the National Policy, it has been purchased from our own refiners, and our people have paid no higher for it than they would have paid if they had bought it, as they formerly did, in the United States. Now, I do not wish to detain the House with figures upon this point ; but I have taken the trouble to ascertain the prices in Canada and in the United States in the months of April and May. On the 5th April, quotations in Montreal for granulated sugar were 3 5-16 to 3⅜ cents per lb. ; at the same date the New York quotations were 3 15-16 to 4⅛ cents, a difference of about 75 cents per 100 lbs. On the 1st of May the prices in Montreal were 3¼ to 3 5-16 cents ; on the same day in New York the prices were 4 cents to 4 3-16, a difference of some thing more than 75 cents per 100 lbs. It must be remembered that at these dates the duty upon raw sugar in the United States was 40 per cent ; that calculated upon the present prices of raw sugar, would be about equal to 75 cents per cwt. So that if we take that into account, in April and May, the people of Canada were getting their sugar as cheaply as they would if they had bought it in the United States. If we take the prices at the present time, we find the same result. On the 16th May, I ascertained by telegraph the prices of sugar in New York and the prices in Halifax. In New York the quotations were : Granulated, $4.44 ; in Halifax, 4 cents per lb. For yellow sugars, New York prices were $3.56 ; in Halifax, 3 cents. It must be remembered that this was after the imposition of the 50 cents duty on raw sugar on the 3rd May last, and alters the relative positions of the markets to that extent. Nevertheless, if we allow for that, the difference in price is still in favour of the Canadian buyer by about 20 cents per 100 lbs. on granulated, and about 30 cents per 100 lbs. on yellow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would the hon. member repeat the figures in New York and Halifax ?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The price in New York on the 16th May was $4.44 per 100 lbs., and in Halifax the price was 4 cents per lb.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the difference was what ?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The difference was 44 cents ; but from that you must subtract 25 cents, which is the difference between the duty on raw sugar in the United States and the duty on raw sugar in Canada ; that leaves 19 cents in favour of the

Canadian consumer as against the New York consumer, in comparing the two prices. I will ask the House to make another calculation. Assuming that the theory advanced by the hon. member for South Oxford is true, assuming, for the moment, that the consumers in Canada pay not only the duty imposed upon raw sugar, but also the protective duty upon refined sugar, which is given for the protection of the sugar refiners, if that theory were true, the price of sugar in New York at the present time would be the cost of raw sugar with the cost of refining added, and that would be increased, first, by the duty on raw sugar, which is 40 per cent, and which at the present time would average about 75 cents per 100 pounds; and, in addition to this, the price of the refined sugar would be increased, if the hon. gentleman's theory was sound, by the ⅛ of a cent per pound, which is given as a protection to the refining industry. These two duties would increase the price of sugar in New York 87½ cents 100 pounds. Upon the same theory, in Canada the price of sugar would be increased, first, by the duty on the raw sugar, which is 50 cents per 100 pounds, and again by the protection, which is 64 cents per 100 pounds; adding these together, it would be increased in consequence of duties imposed under our present tariff, by $1.14 per cwt., as against 87½ cents in New York. Now, if that theory were sound, taking the cost of the raw sugar and the cost of refining to be the same, the price of refined sugar in Canada should be higher than in New York by the difference between $1.14 and 87½ cents, which would be 26½ cents per 100 pounds. If the hon. gentleman's theory were correct, I say that I cannot see any possible reason why sugar in Canada at the present time should not be 26½ cents higher per 100 pounds than it is in New York; on the contrary, in the quotations which I have in my hand from New York, it is actually 44 cents per 100 pounds higher there than it is in Canada. Now, it appears to me that these figures, which are the actual market quotations of the day, give a clear and convincing answer to the arguments of the hon. gentleman, and they prove beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the theory he advances is not a sound one; but that the theory which the advocates of the National Policy advance is sound, and that in their practical operation, they realize the results which the promoters of the National Policy claim for it. I do not propose to discuss this point further, except to give my answer to one of the questions which hon. gentlemen opposite ask in connection with the statement I have just made. They ask, If this is the case, if the imposition of duties on manufactured articles for the protection of the manufacturers do not increase the price of goods, why impose the duty? In my opinion, there is more than one reason for imposing these duties. The first benefit which results is that it gives steadiness and stability to the market. It enables manufacturers to estimate, with a very tolerable degree of certainty, at least, the demand upon which they can certainly rely. It gives them definite data upon which they can base their business calculations. A second advantage from the imposition of these duties is the protection which it affords from the disastrous competition which would at times result from over-production in foreign countries. This is especially important in times like the present, after or during a period of business depression. It is, as every business man knows, of the greatest importance in the early history of manufacturing industry, and while the capital is not large. It is absolutely necessary in a new country where the market is limited to the consumption of the people of the country, and where the population is not large, in order to induce capitalists to invest their money in manufacturing industries. There is a third reason for the imposition of those duties, and that is for the purpose of securing a revenue. While the prices of the leading lines of the manufactured goods which are manufactured in the country have not increased, while the wants of the great mass of the people are supplied by these manufactures, it nevertheless results that there is in all these leading lines a very considerable quantity of goods imported from abroad. This is a limited demand, it is not a large demand; it usually comes from the wealthy and independent class, it is a very proper class from which to secure a portion of our revenue. Take, for illustration, the manufacture of carriages. Every person knows that the carriage manufacturers in this country are supplying the bulk of the wants of our people, that they make the ordinary driving wagons, buggies, trucks, and those vehicles which the mass of our people use. They are supplying those goods as cheaply as they can be brought in from any other country. Nevertheless there are a considerable number of carriages imported, and I find, on referring to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that last year we derived a revenue of over $150,000 from duties on carriages. It arises in this way: There is a certain class of persons who desire a particular make of carriage; it may be a barouche or a fashionable carriage of some kind. They do not find such a carriage at home, or they find abroad a vehicle which suits them better; they buy it, it is brought in and pays duty, and that duty goes direct into the public treasury. The same is true in regard to certain classes of woollen and cotton goods, boots and shoes, hats and caps, and every other leading line of manufacture. The revenue derived in this way amounts to a very considerable sum, and I claim that there is no class of goods and no class of persons from which the revenue could be

better derived than from those to which I have referred. If hon. members will take the trouble, as I have done, to analyse the receipts of our customs, they will find that after taking out the duties imposed on wines and liquors, on fancy goods, silks and other luxuries of that character and on the class of goods to which I have just referred, the balance remaining is very small, amounting, according to my calculation, to not more than one dollar per head of the population. Of course we cannot arrive at the amount with absolute certainty. But if we make the most liberal allowance possible, the tax on those articles used by the great mass of the people and the duty paid on them does not amount to more than $1.25 or $1.50 per head, at the outside of our population, and any reasonable man will admit that that is not a tax which can be considered burdensome even to the poorer classes of the community. I wish before I close to offer a few observations in answer to another line of argument adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the argument which had been used in regard to the movement of our population, by which hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to show that the country has not been prosperous and the National Policy has failed. They pointed to the fact that the immigrants who have arrived in Canada have, to a large extent, disappeared; that some of them may have returned, but that others have gone southward across the line. But the census returns show that taking into consideration the immigrants that have come into the country during the last ten years, and the natural increase of population, the population is not so large at the present time as we might reasonably expect it would be. Hon. gentlemen from these facts jump at the conclusion that the country has not been prosperous and that the National Policy has proved a failure. I desire to endeavour to show that these conclusions are not justifiable from the premises, and that the course of reasoning is illogical. In the first place, I should like to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the growth, progress and prosperity of any country depend, not so much on the number as on the character and habits of its people, and that those countries which have had the largest immigration, or are most densely populated, are not the most progressive or at the present time the most prosperous. To go to the old world, Great Britain is a country which, for many years, has been the great commercial and manufacturing centre. She has received few additions to her population from abroad, but she has sent out constantly a stream of emigration from her shores. Germany, next to Great Britain, has had the largest emigration of any European country, yet no one will say that Germany is not a great, thrifty and prosperous people. Norway and Sweden have had the largest emigration of any European country in proportion to population. These countries are sparsely settled, yet they compare favourably, so far as the ratio of progress and prosperity goes, with other European countries where the population is more dense and from which there has been no emigration. I do not, however, claim that from those countries we learn the most useful lessons. The most practical lessons may be learned by a study of the census returns of the United States, where the conditions more closely resemble ours. The United States for many years received the largest number of immigrants of any country in the world. A high authority estimates that two-thirds of all the emigration has for many years gone to the United States. During the ten years covered by the last census the immigration to the United States amounted to upwards of half a million annually. This foreign element, the census shows, is scattered largely, almost entirely, through the northern and western states. In the North Atlantic Division, which includes New England and New York, the percentage of foreign population, according to the last census, was upwards of 22 per cent. In Rhode Island, where it was the largest percentage, it reached upwards of 30 per cent. In the North Central States, it was upwards of 18 per cent. In some Western States it averaged from 30 to 40 per cent, and in North Dakota, where it was the largest, it attained 44 per cent, almost one-half of the entire population of the state. In the Southern States the proportion of foreign element was small. In Texas, where it was the largest, it was less than 7 per cent: in almost all the other Southern States it was less than 1 per cent. The point in these statistics to which I wish specially to direct attention is, that notwithstanding the large immigration which has been added to the natural increase of population, and notwithstanding the population of the northern and western states has been increased by this large foreign element, the centre of population of that country has remained undisturbed during those ten years. Indeed, for the last one hundred years it has remained on the same parallel of latitude. In 1790 the centre of population of the United States was in the neighbourhood of Baltimore. In 1890 it was in the neighbourhood of Columbus, in Southern Indiana. These are practically on the same parallel of latitude. It has removed westward during these hundred years upwards of 500 miles, but during all that time it has moved but a few miles north or south of the same parallel of latitude. The study of these figures show, that while there has been a movement westward of population in that country, there has also been a movement to the south, and this movement may be accounted for in various ways. In the first place, there are the wealthy, independent classes who go south in search of rest or health. Then there is the class who

are physically and intellectually weak, who find life a struggle for existence, and who desire to carry on that struggle under the most favourable conditions possible. Then there are the vagrant classes, the ordinary tramp, who pays us a visit in July and August, but who, during the greater part of the year makes his home at a safe and convenient distance to the south of us. Besides there is the class—I regret to say it is a large class—that are idle, indolent, and unambitious, whose whole desire seems to be merely to exist, who are satisfied if they can maintain their existence for a whole week on a few cents' worth of corn meal and bacon, and who are content with an entire wardrobe which can be made out of a few yards of cotton cloth. This class of people naturally gravitate towards the south, and they find in those warm climates a more congenial home than they do with us in the north. But the point to which I wish now to direct the attention of the House is this: That these are the non-productive and not the productive classes; that while they add to the numerical strength of a state or a country in which they live, they add very little, or absolutely nothing to its growth or prosperity. Another point revealed by the census returns of the United States, to which I desire to call attention, is this: That the growth and prosperity of that whole country has been principally confined to the northern states; that the increase in wealth, the growth in manufactures, the activity in trade and commerce, have been almost entirely in those states which most nearly correspond with ours in geographical position, in natural resources, in climate, and other conditions; and in addition to that, the movement of population in those, which are the most prosperous states of the union, has been precisely similar to the movement of population in this Dominion of Canada. In the older states of the union, there has been the same decrease of the population in the agricultural districts, and the same increase in the cities and manufacturing towns. There has been the movement of population westward; farmers leaving the unproductive lands in the older states to take up the new lands in the west, where the soil is more fertile, where little or no capital is needed, where their labour is better rewarded, and their condition is in every respect improved. There has also been the movement to the southward to which I have alluded. Now, I do not wish to be understood as underestimating the value of population. Population is an important element of consideration in the growth or prosperity of any country. But particularly in a new country like ours where there are large tracts of land unoccupied, where there are great natural resources undeveloped, it is of the utmost importance that by every legitimate and practical means we should add to the population of the country. But what I do wish to draw attention to is this: The difference in the value of the productive and industrial classes, as compared with the idle and unproductive classes, the difference between those who are active, industrious, energetic, thrifty, and ambitious, and between those who are idle and indolent, who seem to have no desire to accumulate wealth, or to obtain social position, but who simply try to work out the problem of existence in the easiest, and simplest, and cheapest manner possible. I wish further to impress upon the attention of the House this fact: That while we must, in considering the progress of a country, take into account the increase of its population, we cannot accept any estimate of its growth which is solely based upon the increase or decrease of its population. Such arguments are utterly valueless, unless they are supported by other and better testimony. I wish, in this connection, to point out the utter worthlessness of the arguments used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and by many other gentlemen who have addressed us from that side of the House, and which arguments are based upon the exodus of our population. These hon. gentlemen have relied principally upon the fact that the farming population of Canada has decreased in the older provinces, and that if you take the Dominion as a whole the farming population has not increased. That is true; the census returns show it. But that does not prove that our farmers are not prosperous. We have abundance of evidence to prove the contrary. Although their numbers have not increased, yet the quantity of land in Canada under cultivation is 6,500,000 acres greater in 1891 than it was in 1881. That our farmers have increased in wealth, is proved beyond all doubt by the enormous increase in the amount of capital invested in their agricultural enterprises. As was shown by the Minister of Railways the other night, that increase has amounted to $95,000,000 in Ontario alone. Our farmers have obtained improved and labour-saving machinery; they have adopted better methods; they have enormously increased their producing power, and in addition to this, they have a larger and better market to supply to-day than they ever had before. This market is provided by the increase of population in our cities and manufacturing centres. The returns show that the increase during ten years was 38 per cent, and that, in this way, 380,000 people have been added to that class of the population which are not producers, but consumers, of agricultural products. Under our present tariff, the farmers of Canada have the privilege of supplying this large market, and though their numbers have not increased, they are supplying that market to-day. They are giving us a better and more abundant supply than we ever

had before, and, in addition to that, and what is still more remarkable, they have every year increased the surplus which they send abroad, until, at the present time, it has reached the enormous sum of $50,000,000 annually. There are no 537,000 people engaged in agricultural pursuits in any country in the world, that can show a better, or even as good a record of success and prosperity. It is little use, in the face of facts like these, for hon. gentlemen of the Opposition to talk about the decrease in the value of farm property. We know that farm property in the older provinces, in the agricultural districts, has decreased in value. But that is an experience which is common to every civilized country in the world. It is the inevitable result of having opened up large tracts of fertile land for settlement and having placed these on the markets at nominal cost, or absolutely free, to those who were willing to settle upon them. It is useless, too, for hon. gentlemen to base upon the so-called exodus of our population, and upon the fact that our population has not increased during the ten years covered by the census as rapidly as we might expect, in view of the number of immigrants landed on our shores, added to the natural increase of our population—to base upon these facts any argument to show that this country is not prosperous. If you wish to test the prosperity of the country, apply any of the tests which are recognized as the most reliable and most accurate by the best authorities in every civilized country in the world. Take the earnings of the people; take their savings deposited in the savings banks, in the chartered banks, in the insurance companies, in the loan and investment companies, and in other financial institutions; take the enormous increase of capital invested in agriculture, in manufactures, in building operations, in railway enterprises, in every class of commercial industry throughout the country; take the enormous increase in the purchasing power of our people, the higher standard of living and the higher standard of comfort among all classes; take the enormous increase in the trade we are doing with each other and with other nations; and take that which is the best test of all, the improved position of Canada in the great financial markets of the world. By any of these tests you choose to apply, there are no 5,000,000 people in any state or country, either in the old world or in the new, that can furnish as many and as convincing proofs of their growth in material prosperity as can the people of Canada since the adoption of the present fiscal policy in 1879. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House any further. There are a number of other questions which have been raised in this debate which it would be interesting to discuss. Many of them have been fully discussed already; others will be dealt with by those who are to follow. My principal object in addressing the House at all was to press upon the attention of hon. members the fallacy of the arguments which hon. gentlemen opposite have been advancing, based upon the southward movement of population, a movement which has been shown to be governed by climatic conditions merely, and which is influenced by no policy and can be controlled by no Government. I am sure that the financial statement which has been presented by the hon. Minister of Finance is satisfactory to this House, and will be satisfactory to the country. In any of the criticisms which have been offered in the course of this debate, I have not heard anything which should shake the confidence, either of the House or of the country, in the policy of the present Government, or in its administration of our public affairs; and I believe that no statement has been made since this Parliament opened will be received with more general satisfaction than the clear and explicit declaration of the Government, that the policy of the past is to be adhered to in the future.

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

After Recess

Mr. McISAAC. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be very much concerned as to what is and what is not the policy of the Liberal party. Some of them assert that we have no policy at all, others say it is free trade as it exists in England, while all unite in saying that the policy propounded and agreed upon by the Liberals of Canada at their great convention a short time ago, is general, vague and indefinite in its terms. Sir, I think that any person who can read, and who will read that platform for himself, will at once come to the conclusion that it is not vague or general, but clear and definite as anything can be made by the English language. But if you want to know whether it is or whether it is not as clear as it should be, the very best possible way of ascertaining that is by way of comparison. I will ask you to come back some seventeen years in the history of this country, to the time when the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite introduced into this House the resolution upon which was based the National Policy of the Conservative party. I will read to you that resolution word for word; I will ask you to compare its words and meaning with the words and meaning of the platform of the Liberal party; and then I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite if the policy of the Liberal party, as laid down in their platform, is not more definite and clear in its terms than the National Policy resolution. Here it is:

That this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion ; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen, now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if that resolution is clear and definite in its terms ; I ask them if it is as clear and definite as the platform of the Liberal party ? They cannot say that it is ; not one of them will say that it is. Institute a comparison between the two, and you must admit that the Liberal platform is far more clear and definite in its terms than the resolution moved in this House by Sir John Macdonald. Examine that resolution from end to end, and you will not find the word protection in it, although the other day the hon. Minister of Public Works stated that the National Policy, the policy of the present Government, was protection pure and simple, as it was laid down in 1878. In that resolution you will not find the word protection ; it is readjustment, fostering, encouragement—anything and everything but protection. There is nothing definite in the whole resolution from beginning to end. I do not give you that as my opinion merely, it must be the opinion of any person who understands the English language. I will read to you what Sir John Macdonald himself said in this House before he placed that resolution on the Table of the House, to show that he realized that it was vague, general and indefinite in its terms. The resolution was moved on the 7th of March, 1878. On page 853 of "Hansard" I find that Sir John Macdonald, speaking on the resolution, said :

It is not forced upon the Opposition to find a new policy with regard to matters of revenue and tariff and expenditure ; they could not, of course, because they have not the power to do so. As far as matters of tariff are concerned, it is impossible for the Opposition to enter into details, or explain before the House and the country their policy ; they have not the material ; the Government alone have the opportunity, and the only opportunity, of collecting the facts upon which a tariff can be formed. The Minister of Finance has already informed you that, even with all the materials he has at hand, it is not an easy matter to form the tariff ; and it would be presumption in the Opposition to attempt to do so. I shall, therefore, confine myself to general principles.

Now, is it not idle and useless and inconsistent in hon. gentlemen opposite to say that the policy of the Liberal party is not definite and clear, when their own great chieftain, in moving the National Policy resolution, had to make an apology and give an excuse to the House for not being more definite, saying that it was not the place or the duty of the Opposition to define what their policy on tariff and revenue should be. Sir, that is not all. In the great campaign of 1878 which followed, the resolution was understood in one of the provinces to mean protection, and in another to mean low tariff. As the chieftain of the party knew that that would be the case, he no doubt purposely made it vague and indefinite. You remember that some months after this resolution was proposed there was a great agitation in the province of New Brunswick against any increase in the tariff. You will remember, the famous telegram sent by Mr. John Boyd, of St. John. Having a great influence in the councils of the Conservative party and knowing that the feeling in the maritime provinces, especially New Brunswick, was very strong against an increase in the tariff, he sent a telegram to Sir John Macdonald, and in reply the late chieftain assured him that the meaning of the National Policy was not the increasing but only the readjustment of the tariff. Does that not show that the resolution was made purposely indefinite so that every one could interpret it according to his views ? Yet hon. gentlemen to-day boast that their policy has never changed, that it is the same policy which was enunciated in 1878 and has been carried down to this day—protection pure and simple. In the face of their own records, resolutions and speeches, in the face of the declarations of their own leader, surely whatever other defence they may try to set up for the National Policy, they cannot say that their policy has always been the same. Failing to defend successfully protection, some hon. gentlemen opposite, for the last few days have resorted to the tactics of quoting garbled extracts from speeches delivered by some members on this side many years ago, in order to prove that they were at one time protectionists. This is a miserable way of defending their policy—this quoting of extracts from speeches delivered twenty or twenty-five years ago. But if hon. gentlemen opposite adopt these methods, we can follow the same tactics. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1874, when the then Finance Minister raised the tariff of this country from 15 to 17½ per cent, that Sir Charles Tupper said : The hon. gentleman is entering the thin edge of the protectionist wedge by increasing the tariff 2½ per cent. Sir, the National Policy was to benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion. So says the resolution. Well, so far as the agricultural industry of this country is concerned, I am not going to read you

any statistics. I ask any man to be his own witness. The best witness is the man who can look and judge for himself, and not the one who takes his information second-hand from other persons. Travel on the trains, anyway and everywhere, especially through the maritime provinces, and you will see with your own eyes the results of the National Policy. The low price of farm products, the depreciation of farm lands, the boarded windows, the vacant farms along the country, are the best evidence that the agricultural interests have not been benefited but destroyed under the influence of the National Policy. And as to the mining interests of the country, I think it is unnecessary for me to say one word, because no person will have the hardihood to stand up here, and say they have been benefited by the National Policy. But the manufacturing industries—oh, the manufacturing industries of this country. The National Policy was to erect tall chimneys all over the country. The hum of the factory was to be heard all over the land; and whatever else should be the result of the National Policy, that was sure to follow. The other evening we heard the Minister of Public Works, in his attempt to prove the benefits of the National Policy to our manufacturing interests, say that to-day we have 75,000 industries in Canada as the result of that policy. That same tale and those same figures were repeated to-day by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr Wood). It is easy to give the number, but when hon. gentlemen opposite are asked to point to a given province or given county or city and show where these manufactories exist, they are dumb. Take the province of Nova Scotia, and let them enumerate the manufactories which have arisen there under the National Policy. The House will pardon me if I, for the moment read a few extracts from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, delivered a few days ago. This will save time, and it puts the case in a nutshell. He says:

> Nova Scotia is specially privileged. Of the 223 knitting factories, 99 were developed in Nova Scotia. And more than that, of the 99 developed in Nova Scotia, 93 were developed in the county of Shelburne. I find, on further examination, that the 93 industrial establishments in the shape of knitting factories in the county of Shelburne, employed collectively 126 hands. I find further, on the same page of the census, that they earned in that year, $1,833, being at the rate of $14.55 per year for each hand, or 28 cents a week, and 4½ cents a day. I find that in Quebec, in the county of L'Assomption, there were 12 industrial establishments know as knitting factories, employing collectively 12 hands, earning an average of $63 a year, being at the rate of $1.20 per week, wherewith, I suppose, to discharge the wages of superintendents, the cost of finding power, and dividends to the company. Portneuf is equally favoured, it has 12 establishments, which average $90 per year in wages, or $1.60 per week. Now, I find here that the machinery and tools employed in each factory are given; and it may interest the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) to know, that the 93 knitting factories in Shelburne actually consumed for machinery and tools, a total of $623, being at the rate of $7 per factory for machinery. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact. We are told there were 25,000 new establishments; I have shown you what some of these consist of. I have analysed these further, and I find that out of the 223 knitting factories, there may possibly be 30 that deserve the name by a stretch of courtesy. Those 30 pay $228,000 in wages out of a total of $322,000. The remaining 193 pay an average of $200 a year for all purposes. But, Sir, great as the knitting factory is, fine as the work which the National Policy has got in there, finer still is the work which the census commissioners got in there, it pales before the industry of carpet-making. The House will be glad to know, I was glad to know, that there are now 537 industrial establishments for making carpets in the Dominion of Canada. I find, by a reference to the census returns of 1881, that there were only 11 then in existence; we have, therefore, an increase of 546, which is something like—how many thousands per cent? Is it 5,000 or 50,000 per cent. Some of these hon. gentlemen, who are good at it, may occupy their leisure time in making the calculation. Well, Sir, of these 557, 51 are in New Brunswick, under the fostering care of the Minister; and they employ 51 hands, mostly old women. Their collective wages are $1,792; so that each of them earns $75 per year, or 70 cents per week. Nova Scotia possesses 106 factories for carpet-making, employing 117 hands, who earn $62 a year, or $1.10 per week, according to the census. Prince Edward Island, I am happy to inform my hon. friend, averages $100 per year. Assiniboia has one factory for carpet-making, paying $15 per year in wages. Now, I may remark that, of the 213 knitting factories in all the provinces except Ontario, not one appears to average $100 a year in wages, or to employ 2 men. The total wages paid in those 213 factories amount to $14,827, which is not quite $70 per year each.

It is quite easy to get 75,000 industries when you count such industries as those. Why, a member of the Government, the other day, was compelled to say that even a little boy splitting kindling wood was counted an industry. If you count all the little boys who split kindling wood and put them in the 75,000 list, you will find very few industries of any description left. Oh, but the National Policy, according to the resolution, was to stop the exodus; it was to give employment to our own people at home, and bring back thousands of people who had left Canada before 1878. These were the promises made: these are the exact words of the resolution of 1878. I ask you to compare the promises with the result. How many thousands of people have come back to this country as a result of the National Policy? How many thousands of people have been prevented from leaving this country during the last seventeen years, as was promised, as the result of this policy? The fact is that from 1881 to 1891, no less than 1,200,000 people, more than one-fifth of the present population of Canada have left the country, an average yearly exodus of 120,000 from this Dominion. What is the record with reference to

the maritime provinces? In Nova Scotia, the increase in population from 1871 to 1881 was 13·6 per cent. From 1881 to 1891, during which time the National Policy was in force, the increase in Nova Scotia was only 2·4 per cent. In New Brunswick, the increase from 1871 to 1881 was 12·4 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891, under the National Policy, there was no increase whatever. In Prince Edward Island, in 1871 to 1881 the increase in population was 15·8 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891, it was only a decimal —17 per cent. Yet hon. gentlemen contend that, although the census returns are against them, still, the country is happy and prosperous. But I ask them to compare the result as shown by the census with the promises in this resolution, that this policy would stop the exodus, increase our population, keep our people at home, and bring back those who were expatriated before 1878. This is the result of seventeen years' experience of the National Policy. But we were told in the maritime provinces that the National Policy would encourage our sea-going shipping. This was the great industry of that country. I will give you a few figures of the rise, progress, and decrease of this industry:

	N.S. Tonnage.	N.B. Tonnage.	P.E.I. Tonnage.
1873	449,701	277,850	38,918
1878	553,368	335,965	54,250
1893	396,263	156,086	20,970

From the foregoing table, it appears that while the registered tonnage of the three provinces in 1873 was as follows:—

	Tons.
Nova Scotia	449,701
New Brunswick.....	277,850
Prince Edward Island.....	38,918
Total.....	766,469

It had increased in the year 1878 to the following figures:—

	Tons.
Nova Scotia	553,368
New Brunswick	335,965
Prince Edward Island.....	54,250
Total.....	943,583

Or an increase of 177,114 tons which, at the average value per ton, estimated by the Marine Department, of $30, make an increase in the value of the registered tonnage of $5,313,420, between the years 1873 and 1878. The National Policy was introduced in 1879, and has continued in force ever since. The registered tonnage in 1893, was:

	Tons.
Nova Scotia.....	396,263
New Brunswick	156,086
Prince Edward Island.....	20,970
Total	573,319

Or a decrease or loss of 370,264 tons, and, at the same estimate of $30 per ton, of $11,108,220. That is the result to the sea-going shipping of the maritime provinces. But could you expect anything else? No, Mr. Speaker, this result was prophesied in this House before the National Policy was adopted at all by Sir Charles Tupper, when he said that the policy of protection in the United States had driven the flag of that country from the seas, and given to other nations the carrying trade of the world. His prophecy has been fulfilled so far as the maritime provinces are concerned, not because he said it, but because it was inevitable. But, although the National Policy has not benefited any of these industries, I want to be frank and fair; and I must confess here to-night that the National Policy has done some good in this country; it has benefited some people. It has benefited the combinations of this country; it has enabled combines to come into existence in this country as it has done in every country where protection is the policy. It has given us a cotton combine, a cordage combine, an oil combine, a nail combine, a sugar combine, and scores of others. And some people made millions out of the combinations thus fostered and encouraged by the law of the land, and all these millions have been unjustly made, although legalized by the action of this Parliament; and these millions came out of the pockets of the toiling masses and consumers of this country. Our friends opposite now declare: We never change our policy. But we have heard from them this year something far different from what we heard before. I remember, when, four years ago, we had a general election in this country, the Liberal leaders were branded as unpatriotic politicians plotting evil against the country, as men disloyal to the old flag, and to the motherland. The monopoly of loyalty, as of everything else that was good, was claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite. But we hear very little now about the old flag. Four years ago they were loud in their praises of England, its policy and its consequent prosperity. To-day they actually tell the people of this country that England is suffering and going to destruction because the policy of free trade is adhered to. They bemoan the fate of England because the policy of that country is not protection, but free trade. They have lately started upon a mission to redeem and regenerate and save poor England from the effects of the free trade policy that she has followed for the last fifty years? The great Conservative party in England has been led within the last fifty years by some of the most eminent statesmen of the century. Is it not singular that it never dawned upon these great leaders that protection would be the better policy for England, that they never dropped free trade and embodied in their platform and emblazoned on their banner the policy of

protection as we have it in Canada? Is it not strange that even now, on the eve of a general election in England, the great Conservative party do not adopt protection as their policy? They are very anxious to get into power, no doubt, they are anxious to submit to the people a fiscal policy that will prove popular, but no prominent man in the Conservative party of England has the courage to propose protection as the policy of that party. No, Sir, it is left for hon. gentlemen in this House on the Government benches to say that England is going to destruction, and that the policy of free trade has been the cause of it. In a short time you will see a general election in that country, and although on other questions the various parties will differ widely yet upon the question of free trade, Liberals and Conservatives, Unionists, Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites, will all agree. Sir, do you not remember that a little more than a year ago, the late Premier of this Dominion said that the National Policy as it existed for many years previously, should be changed, that it had brought about combines, and that it was doing some injury to some classes of the consumers of the country: and he said that the time had come when they should lop off the mouldering branches of that policy. What did that mean? If it was to be protection pure and simple, as the Minister of Public Works said the other night, protection as it was in 1878, why should the Prime Minister say that they were going to lop off the mouldering branches? That declaration, if it meant anything at all, meant that the policy of protection as it existed previously should not be continued in its entirety, but that some changes should be made, that the mouldering branches should be lopped off. A short time afterwards, in pursuance of that promise, the Minister of Finance made the announcement that the mouldering branches would be lopped off, that a reduction would be made in a great many articles upon which the consumers had been paying high duty. That announcement was received in this House by hon. gentlemen on both sides with a great deal of satisfaction. I remember well how hon. gentlemen opposite boasted throughout the country that the Minister of Finance was at last about to reduce the tariff on a great many articles; I remember how the Conservative press announced to the people: You are going to be relieved of some of your burdens now. It is true that during the first years of the National Policy, while the infant industries were in existence, it was necessary to keep up the tariff: but now as those industries have outgrown their babyhood and have reached manhood, it is necessary to give the consumers a chance, and these industries must now stand on their own feet. Such was the language of the Conservative press throughout the country; they promised the consumers that they were now going to get some benefit on account of the reduction promised by the Minister of Finance. The Liberal party also received the announcement with a great deal of satisfaction, and although it was not such a reduction as we had been fighting for, still we accepted it with pleasure, on the ground that half a loaf is better than no bread. But, Sir, did the Government make these reductions which were promised? We know they did not. They attempted to do so, and why did they fail? In almost all cases the Minister of Finance put back the duties of their original figures. And what excuse had the Finance Minister to make except that humiliating and degrading one, that it was a mistake of the printer, a clerical error? That was all the satisfaction he could give the people. And yet to-day, hon. gentlemen boast that their policy is the same as it was in 1878: they boast that the duties are as high to-day as ever they were. Why are they so high? They did try to lop off the mouldering branches. They knew that their policy had been injurious to the people, they felt that the time had come when the people should be relieved of some of their burdens; the Prime Minister had promised to give relief, and the Minister of Finance had come down with a revised tariff. Why, then, did the Government not go on and carry out their policy? Because, Sir, the combinesters had taken them by the throat and called a halt, and the Minister of Finance was compelled to put the duties back to the figures at which they were before; and to-day the Conservative party are boasting because they are not free men, because they were not able to carry out the promise of the late Premier and of the Minister of Finance: they boast, in face of the fact that they were taken by the throat by their masters, the combinesters, and compelled to restore these. Again we were promised that the National Policy would eventually give us reciprocity with the United States: but to-day they laugh at any person who will say that we want reciprocity with the United States. Oh, they say, it is only the Grits want that; reciprocity means annexation. Well, what did they mean when, in 1891, they dissolved Parliament one year before the time, and asked to be returned to power that they might negotiate reciprocity with the United States? This time, however, they have taken great care not to go to the country one year before the time; it is likely to be one year after the time. But four years ago they said to the people: Return us to power that we may enter into negotiations with the United States to obtain reciprocity in natural and in some of the manufactured products. Why did they say so? Did they mean it, and if they meant it, why did they not go on and make the treaty? They were convinced the people wanted recipro-

city, they knew reciprocity would benefit Canada, and that it would be a good platform upon which to go to the people, if they could make the people believe that they were sincere. They made the appeal upon that platform, they wished to get a fresh expression of opinion at the polls in order to strengthen the hands of their delegates to Washington in 1891. They realized that the people would return no party in power which was not in favour of reciprocity. Sir, it is not necessary to waste any more time in relating what took place, what attempts they made, and how sincere they were and what the result of the negotiations was. Upon false pretenses they obtained a verdict from the people, largely upon that platform; they sent a delegation to Washington with the result that in a few hours the whole thing was at an end; and no genuine bona fide effort was ever made on behalf of Canada to obtain a reciprocity treaty. Sir, why was it? Because reciprocity itself is irreconcilable with the interests of the combinesters of this country, and the Government did not even dare to make a sincere effort to obtain it. But there is something else. You will remember how, during the regime of the Mackenzie Government, the Minister of Finance of that day was branded and hounded from pillar to post all over this country, because he had deficits for three years, although he had surpluses for two years. The people were told that the incompetency of the Liberal party was such that it was impossible for them to have anything else but deficits. We were told what would happen if the National Policy was at an end; and no genuine, bona fide were adopted. We were assured that although the National Policy might increase the burdens upon the people, although they would have to pay higher duties, still there was one thing the National Policy would do, that although it might raise the tariff and make the people pay more, all the money would go into the treasury, we would get back the money we had paid ourselves, and there would be no such thing hereafter as a deficit. But what is the result? After seventeen years the Minister of Finance is obliged to come down and acknowledge that, in a year when there is no famine and no rebellion, after seventeen years' experience of the National Policy and of a high tariff, there was a deficit of $4,500,000. But the present deficit is more than the combined deficit of the three years under the Mackenzie Administration. In justification of that deficit, what did the Finance Minister say to the people? He said: It is true there is a deficit this year, but I will explain it in this way: If we had not reduced the duties two years ago on sugar, there would not have been a deficit of $4,500,000 this year, of over $1,000,000 last year, and an anticipated deficit of one or two or three millions next year. The Finance Minister throws out this crumb of comfort to the people that, while there is a deficit, it is because he did not tax them higher. The hon. gentleman now turns round and says, we must make up this loss and increase the duties in order to wipe off the deficit, and he announces to the people that by giving another turn to the taxation crank he will increase the duties, tax the people to the mast-head and wipe off the deficit in this way. It is extraordinary how the Finance Minister can claim credit for his feats. In eloquent and rounded periods, he boasts that while there was large deficits this and last year, still he had permitted the people to keep in their own pockets the money which he might have taken from them; and now when he is face to face with the problem of geting rid of his ugly and ill-visaged deficits, he again actually claims and expects credit when he proposes to do the very thing he boasted of not doing before, namely, raise the duty again and bleed the consumer more and more. Sir, I think the Finance Minister could give a better explanation to the people of this country as to how he could get rid of the deficit. He could tell the people with a good deal of satisfaction and sound reasoning that instead of again placing duties on sugar and ohter articles and compelling the people to pay duties to make up the deficit, a better way to wipe out the deficits would be to reduce the duties on articles now controlled by the combines. Instead of reducing the duties on sugar, why does he not lower the duty on rope and cordage for the benefit of the fishermen and workingmen? Thus he would take away some of the millions of dollars of profit which the cordage combine is reaping, and leave these millions in the pockets of the consumers. Besides, more money would be taken off the shoulders of the people. The hon. gentleman could also reduce the duties on cotton, and instead of the people paying taxes to the cotton combines, more money would flow into the public treasury and so also relieve the burdens of the consumers. It would be more satisfactory I should imagine to the Minister of Finance, if instead of raising duties to make up these deficits he should on all articles under the control of the combines, reduce them, and thus enable the people to obtain cheaper goods and at the same time have the treasury replenished, and withal keep away that ugly and ill-visaged visitor, whom we have had with us last year and this year and which will be with us next year, the deficit. The Finance Minister could take the people into his confidence, and tell them frankly the cause of his deficits. He could say: There has been for years past a continual leakage in the treasury, by which contractors and others have robbed, swindled and gobbled up the public revenue. He might perhaps say, I had nothing to do with it, it

was a matter beyond my control, but the treasury has been leaking ; in some way the contractors and others have wasted, swindled and taken away millions of the public money, and if this had not taken place it would not have been necessary to come before the people and admit we have a deficit. I will enumerate to the House some of the instances showing how the treasury has been robbed of millions. The Government have thrown away on Tupper's "Dear Onderdonk," $1,118,000 ; on the Tay Canal, familiarly known as "Haggart's Ditch," $476,000 ; on the Caraquet Railway, $224,000 ; on Little Rapids Lock—a useless work which has no traffic and yields no revenue, $124,000 ; on the Galops Rapids Channel, which shipping men will not use, because of its danger, $600,000 ; dredging Wet Basin—contrary to terms of contract, $22,500 ; allowed to be stolen in connection with the Quebec Harbour Commission, over $1,000,000 ; in connection with the Lévis Graving Dock, $139,000 ; the Cross Wall contract, $92,000 ; Esquimalt Graving Dock, $207,000 —this being more than the amount of tender Curran Bridge, over $270,000 ; paid to the "Hard Pan" claimants to which they had no legal right, $272,000 ; Harris Land Job at St. John, $100,000 ; Sheik's Island Dam, $125,000 ; St. Mary's Bridge, Fredericton, principle and interest, $372,000 ; Langevin Block, cost less than $500,000 and for which over $781,000 was paid—$281,000, and there is an outstanding claim of about $250,000 ; wasted, stolen or boodled on the St. Charles Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, $1,500,000. Then there was the Liquor Commission, $70,000, for the purpose of shirking and putting to one side the prohibition question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. $125,000 last year.

Mr. McISAAC. Then there is the Labour Commission, which cost $87,718 ; and for what ? That money was expended in order to find out whether the National Policy was good or bad. We have always been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that it is a great and glorious policy, and yet over $87,000 were expended on the Commission to ascertain whether it was a good or bad policy. These items, not including the outstanding claim for Langevin Block, show an aggregate of over $7,000,000 wasted, boodled or stolen. I have not given all or nearly all the items, but these will be sufficient for the present. I now desire to tell the House what a Minister of the Crown stated not many months ago. The Minister of Militia at Amherst, on 15th January, said :

We have heard a great deal of late about corruption in the Government, and he would like to say a word in this connection. There were three instances generally quoted, namely, the Curran bridge affair, the Caron scandal, and the liberation of Thomas McGreevy. Concerning the first, he said it was a clear case of steal.

That is from a member of the Government, reported in his own organ.

The Government trusted a contractor who was a thief. To-day the Government is at work securing evidence, and besides punishing St. Louis for his theft, it has entered an action for the recovery of the money.

This language was used by a Minister of the Crown, and one of the last Ministers who has entered the Cabinet.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And the last of them that ever will.

Mr. McISAAC. It was stated by this Minister in his own constituency on nomination day. He told the people that the Curran bridge case was a clear steal, and that the contractor was a thief, and he claimed credit for the Government because they were trying to punish that contractor. A few days ago, we had the result of the St. Louis case in the court. Although a Minister of the Crown said he was a thief, and that it was a clear case of steal, yet that contractor has been discharged and found not guilty Therefore, the thief is at large yet. Where is he ? and are the Government going to pursue him any further ? I have shown that over $7,000,000 had been boodled, stolen and swindled. That amount would have wiped off the deficit for this year, and last year, and the anticipated deficit for next year. Would not the waste of this money have been a more truthful explanation to the people of the country of why we have had a deficit this year and last year, and expect to have another next year, than the explanation given by the Government ? The people of the country are now getting so used to the surfeit of scandals that they do not realize what a million of dollars is, because so many millions have been stolen. I propose, Sir, for a moment to illustrate the loss of this enormous amount of money to Canada, this enormous amount of $7,000,000, so that the people will understand what it means. If this amount were divided among the seven provinces of this confederation, it would give each province $1,000,000. If divided among the counties of this Dominion, it would give each county over $32,000. I am going to be a little selfish, now, Sir. I want to illustrate what this $7,000,000 would do for some of the maritime provinces. If it were applied to Prince Edward Island it would have built the great tunnel between that province and the mainland, and there would have been enough left to build the railway extensions required in the island. If it were applied to my own province of Nova Scotia, what would it have accomplished ? As you well know, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many districts in my province clamouring for railways, and I wish to show how many railways this money would have built if it were expended in

Nova Scotia. Supposing the Government applied this money to the province of Nova Scotia to build railways, and that they even allowed $10,000 a mile, how many roads would it build? I shall enumerate: It would build a railway from Yarmouth along the coast line through Shelburne to Lockeport, and thence to Halifax along the southern coast of Nova Scotia. It would further build the following railways:—The Nova Scotia Southern Railway; the Hants Central and the Stewiacke Valley and Lansdowne, and a railway to Musquodoboit. It would build a railway from Sunnybrae or from James River on the Intercolonial Railway to Country Harbour; a railway from Heatherton or Tracadie, in my county, on the Intercolonial Railway to Guysboro'. It would build a railway from Hawkesbury to Louisburg, with branches from St. Peters to Arichat and L'Ardoise. It would build a railway from Hastings to Cheticamp; and from Orangedale to Broad Cove, with a branch to Baddeck. It would have constructed a network of railways throughout the length and breadth of Nova Scotia, and, after doing all that, a large margin would still remain to repair and build breakwaters and piers, and lighthouses on the coast for the benefit of our fishermen. Sir, the protective system as it is operated by the present Government, on the people of this country is like a candle burning at both ends. The people have to pay, either in duties to the treasury or in contributions to the combines. One end of the system is the enormous amount of money taken from the people which never gets into the treasury, but goes into the pockets of the vampire element, the combinesters, who suck the national life-blood of Canada; and the other end of the waste is the continual leakage ever going on from the treasury on account of mismanagement, extravagance and boodling. Let us compare the expenditures during the time that the Liberal Government was in power with the regime of the present Government, and we find this sad state of things well exemplified. In 1877-78, under the Mackenzie Government, our expenditure was $23,503,658, while our opponents then contended that we should do with $22,500,000. Look at the expenditure in 1894 under the present Government, which has reached to the enormous figure of $37,585,025. The public debt of Canada in 1878 was $174,957,268, and in 1894 it has reached the sum of $308,348,023. I believe that the people of this country are becoming alarmed at the enormous magnitude of the combines, that they are becoming disgusted with the power which the combines have in this country, and that they are getting sick and tired of the National Policy. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if it is not especially the case in the maritime provinces, and particularly so in Nova Scotia, that the people are getting tired of it. I hear no one say, "no." Sir, I have made this statement, and I am going to prove it. I will prove that the people of Canada are getting alarmed at the fiscal policy of this Government, and at the magnitude of the illegitimate operations of the combines, and I will prove it on the statement made on the floor of the Assembly of Nova Scotia by a man who is not a Liberal, by a man who is one of the most pronounced Conservative partisans in the province of Nova Scotia, by a man who, for four years led the Opposition in the House of Assembly there, and by a man who, at the time he used the language I shall quote was one of the editors of one of the largest subsidized organs of the Conservative party in the maritime provinces, the "Morning Herald." In the session of 1893 in the Nova Scotia legislature, a Bill was introduced to incorporate the Acadian Sugar Refinery Company, Limited, and on that occasion the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chas. H. Cahan, one of the most pronounced party men in Canada or anywhere, used the language which I shall read to the House. He is not what hon. gentlemen opposite would call a "vicious Grit hungering for office," but he was, at the time, leader of the Conservative Opposition, one of the editors of the "Morning Herald," which always gets more money from the treasury at Ottawa than any other subsidized paper in Nova Scotia. Much as I know it was against his taste, he gave use to these expressions. It is the speech of a Conservative who was basking in the sunshine of the pap which this Government had given his paper for years before, and has given it ever since. Notwithstanding that, he felt that the great majority of his own party, the Conservatives, were getting seriously and dangerously alarmed at the condition of the finances of the country, and by the large combines which are ruining the country. Here are his words, taken from Nova Scotia debates of the House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1893, page 143:

> In regard to this Bill, a number of the corporators were his (Mr. Cahan's) personal friends, and they were men for whom he had the highest esteem; but, notwithstanding that fact, the principle of the Bill was one to which he could not agree.

I think I may correctly say here that some of these personal friends of Mr. Cahan's are sitting in this House to-night, and looking across the floor at me just now. Mr. Cahan further said:

> It was a principle under which it was proposed to consolidate and combine the sugar-refining industries of the maritime provinces. Under this Bill two sugar refineries, which are located in Nova Scotia, might be purchased by this company, and a third, which was outside the province, might be united by this company controlling a major portion of the stock in that refinery. While he believed in giving a fair protection to

an industry of this character, and while he had supported that policy, in another arena of politics, he was not in favour of giving to these corporations legislative facilities for effecting combinations and restraining competition. In so far as this Bill had a principle, it might be stated as facilitating a combination of these interests. He was opposed to it. He looked with the utmost jealousy upon giving these corporations large facilities for effecting combinations. He thought that at the present time Canada was suffering from such combinations, and he believed that, as time went on, whether the country enjoyed a protective tariff or not, it would be necessary for gentlemen assembled in Parliament, representing the interests of the whole people, to throw the utmost possible safeguards around these corporations, in order to protect the public interests. At the same time, if the Nova Scotia sugar refinery, or any other sugar refinery in this province, desired its corporate powers amended, and could show good cause why larger legislative facilities should be given to it to allow it to carry on its industry profitably and so as not to cut down necessary competition, he would support such a measure. But this company, under this Bill, could be organized without a cent of capital. The dangers which had arisen from such legislation could be seen in the neighbouring republic, and similar dangers had arisen in this country. While, on personal grounds, he should desire to facilitate the operations of these corporators, some of whom were his personal friends, he could not forget, while he held a seat in this House, that he did not represent their interests, but came here to represent what he believed to be the interests of the public.

Sir, these are the words uttered by a man whose every sympathy and every prejudice would have led him to say anything but what he did say. As he said himself, those who were promoting that legislation were his personal and political friends; but he had a great struggle in his mind between the interests of his own friends who were promoting this Bill and the fear entertained by Conservatives throughout the province of Nova Scotia, feeling as he did that they were getting restless and discontented on the subject of the combines in this country. He was troubled and wrestled with himself, and to use the words of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) the other night, he strained every nerve to see if he could not vote for the Bill, but it was no use. I believe, Sir, as it is laid down in the platform of the Liberal party:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain;

In these, and in many other ways, it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

That the people deplore the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

Sir, it was upon these issues that I appealed to the electors of my county some few weeks ago; upon these issues and upon these issues alone I asked for their verdict. I assailed the record of scandals of this Government and condemned their fiscal policy, and I asked the electors, if they believed with me, to support me. Our opponents made every effort to dodge and evade the real issues by substituting other and unfair issues; but the electors of that county, as Mr. Cahan said of the people all over this country, became aroused and alarmed at the condition of our public affairs, and the result was that that county, which endorsed the policy of this Government four years ago by 227 majority, reversed that decision on this occasion and condemned their policy by a majority of 118. It was the last occasion on which we have had from the maritime provinces an expression of opinion from the people at the polls, with the result that they condemned in unmeasured terms this Government's record of corruption and scandals and repudiated their fiscal policy, and endorsed unreservedly the great, popular, able and distinguished leader of the Liberal party, and adopted the platform of the Liberal party in its entirety.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the torrent of eloquence which the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) has poured upon us, he gave us one of the strongest arguments which he has been able to use on behalf of his friends and himself, when, referring to a certain gentleman, he said: "this is not a Grit hungry for office." It appeared to me, Sir, that he accepted that attitude as being characteristic of his party—

a Grit hungry for office; and I am not disposed to correct him, because we find that the hope, long deferred, of holding the reins of Government has truly made that definition a fair and proper one. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the people of Canada are alarmed; and I must say, speaking for my own constituency, that there is a certain degree of alarm pervading it; but I find the alarm to be based upon a fear that, in the gropings for a policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have been making for the last few years, they may find something that will be delusive enough to appeal for a time to the majority of this people of this country, and that we may be so unfortunate as to have in this House a majority of hon. gentlemen opposite. But I feel assured that when the next election passes over and the people are relieved from this cause of alarm, the alarm will be quickly dissipated, and they will be quite satisfied again to settle down quietly to business, as we have been going on under the National Policy. Now, the hon. gentleman in the concluding part of his oration, referred to certain public works; and, without going over all the ground he did, I would like to call attention to this weakness in his argument. He takes for granted that the first estimate of the cost of public works ought not to be exceeded, and that, if it is exceeded, the whole amount above the estimate has gone in boodling and robbery. Now, I would like to call his attention to the fact that in the province of Ontario, which is under a Liberal Government, we have recently erected a legislative building, of which the original estimate of the cost was $300,000 or $400,000, and the final cost, $1,250,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not so. The original estimate was not the amount the hon. gentleman says.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think the hon. gentleman is right in his correction. I merely placed the first estimate a little too low; it was about $500,000, while the actual cost was $1,250,000. The hon. gentleman has argued that where a public building costs more than its original estimate, the balance has gone in boodling. If that be the case, the friends of the hon. gentleman, on that one small, public building at Toronto, have boodled to the extent of about $700,000. My mistake, if there be any mistake, is a very slight one, and the hon. gentleman knows it very well. What I say is this: That if the hon. gentleman applied the same argument to all their own public works that he has applied to the necessary public works of this Government, the boodling would have gone up to $20,000,000 or $30,000,000, instead of being so small as $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. He referred to the deficit. It is an old friend of hon. gentlemen on the other side, and I was not surprised that he should refer to it; but it seems strange that in the same breath he should blame us for lopping off the mouldering branches and also for having a deficit. The fact is the hon. gentleman and his friends are very desirous of seeing us cut the tree down altogether, because, should we cut the old National Policy down, instead of lopping off the mouldering branches, we will fail in our duty to the country, and then hon. gentlemen opposite will no longer be hungry for office, but will occupy the places from which we will have been deservedly turned out. The hon. gentleman also referred to the question of reciprocity with the United States. I do not propose to deal with that at any length, but there is this difference between our attitude on that question, and theirs. We have always been in favour of a fair, reasonable reciprocity with the United States, which would not sacrifice the interests of this country. We stand in that position to-day, we have stood in that position for the last twenty years, and we will remain in that position rather than sacrifice the interests of this country to those of another. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen opposite, with their unrestricted reciprocity, were prepared to sacrifice the interests of this country. They were prepared to have reciprocity at any price; they were prepared to break down the barriers on this side, give the Americans control of our tariff, allow them to dictate to us what duties we ought to put upon goods, and, ultimately, drive us into annexation. Another subject which the hon. gentleman has mentioned is free trade as it is practiced in England I must say that we do not yield one iota to hon. gentlemen opposite in our loyalty to the institutions of the mother country. We have forced these hon. gentlemen into a position of loyalty. I say, without any hesitation, that during the last general elections, we heard no word about free trade as it is in England. It is only since hon. gentlemen opposite have found that the people of this country will neither be badgered nor cajoled into supporting any such policy as they have been previously advocating, that they have made up their minds, that, as the Tory party are notorious for their loyalty to the institutions of the old country, the best thing they could do was to copy a leaf out of our book. And so they conceived this policy of free trade as it is in England. I sincerely trust that they will stand to their guns as they have them loaded to-day. We are prepared to meet them on the issue they have laid down—free trade as it is in Great Britain, with a revenue tariff as England provides it. We are prepared to meet them on that issue, and are satisfied that the verdict of the people will be, as it has been heretofore, in favour of the present Government. That policy has been referred to a number of times on both

sides. It was most clearly set forth, I think, in the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking in Winnipeg, on the 3rd September, 1894, where he laid down his policy in the following words—and I take the precaution of quoting from the "Globe," the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite freedom of trade as it is practised in Great Britain. This is the policy we adopt:

> As soon as we shall have a Liberal Administration in Ottawa—and I think we shall have one before very long, although it is not for me to say when—there can be a very radical alteration of affairs looked for. We shall give you freer trade, and, although it will be a hard fight, we shall not give in one inch or retrace our steps until we shall have reached the goal, and that goal is the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day.
>
> To make up the deficit which will arise, it will be necessary to get an addition from some other sources.

That is the policy of the leader of the Opposition, and that is the policy upon which hon. gentlemen opposite are standing to-day—free trade as it exists in England at present, with a revenue tariff as collected in England. This was also laid down by the leader of the Opposition in what was known as the Massey-Hall meeting, Toronto, where he expressed himself as a Liberal of the English school. With all the loyalty we may feel for the institutions of the old country, the means of raising revenue adopted in Great Britain are not at all applicable to this country. This is where we must take one of our greatest issues with hon. gentlemen opposite If we adopt the policy of free trade as it exists in England, then we adopt the means which Great Britain takes of raising a revenue. The one part of the policy involves the other. That is what the leader of the Opposition, I take it, meant when he said at Winnipeg that to make up the deficit it will be necessary to get an addition from other sources. Now, they have never gone into detail, and it is only fair to the country that we should be taken more into the confidence of the hon. gentlemen. When they profess they have a panacea for the alleged woes of this country, they ought to give it out to the country; they ought to scatter it far and wide: they ought not to deal in generalities, but should come down to the practical details so that every constituency in the country will be able to see and understand. They have not done so because the question of revenue is an exceedingly ugly one. They talk about their economies, they talk one thing and another, but they all know that they have to raise a revenue. They know that the affairs of this country cannot be carried on without a revenue. We have already fixed charges upon our revenue amounting to $16,000,000 a year, or thereabouts, and they would have from $18,000,000 to $20,000,000 to work upon. In all their propositions of economy, they do not propose to economize to the extent of more than a million or two; and even if they did that, they would still have a revenue of $35,000,000 to raise. This must be obtained, according to the proposition of the hon. gentleman, in the same way that revenue is raised in Great Britain, and I presume it can hardly be raised in any other way. We give the British people, and I think, rightly, credit for a great deal of discretion and business judgment, and it is quite impossible to conceive that they would not have the best possible way of collecting revenue under the free trade system which they have adopted. But I ask the question: Is the British method of raising revenue possible in Canada? And I answer it in this way: We will find, even upon the most superficial analysis of revenue, as it is raised in Great Britain, that it would be simply an impossibility for us to raise revenue in the same manner in this country, because we would be robbing every municipality and every province in the Dominion of a large proportion of their present revenue, and we would place on the people a burden of direct taxation which they could not possibly bear. Now, the items of the British revenue are not very numerous, and I would just like to refer to them for the purpose of calling the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the position in which their own policy places them. The revenue derived in the mother country during the years 1893-94 amounted to £90,375,000. This revenue was derived from customs, excise, stamp and land tax, house duty, property and income tax, post office, telegraph service, crown lands, and miscellaneous items of revenue. It is not proposed by the hon. gentleman to abandon altogether the customs revenue; and I presume that if they adopt free trade as it is in England, as one of the hon. gentlemen said the other night, they would not be bound by the veriest details or revenue as it is in the old country. At the same time, we must assume that they are substantially bound by the principles of raising the public revenue, and the main items of that system in use in the old country. For instance, we place a tax upon carriages. But the hon. gentleman cannot adopt that tax and yet have free trade as it is in Great Britain, because there is no tax on carriages in that country. So I might go on with a long list of items to show that hon. gentlemen must practically adopt, on the whole, the tariff of revenue as it is in Great Britain if they are to adopt, as the leader of the Opposition says, free trade as it is in England to-day. The customs revenue in Great Britain is raised from beer, chicory, cocoa, coffee, currants, raisins, spirits, tea, tobacco, snuff and wine. Now, the hon. gentlemen pretend that they are going to take the duties off the necessaries of life. That is one of the sprats they offer to the electors in this country,

that they are going to throw off the duties upon the necessaries of life. But if they adopt the tariff of Great Britain, they must put an enormous tax upon tea and coffee, which come free into this country to-day, but the customs tax upon which in Great Britain is $17,250,000 a year. Then, there is the item of excise. The excise collections are on beer, spirits, chicory, coffee, tobacco, and railway duties. And, coming to the railway duty, we come to see one of the first items in which they would interfere with the taxes and the duties that are levied by our municipalities. Now, in the various cities where the electric railways are being organized and carried on, a percentage from the receipts of these railways is becoming one of the sources of civic revenue. Hon. gentlemen would propose to transfer that revenue from the municipalities to themselves. Then there are the license duties in Great Britain. The brewers, distillers and rectifiers, tobacco manufacturers, patent medicines, beer and wine dealers, spirit dealers, publicans, wine and spirits, refreshment houses, tobacco dealers, dog, gun, game, male servants, carriages, plate dealers, and others, are subject to these duties. Now, what I have to say with regard to that, is this—that with us the great proportion of these, where they are taxed at all at the present time, are taxed for local purposes; and if the hon. gentlemen propose to put a tax on them, it must be either by taking the taxes from the municipalities or the provinces and appropriating them to themselves, or by placing an additional tax upon the people of this country. It is for them to say in what way this is to be done. For instance, we take the matter of licenses. Our province of Ontario, at the present time, has an income of over $200,000 from licenses, and if this is taken from them, and if the large revenue which the province of Quebec obtains from the same source is to be taken from that province, there will be a great outcry against the change. But it is needless, and would be wasting the time of the House to go through all these items. It is sufficient for my general purpose to show that nearly all of these are taxes collected now by the municipalities or the provinces. Take under the head of what is called the death duty, property duty, estate duty, duty on realty, and the duty on personality. All these taxes are now collected here by the provinces, so far as they are collected at all. We have recently established in Ontario a system of estates duties, and a large revenue has already begun to be derived from it. I presume that what hon. gentlemen mean is that they would sweep this source of revenue from the province and appropriate it to themselves. But, Sir, one of the most serious elements in their position would be what is known as the land tax and house duty and income tax. Sir, we all have a good deal of taxes to pay at the present time. The taxes in the old country which are collected by the Imperial Government are collected, in the first place, as a land tax on lands and tenements, and also in what is known as the inhabited house duty. Are the hon. gentlemen going to take these from the municipalities of Canada and appropriate them to themselves? That is a question, I think, the people of this country will ask them very seriously. If they are going to raise the revenue as it is raised in England, do they propose to take from us our municipal taxes, or are they going to propose an additional burden of taxation beyond what we already bear? If they do they place themselves in a position of antagonism to the people of the country. If they will go into details of their policy and show the country what they mean——

Mr. MONTAGUE. They will never have the chance.

Mr. STEVENSON. They don't mean what they say.

Mr. COATSWORTH. An hon. gentleman says they do not mean what they say. I am inclined to think that he means what he says when he says that. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite are to be taken seriously. I do not think they seriously intend to upset all the existing institutions of this country, and to impose upon this country taxes which have never been heard of heretofore and which I trust will never be heard of for centuries to come. Now, take the income tax. There is an income tax imposed already in municipalities. We have a large revenue from that in my own constituency in Toronto. Do the hon. gentlemen propose to take that income tax from us? If so, there will be the same representation from Toronto as there has been for years past—all on this side of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I might dwell somewhat upon the stamp duties if I did not feel some hesitation about taking up the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. COATSWORTH. We find the stamp duty has become something terrible in the old country. You can hardly carry out the smallest transaction there without coming under the imposition of the stamp duty. I would like to read, for the benefit of the House, a few lines from a letter I received from a friend, a gentleman whom I believe to be a Liberal, though I will not pledge my word to that, who spent many years in this country, and two or three years ago returned to the old country, the place of his birth, so that he might spend his declining years there. He writes me about the British trade policy and its applicability to this country:

And supposing she is to a large extent a free trade country, does that lessen the burden of taxation to her citizens, or subjects, as they like

to call themselves. The excise taxes are enormous, the stamp, which pervades almost every department and every transaction here from the huxter's shop to the Court of Chancery, is something dreadful. You can scarcely carry out any transaction, except the very pettiest, without the presence of the stamp. In law proceedings the cost on this account alone is frightful. The death duties are simply confiscation, the income tax, which is not to be evaded, is a government and not a municipal tax, is 8d. in the pound, and applies to every cent you receive as interest or otherwise. So I could go on to endeavour to show that the prodigious revenue of England has to be paid by methods far more galling and exasperating than if to a large extent collected from customs, while the expenditure is prodigal in everything that goes to sustain caste, beyond that of any other country. The "Globe's" picture of free trade England is a very different affair from the actual one.

That, Sir, is the experience of a returned Canadian. Now, with reference to the economy that hon. gentlemen propose to practice, I would like to say a few words before I sit down. They say they propose to economize the public expenditure. Now, there are three or four things that go to prove that they will not and cannot economize in public expenditure. In the first place, we have to be governed in our judgment of them to a large extent by their former performances. When they were a few years in power, they ran up the expenditure at once several millions, and I claim they would do the same thing again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You had better look at the figures.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think the hon. gentleman has looked at the figures until his eyes are sore, and I do not think he has changed them any. The hon. gentleman knows that the figures increased very largely and I think he feels they would be bound to increase again. In the next place, we must remember that their friends the Liberal provincial governments recently met in an inter-provincial conference and demanded additional subsidies; so that the moment hon. gentlemen get into power there would be a general demand from all the Liberal provincial governments for increased subsidies, a demand which, I believe, in view of the aid and assistance that these Liberal governments are preparing to give them, would be almost if not entirely irresistible. In fact, it is said that the hon. gentlemen opposite, before the last election, were committed to the increase of the provincial subsidies in case of their success at the polls. In the next place, if I might use again the expression of my hon. friend who preceded me, they have the hungry Grit to reckon with; and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that individual is not confined to any particular place in Canada. He may be found all over the country, and there would be a demand for place and position such as led the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to state, in that remarkable letter, that during his Administration he had literally to stand by the door of the treasury with a loaded revolver in his hand to keep his friends from robbing it. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have the same demand for place and position, and there would be a far greater number of men demanding to fill those places, so that I feel assured that hon. gentlemen opposite, even with the best intentions, would be quite unable to resist that demand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Humanity has kept away the revolver for the past eight or ten years.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes, and the leader of the Opposition says they will be able to resist.

Mr. LAURIER. No; I said the men in power resisted very well.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes, and the hon. gentleman would be able to resist by keeping out of power. Then we have the example of the provincial Liberal governments. They have not been very economical; in fact, I believe that in Ontario the provincial government has been rather an extravagant one. I might refer to a good many items of expenditure which characterize that government, but I will simply mention one, because it is an illustration that comes home to us in this House. In the Ontario house they have 66 sessional clerks, while we have only 37 here. That shows how economical they would be; and I think if hon. gentlemen have the good fortune to get into power, and the country had the misfortune to see them in power, we would see the same thing pervading the whole system, and a Liberal Government would enter upon an era of extravagance such as we have never known in Canada before. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to talk about the extravagance of this Government; we would have the same thing repeated that we had in 1874, the expenditure of the country would go up to 40 or 45 millions, and there would be deficits every year. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country are too well informed to think for one moment of allowing hon. gentlemen opposite to get into power.

Mr. PERRY. I desire to say a few words upon this all important question. We are discussing the ways and means by which the people may be taxed in order to keep up the expenditure and extravagance of the present Government, and it is a question which our constituents expect us to consider carefully. I intend to devote a few of my remarks to the speech delivered the other evening by my hon. friend from the county of King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald). He was good enough to say the other evening that the farmers of Canada, and more especially the farmers of Prince Edward Island, had protection under the National Policy. Well, I fail to see how they are protected, in fact, I think he must fail himself. We find that

the farmers of the Dominion are taxed more in the articles they consume under the present duties, than any other class in the country. We find that carriages are taxed 31 per cent; manufactures of cotton are taxed 28 per cent. No doubt the poorer classes of people use cotton. Earthenware is taxed 33 per cent; manufactures of flax, hemp and jute, 22 per cent; manufactures of glass, 26 per cent. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will say that these are luxuries, that poor people can do without them. Hats and caps are taxed 30 per cent; manufactures of iron and steel, 28 per cent; musical instruments, 27 per cent. I suppose my hon. friend would say also that musical instruments are luxuries. Paper and manufactures of, including wall paper, 33 per cent. I suppose he would deny the propriety of a poor farmer having a little paper on the wall of his house. Provisions, 36 per cent; soaps, 54 per cent. Well, now, it is a wonderful thing to see such a high duty on soaps, for I was under the impression that it would require a great deal of soap to wash away the political sins of hon. gentlemen opposite, and therefore soap ought to come in duty free. Champagne, 54 per cent. Champagne is used by the richer class of people, at these great state dinners, and it is only taxed 54 per cent, while kerosene oil that is used by every poor family in the country, is taxed about 160 per cent. Is that the protection that hon. gentlemen opposite intend to give to the farmer? You tax the farmers 150 per cent more for the articles they use, than you tax the richer class of people upon their champagne wine. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from King's, P.E.I., endeavoured to show that it was good policy to populate the cities of Canada and to depopulate the rural districts. My version of that is that it is robbing Peter to pay Paul. That does not increase the population of a country, and no country is worth anything unless it has population. We have seen in Canada the effect of overcrowding cities and depopulating the rural districts. In Montreal, not quite a year ago, many people were starving, thousands of men waited on the mayor and asked him for work or bread, and soup kitchens had to be brought into requisition. The same conditions of things existed in Toronto and other cities. That is one of the results of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite as enunciated by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald). It would be much better if many of the people now in the cities were settled in the country districts and became producers, tillers of the soil, for then they would not only produce, but they would also consume goods brought into the country and would help to provide a revenue. The hon. member for King's also told the House how prosperous we were. He said that when the present Government came into power we had no continental railway and no Sault Canal and certain other public works. One hundred millions has been spent on building the Canadian Pacific Railway, which meant so much money given to the company; but what benefit has it been to the people of Prince Edward Island or to the people of King's County? I thought when the hon. member was alluding to public works he would announce to the House that the Government had determined to build the Southern Railway Branch in the Island. Meetings were held which the hon. gentleman attended and at which he made strong speeches, and at which a member of the Cabinet for the island also attended and made great promises and held out great inducements; but we must remember that this was done when the country considered it was on the eve of a general election. The hon. member was silent on that point when addressing the House; he did not state whether the Government were going on with the surveys, or whether they were going to place a vote in the Supplementary Estimates. When at home the hon. gentleman, addressing his constituents, tells the people there, for election purposes of course, that the Government are going to build the southern branch; but when he comes here his masters tell him to hold his tongue on that subject and not to say a word until after the election, and that then if successful—which I doubt very much—they will build that branch. The hon. gentleman, I say, was silent, and no doubt it was the best course for him to pursue, because I am well aware that, although the hon. gentleman and his colleagues accompanied a delegation from the east end of the island when they waited on the Cabinet Ministers with respect to this great question, the Government made no promises, not even that they would take the matter up on a future occasion, and although the members of the deputation came here expecting from the promises made by the Cabinet Minister for the island that their request would be entertained, they went away fully satisfied that the Government had determined to do nothing. If we are to judge the future by the past, it was the only natural conclusion to which we could arrive. Look at the great work of the tunnel from the island to the mainland, which has been a subject of agitation for ten years. In 1891 we were so near securing its accomplishment that we expected to have that great public work commenced at an early date, and everybody thought it would be an accomplished fact in a comparatively short time. What has become of it? Just what is going to become of the project connected with the Southern Railway Branch, so long as its construction is left in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. So much for the promises of the Government. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), further stated that goods were cheaper under the National Policy than they had been under a tariff for revenue

purposes. If the principle is correct, why not add a little more duty, and instead of 30 per cent increase the duties to 40 or 50 per cent? I admit that goods are cheaper to-day than they were twenty or forty or fifty years ago. But what are the reasons? One reason is that the facilities for manufacturing are much greater than they were at that time; labour perhaps is cheaper, raw material is cheaper, and the great cause and the almost only cause is that free trade England is now supplying the whole world, wherever her manufactured articles are carried, cheaper than any country that has protected manufacturing industries. Sir, we find that in 1874 England exported 220,599,074 yards of cotton yarns, worth £14,516,093 sterling, while in 1884 she exported 271,077,900 yards, and that quality only realized £13,811,767. Therefore, the same class of goods sold 18d. cheaper in 1884 than they sold in 1874. Now, in the year 1894, England exported 236,198,500 yards, which only realized £9,289,078 sterling, or 12·8 per cent cheaper than in the year 1884. That shows conclusively that free trade England can afford to manufacture and sell her manufactured goods cheaper than any country in the world. English goods are getting cheaper every year, and if goods are selling cheaper to-day in Canada, it is not because of the effects of the National Policy, but because our home-made articles have to compete with the goods manufactured in free trade England. Supposing that there were free trade between Canada and England now, and supposing English goods came in here free of duty, why, Sir, it is an undoubted fact that they would sell at from 25 to 40 per cent cheaper than they do now. However, I am not advocating a policy of allowing goods to come in here from foreign countries free of duty. I am well aware that a revenue has to be made up, and although the Liberal party is accused of being ready to wipe away the customs duties altogether, and to have recourse to direct taxation, I may say, Sir, that that is a false accusation, and I maintain that it was never the intention of the Liberal party to endeavour to carry out such a principle. Now, with reference to cotton fabrics. In 1874 England exported 4,417,481,000 yards which only realized £51,000,000 sterling, or 20·2 per cent cheaper than they sold for in 1874. In 1894 she exported 5,312,753,900 yards, which sold for £50,223,291, or 20½ per cent less than they realized in 1884. That shows that these articles are now being manufactured and that they are selling in England at from 25 to 30 per cent cheaper than they were selling twenty years ago, and that is the reason why the goods manufactured in Canada have to sell to-day at a correspondingly reduced price. Articles of iron and steel manufacture are just in the same category, and their comparatively lower price is regulated by the price in free trade England. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the great things they have done. They boast of our great North-west Territories. Well, ten or fifteen years ago we had some great expectations from the North-west, but where are they now? We believed then that the North-west was going to receive fifteen or twenty million people in ten years. We believed that it was going to be a home for the surplus population of some of the lower provinces, and we believed that we were going to receive a good revenue from it. These great prophets on the opposite benches told us all about that. I remember when Sir Charles Tupper made the statement from his seat in this House, that in 1892, Canada would have $70,000,000 in its treasury as the proceeds of the sale of lands in the North-west. He told us that without a blush; and although we all know that he was apt to stretch things, yet this was one of his greatest exaggerations. If I asked the Finance Minister how much he has to-day as a surplus from the lands of the North-west his answer would be that Canada is paying $150,000 a year more for the management of the North-west lands than the yearly revenue derived from them. We are told to-day that the railway companies—that is if they succeed, and no doubt they will, if they press hard enough—we are told that the railway companies want the Government to take their lands off their hands, and pay them a stipulated price per acre. Are the Government prepared to do that? We will see. My hon. friend from King's County (Mr. Macdonald)) stated that the labourers, the artisans, and the farmers were better off under a protective system. He told us that the farmers' market for pork, beef, oats, and barley, was better than it would be if the farmers were not protected under the National Policy. He did not mention mackerel, because he had not the hardihood to do that. I hold that that argument of the hon. gentleman will not bear investigation, because we are not importers of pork, or beef, or mackerel or horses or sheep, or potatoes, or eggs. We have all these articles in abundance, and to sell, and I contend that although these articles are protected by the National Policy, yet that has nothing to do whatever with keeping up their prices. Although it may happen that pork in the barrel is something cheaper in Chicago than it is in Toronto, yet that does not go to prove that the Prince Edward Island pork, or the Canadian pork, as a general rule, will always carry the same price. A quantity of American pork is imported into Canada, which is used by lumbermen, but the Prince Edward Island pork, or the Canadian pork, as a general rule, can never be superseded by the American pork. The hon. gentleman also said that free trade

with the United States could never be carried out, and if carried out, it would be of no service to the people of Canada. Now, the following table shows that in certain articles our exports to the United States are more than our exports to all the rest of the world. The figures are for the year 1893 :—

——	United States.	All other countries.
	$	$
Products of the mine....	4,756,280	573,610
Products of the forest...	13,859,960	12,499,950
Fresh-water fish and salt-water fish, fresh.....	1,287,822	4,642
Horses	1,123,339	337,818
Swine	130,093	15,997
Sheep	1,088,814	159,041
Poultry	52,114	9,013
Bones	58,444	10,282
Hides	385,246	7,122
Sheep pelts	66,939	16
Wool	228,030	281
Flax	124,082	.....
Berries	96,104	115
Fruit, N.E.S.	24,646	1,114
Barley	638,271	306,084
Beans	351,058	4,624
Hay	854,958	597,914
Straw	25,117	932
Maple sugar	48,174	1,477
Trees, shrubs and plants.	11,969	232
Potatoes	259,176	162,782
Vegetables	105,836	10,404
Other articles.....	27,096	1,577
Fertilizers	7,706	.....
Furs	6,664	2,103
Grindstones	24,754	948
Gypsum	27,091	2,366
Household effects.....	1,246,085	37,081
Lime	97,898	8,207
Barrels	10,631	6,297
Household furniture.....	123,872	50,749
Wood pulp.....	424,253	1,640
Other manufactures.....	249,752	117,727
Bullion	309,459	.....
	28,132,233	14,932,145

Mr. AMYOT. Will the hon. gentleman say what he is reading from ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PERRY. If the hon. gentleman will have a little patience, he can speak after I am done. If he does not understand, I will speak to him in French.

Mr. AMYOT. I only wanted to know from what the hon. gentleman is reading. Is he ashamed of his book ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend has a perfect right to inquire, as he has done, what the hon. gentleman is quoting from, and I do not see that there can be any objection on the part of the hon. gentleman to say what he is quoting from.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend can take care of his own case.

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. HAZEN). It would seem to me, unless the speaker is willing to be interrupted, that the question cannot be raised.

Mr. PERRY. I am quoting from the blue-book—le livre bleu—which I got under the immediate supervision of the hon. Postmaster General. Hon. gentlemen opposite have the political impudence to say that we ought not to have free trade with the United States. It is true, in 1891, they went through the sham of opening negotiations ; at all events, they told the people at large that they had opened negotiations for trade with the United States on a certain basis. That was a short time before the general elections—they must always have such things to do service for them in the elections ; and they knew perfectly well that nothing would captivate the minds of the people of this country to a greater extent than the promise of free trade with the United States. On that they dissolved Parliament and went to the country on that and that alone. They carried the elections ; and in less than a month after, a flat denial was given to their statement by Mr. Blaine. He told them they were liars—that nothing of the kind had ever taken place, nor could take place on the basis offered by the Government of Sir John Macdonald. I have no doubt that they may have some other promise previous to the next elections, which must be soon—or perhaps they may hold on to the very last day before they issue the writs ; because they are trembling in their boots, and they are not scrupulous as to the statements they make. They are willing to make any sort of statements for political purposes.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. PERRY. It is order. I know it does not suit the hon. gentleman, but it is the fact. Now, Sir, for the information of hon. gentlemen I will read Mr. Blake's letter. It is dated Washington, 29th January, 1891. Now, that was very near the eve of that general election. You will all remember that the writs were issued some time in February, and the election took place on the 5th March. Mr. Blaine wrote to Mr. Baker :

> I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be sure that no scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this Government. I know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper coming to Washington. J. G. BLAINE.

This was a direct contradiction of the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper and hon. gentlemen opposite. They rode that horse out for election purposes and they got into power on its back, but no sooner did they

get into office than they allowed the poor old animal to go and graze for itself. They did not need him any longer, they allowed him to die, and to-day we do not hear a word from them about reciprocity with the United States. The Government and their supporters do not tell us that they are going to open up negotiations with the United States. Every one in this House knows well that the United States are prepared to-day to entertain an offer from Canada of reciprocity upon certain lines. The idea of asking the United States to reciprocate in trade relations with Canada, on the same basis as the treaty of 1854, is preposterous. We know very well that that would be a one-sided policy. The American people have told us: you want to open a trade with the United States for your products, but we cannot reciprocate; you do not want the corresponding article. Admit, however, a certain line of manufactured articles as mentioned in the schedule, and we are prepared to meet you. These manufactured articles the present Government would not admit duty free. Why? Because it would starve the monopolists, because it would destroy the opportunity of obtaining money for elections. We know very well that the manufacturers, the monopolists, are to-day the masters. We know that last year, when the Minister of Finance was introducing his tariff, which was certainly an amelioration upon the old one, the very next day we found these corridors thronged with delegations waiting upon him in order to urge him to reconsider the tariff. In fact he had to reconsider it. He called them clerical errors, but the clerical errors all turned out to be in favour of the monopolists and the manufacturers and against the consumer, which goes to show that the manufacturers are the masters of the Government, and that the Government are not at liberty to act in the manner which they know would be for the welfare of the people. Now, millions have been spent in the North-west, and millions are still being spent on different parts of Canada. We find railways subsidized here and there, and canals being built, such as the Tay Canal and the Curran Bridge, and we find money spent by the millions everywhere except in the lower provinces. Look at Prince Edward Island. About $150,000,000 have been expended on public works in Canada since 1873, the year that Prince Edward Island entered confederation, and show me how much of that has been expended in Prince Edward Island. Why, the fortieth part of that is the legitimate share which the people of the island have to pay; and if our net debt is $250,000,000, at least, representing $50 per head, man, woman and child, make up the interest at 4 per cent, and you will see what the people of the island have to pay. And yet, they are refused even a special train from Summerside to Tignish. When the Government were asked to build up a branch railway they are refused. I do not believe they have been asked; I believe that the hon. member for King's County (Mr. Macdonald) is too much afraid of the Government to ask them for a cent. I believe he insinuated in the King's County that the Government would build it if only he were elected, and if the people would only elect Mr. Martin against Mr. Welsh and Dr. Jenkins against the senior member for King's County. But when these gentlemen came here, they had not firmness enough to tell the Government that they must build it. Having expended so much money in other parts of Canada—the money of Prince Edward Island as well—is it not time for the Government to think of doing justice to the people of the island. It is now ten years since the agitation began for the building of the tunnel. We know that it has done service in two elections, and the Government expect it will do service at one more. However, I doubt that very much. I have been told to-day that the Government have made up their minds to give up the idea of building the tunnel. I would like to know if that is the case. I am told they have also given up the idea of subsidizing the ferry, and also that they are going to enter into a contract with a certain gentleman to open up a ferry in the winter between Cape Traverse and Tormentine. Is that the case? We were told about a month ago by the Minister of Finance that it was intended to bore holes again this summer across the strait. The weather was so stormy in 1893-94 that they could not bore one hole, and if we can judge of the coming summer by the weather now, I am afraid it will be so stormy that they will not have the opportunity afforded of boring even one hole. But if they are determined to give up the building of the tunnel, I ask these gentlemen to resign and pay the island $150,000 or $200,000 per year for the number of years during which they have failed to carry out the sacred terms of confederation. It is time that the Government should begin to pay its debts. I saw the other day in a paper published in Toronto, the "Mail and Empire," in which it was stated that unless the tunnel were built, the people of the island were going to rebel. I deny that I ever made such a statement. I said that the people of the island were badly used and robbed of their rights, and that the Government had better not push them too far—that they were independent, that although small they were a strong, intelligent people, and just as worthy of an expenditure as the people of British Columbia. And I think they were as worthy of having a few thousand dollars spent there as the people of British Columbia were. I repudiate and deny the statement that this was said merely for an election dodge. Why, Sir, this was sent out broadcast. I do not know

how many copies were sent, perhaps by direction of the Government for all I know, down in my own county trying to make out that the senior member for Prince County is disloyal and is trying to breed dissension. They think it is time to put down the senior member for Prince County. But, I made no such statement. I say we are loyal in Prince Edward Island. We know how to be loyal, how to be decent; and how to do justice to other people—not like the Government. We are proud of being Canadians and we are Canadians first and perhaps French, English, Irish or Scotch next. I deny, and I throw back in the face of the Government paper the statements made against me. I suppose that this must have been inspired here in order to get it into that paper. It is a shame that such things should be. I wanted to bring the matter up the other day but I was not allowed. But I have now an opportunity of denying the charge, the foul charge made against me by that paper, and I say again that I hold the Government responsible, because it is well known to be a Government paper. If I am so much in the way, why do they not send down their thousands and half millions and try to drive me out? They have tried it on several occasions but they have not succeeded. They have tried their bribes, even by thousands. But, Sir, I cannot be bribed. The Liberal blood is in my veins and will be, I hope, while I live. Let them try their hands at the next election whenever it comes. I defy them. The people of Prince County know how to appreciate honesty, industry, and fair-play. The great majority of them are Protestants, but they never ask me whether I am French or English, Catholic or Protestant, but they are glad to have as their representative a man they can depend upon, a man who will not be bribed. I doubt if I could say as much for several of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I believe if they got the chance they would very soon take it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Order.

Mr. PERRY (P.E.I.) I know this does not suit some hon. gentlemen, but I cannot help it. If the hon. gentleman is tired of my talking English, I may try to administer to him a dose in the French language. Perhaps that will do him better. Now, we will see what the farmers are taxed. On agricultural implements, including shovels and spades, 50 per cent per dozen, and 25 per cent. Now, every poor farmer must have a spade and a shovel. Axle grease is taxed 25 per cent. The grease that goes to grease the poor man's truck, wagon and cart, while the rich man who can afford to drive fine buggies will use sweet oil, or something of that kind. Bags or sacks of hemp, linen, or jute, and cotton seamless bags are taxed 20 per cent. Bags, cotton, made by the needle 32½ per cent. Did you ever hear the like of that before Bags, paper, printed or plain, 25 per cent. Who uses these? Members of the Cabinet? No; but the poor people. Baking powder, 6 cents per pound. Barbed wire fencing of iron or steel ¾ cent per pound. Binder twine 12½ cents per pound. Blankets 5 cents per pound and 25 per cent. Now, the poor people cannot very well do without these blankets. And a coarser class of blankets will weigh twice as much as the finer kind, so the tax upon the blankets used by the richer class is at a less rate than that used by the poor. Look at the discrimination in this part of the tariff as against the poor man in favour of the rich. And yet my hon. friend from King's County, P.E.I., (Mr. Macdonald), says the farmer pays nothing. Bolts, nuts and washers (iron and steel) 1 cent per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem. The farmer uses all these things. Bolts, nuts and washers (iron or steel, less than ⅜-inch in diameter) 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent, but not less than 35 per cent. Boots and shoes (leather) 25 per cent. I am sure the poor people must have boots and shoes. Braces or suspenders, 35 per cent. What keeps up the poor man's pants? He is taxed 35 per cent. Do they expect him to go without these braces? Brass nails, rivets, screws, &c., 30 per cent. Who uses these, if not the poor people? Brushes, 30 per cent. I suppose the Finance Minister will say these are a luxury. But the poor people require brushes and soap and a good deal of it. Buckles, iron or steel 27½ per cent. Brass, 30 per cent. Builders' hardware, 32½ per cent. The poor man who wants to buy a lock or a latch for his door must pay this heavy duty. Candy and confectionery, 35 per cent. Caps and hats, fur, 25 per cent. The poor man's cap or hat is taxed. Carpets, two-ply and three-ply, ingrain, whose warp is wholly composed of cotton or other material than wool, worsted, hair of alpaca goat or like animals, 3 cents per square yard and 25 per cent. Oh, dear! And yet we are told that the tariff has been changed in favour of the poor man. Carpets, other than above, 30 per cent. Carriages, buggies, pleasure carts and similar veichles (not elsewhere specified costing not more than $50, $5 each, and 25 per cent; costing more than $50, 35 per cent. Now, you will see, Mr. Speaker, how the carriages that are used by the poorer classes of the people are charged more than the rich man's buggy. Carriages: Farm and freight wagons, carts, drays and similar vehicles, 25 per cent. Last year the whole was down to 25 per cent, but through a clerical error, I suppose, it was put up. Chains, trace, tug and halter, 32½ per cent. How is the poor farmer going to plough without chains? How is he going to work his farm? The farmer is charged 32½ per cent for the chain he uses in working his farm, and the rich man is charged very little more upon the champagne he drinks to have a good time and make him have the appearance of a gentleman.

Then we find lamp chimneys, 30 per cent; churns, wood, 20 per cent; china and porcelain ware, 30 per cent; clothes wringers, 25 per cent; cordage, 1¼ cents per pound, and 10 per cent. Now, this revenue which they collect upon cordage does not actually go into the treasury, because we import no cordage. We have two or three cordage industries amalgamated into one; they are able to manufacture all the country needs, and being protected by a high duty of 1½ or 2 cents per pound, no person can import it. We give the manufacturer of that cordage the benefit of the duty, which does not go into the treasury, but goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. Collars, cotton and linen, 24 cents per dozen, and 25 per cent. Now, will the Minister tell me that the poor people do not wear collars or cuffs? Cuffs, 4 cents per pair, and 25 per cent; cultivators, 32½ per cent; curry combs, 32½ per cent—for the curry comb that curry the old horses that hon. gentlemen opposite were riding a few years ago. Table cutlery, not plated, 32½ per cent; duck, cotton, printed, dyed or coloured, 30 per cent; earthenware, 35 per cent; drain tiles, 20 per cent; edged tools, 35 per cent; fanning mills, 35 per cent; flour, 75 cents per barrel. I am afraid we shall have to ask the Government to take the duty off flour. Barbed wire fencing, iron or steel, ¾ per cent per pound; flags, cotton or bunting, 30 per cent. Just fancy a tax of 30 per cent on the old flag. Now, if I had my way I would admit that duty free, but these disloyal hon. gentlemen opposite tax the old flag. Mirrors, 27½ to 32 per cent. Well, I suppose poor people must do without mirrors. Grindstones, 25 per cent; hammers, 25 per cent. Now, we can see from these items what sort of protection the poor farmers are getting under this National Policy. To speak seriously, we must admit that it is high time a change should take place. It is high time that these hon. gentlemen, if they intend to hold on to the reins of Government much longer, should begin to show by their actions that they intend to legislate for the welfare of the people at large. The policy of this Government tends to make 10 per cent of the population millionaires, and to starve the other 90 per cent. Sir, what proportion of the population of this country are the manufacturers compared with the farmers, the workingmen, and the artisans? They are just about 10 per cent as compared with 90 per cent, and the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to benefit the 10 per cent at the expense of the 90. It is time the people should understand these things, and I believe they do understand them. I believe the people are only waiting for the year, for the month, for the week, for the day, for the hour, when they will have an opportunity of going to the polls and sending these gentlemen into the shades of oblivion. Sir, I believe the people are beginning to see that this Government have been squandering millions of their hard-earned money. How hon. gentlemen opposite can afford to look hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in the face, and stand these charges without ever a blush, is what I cannot understand. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) referred to Mr. Mackenzie's letter wherein that gentleman said that he was bound to protect the treasury. He meant by that, I suppose, that he was bound to see that every dollar extracted from the people in the shape of taxes, was properly expended for the legitimate interests of the country. And, Sir when he left office he had protected the treasury, he had saved the treasury. But unfortunately for this country, so many boodlers subsequently came around that they took all there was in the treasury, and taxed the people 75 per cent more than they were taxed under the Mackenzie regime. And what is the result of all their taxation? Why, Sir, last year they had over a million dollars deficit, and this year they have five million. It was hard dragging it out of the Minister of Finance, he called it four and a half, but I call it five; and I am afraid that before the next session it will be six millions. What kind of a showing is that? Notwithstanding that we are taxed at the rate of $40,000,000 a year, in place of the $23,500,000 in 1878-79, notwithstanding all that, we have an expenditure over estimates of more than a million dollars, with a deficit of over five millions. What is the reason of this deficit? Will hon. gentlemen tell me that there has been a war during the last year? Were there any great public works? Was the Canadian Pacific Railway building? Was the tunnel building? Was the Southern Branch Railway building in Prince Edward Island? How can they account for the mismanagement which has produced a deficit of five or six millions? During the last year the national debt of this country has increased over seven million dollars, if you can rely upon the blue-book. Take up the Auditor General's Report, and what do you find? You can hardly turn two pages, one after another, but you find war between the Government and the Auditor General. The Auditor General refuses to pay certain accounts. How is he prepared to pay that $2,500,000 which the Government have passed an Order in Council to give as a bonus to the Hudson Bay Railway Company? How are they going to get over that? They expect to get a vote from this House to back up their Order in Council. Will they get it? I am sure they won't get it on this side of the House; if they do, I will leave my party, I will not belong to them one minute longer. This is the way things are mismanaged, this is the way things are muddled, and no wonder the deficit is there. No wonder the debt has increased over seven millions during the last year. One would think that, within the

last ten years, having had no rebellion, having had good crops, having had good times, and a high tariff, the Government would have wiped out 50 or 100 millions of the national debt. Instead of that the debt has increased alarmingly, and I speak for the majority of the people of this country when I say that it is high time to put an end to this mismanagement of our affairs. It is time this country were administered honestly, not for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, but for the general welfare of the people at large. Sir, the people are not asleep, the people are not ignorant, and they cannot be bamboozled much longer by the sophistry of the Conservative party.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will be glad to learn that at this stage of the debate it is not my intention to inflict a long speech on the House. It is very interesting, I am sure, to myself and to many older members of the House to listen to a discussion on the National Policy. It is true the National Policy has been established as a compromise between the various interests and industries in the Dominion. In 1867, at the outset of confederation, the tariff on goods imported into Canada was 20 per cent, in New Brunswick, the tariff was 15 per cent; in Nova Scotia, 10 per cent. As might be expected, a compromise was made between the various tariffs on goods imported from abroad into the several provinces forming the confederation, and the tariff originally adopted by this Dominion was a tariff of 15 per cent. This, as can easily be seen, was a compromise between the tariffs adopted previous to confederation by the several provinces of this Dominion. For the first six or seven years of confederation this was the tariff in existence. When the Conservative party was defeated in 1874, the Liberals adopted a new tariff. It was then found necessary to increase the tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent. During the Liberal regime, it was ascertained that the tariff was not sufficient to maintain the revenues of this Dominion at a figure to enable the Government to meet their obligations. It was found necessary in 1877 to increase the tariff. They increased it on various lines of goods, and on many articles which were imported into the Dominion from 17½ to 25 per cent. If a careful analysis is made of the tariff in existence in 1877 and 1878 it will be found that it was not very materially lower than the existing tariff. In 1870, I may observe, the Parliament of Canada conceived the idea of adopting a national policy. At that time, Parliament determined to adopt a policy of protection to the natural resources of the Dominion of Canada, as regards the products of the mine, of the field, of the sea, and of the forest; but, unfortunately, owing to a great desire on the part of the western provinces particularly, to have coal imported into Canada free of duty, that policy lasted but a short time. It was found, however, that it gave a great stimulus to the various industries, even during the short period in which it was in existence, and after it had been abandoned for several years, the Liberal-Conservative party, very wisely, as I believe, adopted a national policy, which, as was properly stated at the time, did not, after all, mean or intend to mean an increase of taxation on the people; the object at the time was simply to so readjust the tariff as to foster the industries of this Dominion, to develop the natural resources of the country, and in this way prove a benefit to the Dominion at large. This has been the policy since 1879. This policy has been assailed by hon. gentlemen opposite for a long period now, and if I am a judge of the situation, they seem to me to be just as far from displacing the Government from the treasury benches on the lines of their policy to-day as they have been in years past. They adopted, for a short time, it is true, commercial union, then unrestricted reciprocity, continental union, and now at last they have come down to a policy for revenue only, on the lines of British free trade. The resolution which is now under consideration of the House was moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and is as follows:—

That, inasmuch as enormous sums of money are now exacted from the people of Canada which are not paid into the treasury, and inasmuch as the burthens of the people are thereby greatly and unnecessarily increased, and it is of the utmost importance to the well-being of the community that not only should the present extravagant expenditure be diminished, but that the said burthens should be reduced as largely and speedily as possible,—it is expedient that in making provision to restore "the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure," as recommended in the Speech from the Throne, the existing tariff be so modified that it may be made a tariff for revenue only.

This means nothing more, and nothing less than a revenue tariff on the lines of British free trade, as enunciated by the leader of the Opposition from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This resolution, therefore, is one on which, it appears to me, hon. gentlemen opposite have determined to appeal to the people at the polls. It is, therefore, of interest to Parliament and the people of the whole Dominion, to inquire how a revenue tariff, on the lines of free trade, will affect the various industries of this Dominion. The revenue in Great Britain is raised by customs to a considerable extent, and practically, the balance of it is raised by direct taxation. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth), it is impossible that Canada can adopt the British free trade policy in its entirety. But, the leaders of the Liberal party have announced, that every vestige of protection must be eliminated from the tariff, and to that extent

they can be in line with British free trade. They may adopt the customs and excise tariff of Great Britain, but it will be impracticable for them to adopt the stamp duties and other taxes which are imposed by the Imperial Government. Now, we find that in Great Britain the following amount of taxations raised under the following heads :—

Customs	£19,715,000
Excise	25,360,000
Stamps (exculding fee, &c., stamps)..	13,805,000
Land tax	1,040,000
House duty	1,410,000
Property and income tax	13,470,000
Post office	10,400,000
Telegraph service	2,480,000
Crown Lands (net)	430,000
Stamps in lieu of fees	832,563
Interest on advances	220,396
Interest on Suez shares	198,829
Allowance from the Bank of England.	170,970
Miscellaneous	862,714
Add local taxation	7.214,202
Total national income	£97,609,579

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Imperial Government imposes customs duties to the extent, in round numbers of $100,000,000, or five times the amount we raise by our customs duties in Canada. I presume the Liberals, if they ever get to power, will adopt that line of policy, and in order to do so, they must impose a duty on tea and other articles which are now admitted free for the benefit of the consumer. When such a policy is generally understood and properly explained to the electors of Canada, I have no hesitation in predicting that, after the next general election, the defeat of the Opposition will be more overwhelming than ever it was before. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), called attention to the effect of the National Policy on the farmers of the country generally, and the farmers of this country particularly, and he referred to the vacant houses and boarded windows in Antigonish as evidence of the disastrous results of our protective system. I am fairly familiar with the condition of things in that beautiful agricultural county which he represents, and I am free to admit that in passing through it, you will find some vacant houses and boarded windows. But, strange to say, the farmers' sons who left those houses vacant and boarded up their windows have not gone to free trade England ; but they have crossed the line to the United States, there to live under a much higher protective tariff than we have in Canada. It is not owing to the fact that we have a National Policy here that these men have emigrated to the United States. The farmers' sons of the county of Antigonish, as is the case in many of the rural districts throughout the country, find that their occupation on the farm is not to their taste, and they move towards the large cities in Canada and the United States. Naturally, they go to the United States, where they have a wider field for their energy, and enterprise, and pluck, and I am happy to say that to my own personal knowledge the sons of farmers who left vacant houses in Antigonish have been very prosperous in the United States under the high protective tariff of that country. I have no doubt whatever, Sir, that if they had gone to the western part of this great Dominion they would have succeeded equally as well. Forty years ago the tide of emigration from the maritime provinces to the United States commenced, and it continues to the present day, and it will continue unquestionably, because those who have gone there and prospered in times past have been encouraging their people to follow them. In that way many have left us and more will follow. It is often stated in this House that under the National Policy the farmer is not fairly treated. As the son of a farmer, and as a farmer myself, I have no hesitation in saying that there is no line of industry in this Dominion so well protected as the farming industry. It is simply idle for the Liberal party of Canada to endeavour to mislead the farming community into the belief that they are not fairly treated under the National Policy. In times gone by, when education was not so general as it is to-day, it might perhaps be possible to fool the farmers by such fallacies. My own experience is, that there is no class of people in this Dominion who so fully realize the advatages they derive from the National Policy as do the farmers. They have all the products of the soil protected, and protected to a very large extent. They have their pork protected, their beef protected, their cheese protected, their mutton protected, their eggs protected, and, in fact, everything which is produced on the farm ; and in this way, not only the products of the soil, but also those important adjuncts of the farming business, namely, pork, beef, cheese and other lines, are protected also. There are some hon. gentlemen in this House who are farmers—I am sorry to see they are not in their places just now—who complain bitterly that they do not get free corn for the finishing off of their cattle. Now, it is quite evident that those gentlemen, who speak so loudly in that direction, are not farmers any more than millers are. They are running a line of manufacture which is specific. They raise cattle, and hogs, and horses, and they are very anxious, in the same manner as millers are anxious, to have feed for their lines of products as cheaply as possible. But would it not be unfair for the agriculturists of this Dominion that their customers, and possibly their best customers—as millers are their best customers—would have an opportunity of squeezing down their prices, to the lowest possible figure, by allowing the agricultural products of the other side of the line to enter into competition with the agricultural products of Canada, in order to en-

able them to secure feed for their lines of products at a low figure. The natural enemy of the agriculturists in one sense is the miller, for the miller who requires the products of the soil to a large extent would like to obtain those products as cheaply as possible. Therefore, the removal of the duty from wheat would be to the advantage of the miller; but I feel assured that the farmers of Ontario would be very sorry indeed to see the duty taken off wheat, while a duty of 75 cents a barrel was maintained on flour. For a similar reason it would be equally unjust for the agriculturists of the Dominion to have the duty taken off coarse grains with a view to enabling the feeders of stock to secure feed for their cattle at a lower figure. The ob-object of the National Policy is to so adjust the advantages to the different industries as not only to make it beneficial to all concerned, but also to enable the Government to raise a sufficient revenue to maintain the public services of the country. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) referred to the protection of coal. Surely, there is no one from the province of Nova Scotia, particularly, who would ever advocate the abolition of the duty on coal. During the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite there was no duty on coal, and, unfortunately for that industry, it was so depressed that the coal miners were begging for aid throughout the districts in which the mines were situated. The output of coal in 1878 did not amount to more than half a million tons in the whole province of Nova Scotia, whereas in 1895 it amounted in round numbers, to 2,000,000 tons. This was unquestionably owing to the beneficial effects of the National Policy; and that industry, besides giving employment to the coal miners, also gave employment to ships, gave markets for the farmers in the neighbourhood of the mines, and increased the revenue of the province, in fifteen years, to the amount of $150,000 a year. Would it not, therefore, be most disastrous to the industry to have the duty on coal abolished? And if the duty on coal, or the duty on any other important line of products of this Dominion be abolished, then, as I predicted in this House on a former occasion, the National Policy would fall to pieces. It is essential, in the interests of the National Policy, that all lines be equitably protected; therefore, the abolition of the duty on any great line of products of the Dominion would be disastrous to the whole policy. It has also been said that the National Policy has not been of any advantage to the fishermen. Surely no one from the maritime provinces would make a statement of that kind, expecting it to be believed, at least in the maritime provinces. The fisheries are well protected under the National Policy. A bounty has been given to the fishermen, lines of goods which are used by the hardy fishermen of the maritime provinces have been admitted free of duty, and the fish itself is protected. So that it is idle for any person to say that the fisheries of this Dominion are not well protected by the National Policy, and that the fishermen are not contented with that policy. The mechanics and labourers are also protected, as well as the manufacturers. Without the market afforded by the manufacturers, the labourers, the mechanics, the miners, and the fishermen, and, unless these industries are prosperous, the farmers will have but poor markets for their products. It is necessary, in order to maintain the equilibrium between the various industries, to have the compromise, as it is, and as it was, and as it should be, between the various industries well maintained, and to have withal a sufficient revenue to enable the Government to maintain the public service of the country. In 1878 the policy adopted by the Liberal-Conservative party was this:

> That this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

In all the discussions that have taken place in this House up to the present time, I find that the impression is general that the object of the National Policy was reciprocal free trade. But the resolution speaks for itself. Its object was to move in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs, and its aim was to retain those people at home who were obliged to expatriate themselves in search of employment abroad. Therefore, it was not, in my opinion, the intention of the National Policy to have reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States. It has been changed at various times as much as practicable in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs. At present, it is true, the revenue tariff of the United States is about 10 per cent higher than that of Canada. In my opinion, the present Government should go further in the line of a reciprocity of tariffs, as indicated in the resolution introduced by Sir John Macdonald as early as 1877 and 1878. Let us examine how far even that extent of reciprocity of tariffs has affected the trade between Canada and the United States. Referring to the imports and exports, I find that the imports for home consumption from the United States in 1878 amounted, in all, to $48,631,739.

The exports from Canada that year amounted in value to $25,775,245. There was a balance against Canada of $22,856,494. The people of Canada purchased $22,000,000 from the United States more than the United States purchased from Canada. In my opinion that is a very unfair trade. That was the trade which existed under the revenue tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was with the view of correcting that unfair condition of things that the tariff was readjusted by the Liberal-Conservative party when they came into power in 1878. Let us now examine the condition at present. In 1894 the imports for home consumption from the United States amounted in value to $53,034,100, and the exports from Canada to the United States amounted to $35,809,940. The balance of trade was $7,224,160. As my hon. friend from Bothwell will observe that balance is unfortunately in favour of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Very much more than before.

Mr. CAMERON. No, at that time it was $22,000,000 in their favour; at present it is only $7,000,000, showing that a fairer trade with the United States has been secured by the National Policy to the extent of $15,000,000. During the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, the exports from Great Britain amounted in value to $48,941,539, and the imports amounted to $37,431,180, leaving a balance of trade in our favour of $8,510,359. In other words, England purchased from Canada more than Canada purchased from Great Britain to the amount of $8,510,359. Under the present system—hon. gentlemen opposite may make such use of the figures as they like—I find that the exports to Great Britain were $68,538,856, and the imports from Great Britain amounted to $37,510,359. The imports from Great Britain to Canada increased about $2,000,000 during that period, but our market in England has increased from $45,941,539 in 1878 to $68,538,856 in 1894. So that we find after all that England is our best market, and it would be simply puerile in my opinion to argue that the free trade policy of Great Britain would be applicable in any sense to the wants of the Dominion. Great Britain is so situated that to some extent, her industries are protected by the cost of the transportation of goods from other countries into that island. The position there is very different from what we occupy here. The condition of things that exists in England does not exist here, and the laws of tariff that would be adapted to the wants of Great Britain would be ruinous to the best interests of the Dominion. The idea was that the object of the fiscal policy of this Dominion, as contemplated in 1878, was to have a reciprocity of trade in which the advantages to both countries would be as nearly balanced as possible. I am one of those who believe that it is in the interests of the United States to have a National Policy as they have had in that country for many years, and that for the same reason it is equally in the interest of this Dominion, as our industries are to a large extent similar, to have a National Policy also. It would be in the interests of both countries that each would so protect the industries of its own people that general benefit would result. I have therefore no hesitation in saying, as I did on one occasion some years ago, that in my opinion hon. gentlemen opposite will never have an opportunity of crossing the floor of this House unless they abandon the revenue tariff on the line of British free trade in the same manner as they have abandoned commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade.

Mr. DAWSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion negatived.

Mr. DAWSON. The last hon. gentleman who addressed this House, like many others who preceded him, seemed very anxious to clear away the difficulties which may beset the path of the hon. leader of the Opposition when he takes the reins of power. They seem to be anxious for the success of the Liberals when they come to power, and wish to point out in advance the difficulties of raising revenue and all the other difficulties that may have to be met by the leader of the Opposition. But I will say, as a humble follower of that hon. gentleman, that I have no fear at all for him, and that, without the assistance of our friends opposite, he will himself solve all difficulties when the people, in due course choose to trust the affairs of this Dominion in his hands. This debate, so far as it has proceeded, seems to have made one point very clear at any rate, and that is, where hon. gentlemen opposite are on the National Policy.

For some time past they have been very chary about saying much in favour of the old policy. Some of them have been wont to describe it as a tree decaying and tottering to its fall, from which the rotten branches must be removed; and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat likened it, last year, to a building so fearfully and wonderfully made that if you took one brick away from the structure, it would tumble down about their ears, burying them in a political sense, in its ruins. Last session we thought they were beginning well in the direction of tariff reform and that something would result; but when the delegations of the highly protected interests began to pour into this city from their palace cars, the policy of tariff reform was abandoned, and now they have drifted back to the old policy under which they have sheltered themselves the last sixteen years. We now know that the National Policy is to be maintained by them, let the cost be

what it may to this fair young country.

To prove its worth they point to our vast exports. They say, look at the amount of our exports, $104,000,000, and exultingly exclaim: see what the National Policy has done for us. Analyse the returns, and you will see that of the $104,000,000, $61,000,000 went to England. They were sent to the free ports of that country, there to fight their way against the products of the world.

Our wheat has to meet there the product of cheap native labour from the fertile valleys of India, and the millions of bushels now being sent from the plains of Argentina.

Our beef has to compete against the exports from the limitless pasture lands of La Platte, and the cheap frozen beef from the Antipodes. Our butter has to compete with the dairy products of Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands, and our cheese with the cheap production of the Australian farmer.

Yet, in spite of all this opposition, in spite of all this competition, our products have held their own in the British markets, the excellence of quality securing for them a place there. We have been able to sell our products, but the price that we have received has been just such as we have been able to get, not such as would yield us profit on the goods sent, but such as the markets in England allowed.

There is no sentiment in that market. The English buyer will pay for a like quantity exactly the same price to us as to any other person. We have received no more or no less for the products we sent than the shipper from the Argentine Republic, from India, from Russia or from any other part of the earth. Sixty-one millions of our exports found their way into the open ports of England; $43,000,000 had to fight their way unaided by any effort of this Government across the tariff barriers of the other nations of the world. Scarcely, unaided, however, for I should not forget that the Government has granted subsidies to lines of steamships to convey our products to other lands. For instance, $122,000, or, the subsidy being in pounds, £25,000 sterling, for a line of steamships to Australia. When the delegates to the intercolonial conference were here, I was told, they brought samples of Australian cheap mutton, butter and cheese, and told the Canadian people how much more cheaply these products could be placed upon the market here than the products of the Canadian farmer.

So the Canadian farmer is asked to contribute $122,000 a year to subsidize a line of steamships to be employed in bringing these cheap products of the Australian farms into competition with our home products. But what was the result of this subsidy? A trade aggregating altogether half a million dollars, yielding to the revenue of this country $16,000 a year in return for $122,000 spent.

We are told that it is treason to look with longing eyes to the vast markets for just such products as we have to sell to be found in the great cities of the United States within close reach of us here. We are told that it is treason to look with longing eyes to this market, our prospects in which have been growing less and which now—thanks to the incapacity of the present administration—is almost lost to us.

We are told that trade follows the flag or ought to follow the flag, and we are advised to cultivate trade with the other British possessions of the world. We have been cultivating trade with the other British possessions, and the Trade and Navigation Returns show us some of the results. Excluding Great Britain, these Returns show our exports to the British possessions to be five and a half millions. This includes Newfoundland and the British West Indies, which took four and a half millions. Thus, we find that the whole British Empire, outside of the mother country, Newfoundland and the British West Indies bought from us a scant three-quarters of a million dollars worth of our products. These are the markets that are offered to us in exchange for the market that can so readily be found in the United States. Cultivate trade, they say, with our British fellow-citizens throughout the Empire, and look no longer to the market we promised to secure for you in the United States.

If the Government had been able to show that they had induced countries from which we had purchased our supplies to take our products in exchange, then they might have something to be proud of. How is it? I find in the Trade Returns that the whole value of our exports to the following countries:—Uruguay, Bolivia, Hayti, Mexico, Dutch, Danish and French West Indies, Madeira, Denmark, Turkey, Switzerland, Russia, Austria, Spain and her possessions, aggregated less in a year than we spent on the Curran Bridge or the Tay Canal. We bought from these countries and brought to our shores no less than $1,500,000 worth of their products.

In China we sold half a million dollars worth of our products, and purchased a million dollars worth of theirs. In France we sold half a million dollars worth, and purchased $2,500,000 of theirs. In Germany we sold two-thirds of a million dollars worth, and bought $6,000,000 of theirs. In Japan, as the result of subsidizing a line of steamships to trade with that country, we sold less than one-thirtieth of a million dollars worth, and bought one and a half millions worth of theirs. For every $8 we have spent in Germany they have spent $1 here. For every $50 we have spent in Japan they have spent $1 here.

We have sold of our products to all the nations of the earth, outside of the British Empire and the United States, just $5,000,000 worth, and we have purchased from these nations in exchange rather more than $18,000,000.

Seventeen years have passed away since the promise was made that hon. gentlemen opposite would secure for us a reciprocity treaty with the United States—not a reciprocity of tariffs but a reciprocity of trade with the great country to the south of us. This promise was made by the great chieftain, Sir John Macdonald himself. It was that promise that returned him to power in 1879, that promise the fulfilment of which meant the return of prosperity to this country the like of which those engaged in agriculture have not enjoyed since the days we lost our treaty with that nation. No man of sense can fail to see the enormous benefits of that market to us. Ask those who are engaged in developing the natural wealth of this country what they think about it; ask our fishermen; our miners, our lumbermen, or our farmers, what benefit that market would be to them. In reply to the demand that an honest effort be made to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States, securing to us free access to their markets, an effort is made to attract our exports to Australia, Mexico, South Africa, Brazil—anywhere in all the broad earth rather than to the market lying at our door.

In our country we have vast mineral wealth. The Geological Survey has been piling up evidence of this, year after year, for many years; and now it is known that Canada is rich beyond the conception of man, in mineral wealth. Well, vast as is our mineral wealth, our exports last year were less than $6,000,000, of which more than $3,000,000 was for coal, leaving about $2,500,000 as to the value of our exports of every other kind of mineral. Surely this is a pitiful showing for a country so rich in mineral wealth as Canada undoubtedly is. Countless millions of tons of iron ore are to be found everywhere throughout the province of Ontario, and last year our total export of this article was 618 tons, less than a week's output for a small pit.

In what way has the Government contribute to the prosperity of the lumber trade? Is it by taxing the blankets, axes, saws, iron and machinery used in that industry? How have they contributed to the development of it? They have contributed by leaving it alone. Never having been made the subject of the class or special legislation of this Government it has grown to be one of the two mighty interests of our country, second only to agriculture, and contributing $26,000,000 to our exports, unaided by any legislation, allowed to go free, to develop itself by a natural process, until the great lumber trade of Canada has become an object of pride to all Canadians.

The farmers have contributed $52,000,000 to our exports. What has protection done for them, a class seeking markets in foreign countries, a class to find markets for whom hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly are spent by this Government, so they say? What use is protection to them? Protection on their cereals, and on their meats, when they have vast quantities of these to sell, and do sell them in the same market in which their great competitor, the American farmer sells his.

Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the farmers of Canada have nothing to fear from American competition. The Americans furnish a discriminating market; they know a good article when they see it, and they know it better when they taste it. Canadian farm products, as was shown by the World's Fair, stand second to none in all the world. Americans recognize this fact, and in their large cities, when their market is open to us, we will find abundant customers for our butter, for our cheese, for our meat, for our barley, our beans and pease, all known to be of quality superior to any that is produced in the United States.

The National Policy, however, has done something for the farmers, it has oppressed him, it has forced him for sixteen years to pay heavily through the customs on such goods as he chooses to import. It has forced him also to pay tribute to the manufacturers of this country; it has forced him to pay tribute to the sugar refiners; it has forced him throughout the whole of the last year to pay a uniform price for his sugar, 20 per cent in excess of what the same article could be laid down for by the British refiner. It has forced him to pay more for his forks, rakes, hoes, nails, chains, shovels, axes, wire fencing, agricultural machinery—everything, in fact, that he requires—more than he would have to pay were it not for protection. The tariff practically prohibits him from purchasing abroad, compels him to buy at home, and pay the enhanced prices which it enables the manufacturer to charge.

A short time ago I noticed a comparison of prices between Saginaw and Montreal, in a few articles in common use by farmers. I found that the farmer who purchases in Montreal must pay 60 per cent more for his cut nails than the prices charged his American neighbour, the price in Saginaw being $1.25 per cwt., and in Montreal $2.25. For his piping for pumps he pays 55 per cent more, the price in Saginaw being $5.25 per 100 feet, and $8.10 in Montreal. He pays 39 per cent more for spades, the price in Saginaw being $3.50 and $4.75 in Montreal. He pays 40 per cent more for barbed wire, the price being $1.90 in Saginaw, and $2.87½ per cwt. in Montreal. Now, we learned the other day the extraordinary precautions the Government are taking to prevent the importation of hardware from the United States. In this short table of prices we find the secret of their hostility to American goods.

Let the farmer of Canada purchase his supplies in the cheapest market he can, and he will ask you for no protection. Doubtless, the farmers were bringing their grievances to the ears of the Ministers when they were out on a tour last fall, and to comfort them the Ministers as-

sured them that while it was true their products had fallen in value, the purchasing power of such as they had to sell was as great as ever it was. They said the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat, then worth 60 cents, was as great as it was in the period from 1871 to 1881, when it was worth 90 cents per bushel. According to this argument, then, 60 cents in money in 1894 was worth as much as 90 cents in 1881, and, I suppose, still more in 1878. If 60 cents to-day has a purchasing power equal to 90 cents in 1878, then it puts us face to face with a very curious problem in finance.

It takes 37½ millions to govern this country now; if what they say is true, then 37½ million dollars to-day will go as far as 56¼ millions in 1878. What a tribute this is to the skill of the hon. member for South Oxford and the Government of which he was a member, who, in that year, governed the country for ten million dollars less than one-half this amount.

Will 60 cents to-day go as far as 90 cents in 1879? Will it go as far as 90 cents in the farmer's payment on his mortgage, or on his land, or his interest, or on his taxes, or on any other debt? Then, there is another thing that must be remembered, the farmer's crop is not all his to spend. There is a lien upon it for seed, for rent, for interest, for the cost of production. He must first set aside a sufficient sum to meet these charges, and the balance only is his to spend.

Hon gentlemen are fond of quoting Mr. Blue. Mr. Blue says that he has ascertained that the cost of producing an acre of wheat is $14; the average price of wheat was 90 cents per bushel, the crop 20 bushels an acre. At 90 cents per bushel, this would be $18 as the value of the crop of each acre of wheat. The difference between the value and the cost of production would leave in the farmer's hands $4 on each acre for him to spend. But the price of wheat last year was only 60 cents per bushel, that is the price received by the farmers of this country. The cost of production may have been a little less, let us say $13 per acre. Now, 20 bushels of wheat at 60 cents yields $12 per acre; so that if the unhappy farmer had to pay the cost of production in cash, if he did none of the work himself, he would be producing his wheat at a dead loss of $1 per acre.

It is well known to the farmers themselves that it is only by incessant labour that they have been able for some time past to escape the hands of the sheriff, that constant toil, day after day, yields them the necessaries of life and little else.

But while the Government has done nothing for our miners, our fishermen, our lumbermen or our farmers, they have done much for the manufacturers. They have forced all the rest of the community for sixteen years past to pay a heavy tribute to this favoured class. For sixteen years they have been fed on the pap of protection, and by this time should have attained a lusty growth which would cause us to feel proud of the manufacturers of our country. By this time, after sixteen years of protection, they ought to cut some figure, surely, in the export of our country. Let us see what the exports are. I find that we exported last year, manufactured goods to the value of seven and three quarters million dollars. But of this I find that one million is put down for household effects of the people leaving the country, reducing the export of manufactured goods to 6¾ million dollars.

The Year-Book for 1893, informs me that protection was of no benefit at all to the tanners of this country, that apparently it has paralyzed that industry. It tells me that there were 1,012 tanneries in 1881, against 802 in 1891; that the output had fallen from $15,000,000 in 1881, to $11,000,000 in 1891. But the tanners last year exported a million and a half dollars worth of sole and upper leather. Wood manufacturers, who, surely, do not owe their existence to the fostering care of the tariff of protection, exported ¾ of a million dollars' worth, and we exported half a million dollars' worth of wood pulp; so we will have to write off a million dollars for household goods, and 2¾ million dollars for manufactures that were not aided by protection, and that leaves four million dollars as the contribution of the protected manufacturers of all Canada to the exports of the country. Even these four millions include some manufactures which I cannot see are the result of protection. I find they include jewellers' sweepings, gypsum, lime, brick, building stone, grindstones, ice and rags. Rags alone, of the whole list might fairly be called a product of protection.

But among the most curious features is the effect of the tariff on our trade with England. Hon. gentlemen have become somewhat famous for their loud declarations of loyalty. I have little faith in the man who is for ever proclaiming as to what an honest man he is. So soon as he informs me in unctuous language of his honesty, a cold distrust of the man grows up within me, and my respect, faith and belief in the loyalty of the man is not increased by his constant declarations. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite are treating the country with loud and oft repeated assurances of their unfailing loyalty to the old flag and their great devotion to the mother country, and that they are ready to follow the lead of the motherland. But, while professing loyalty, those hon. gentlemen have been, I cannot but think deliberately taxing the goods which we import from Great Britain more heavily than they do the goods imported from the United States. Their own Trade and Navigation Returns reveal the fact beyond all question.

If hon. gentlemen will turn up the returns, they willl find that they took $8,245,845 in duty on goods of the value

of $27,483,160 imported from Great Britain. These are dutiable goods, they do not include free goods or goods brought in for manufacture. This is equivalent, they will find, if hon. gentlemen will figure out the calculation, to a duty of 30 per cent. In the same year they levied $6,960,950 in duty on dutiable goods worth $25,823,936 imported from the United States. If they will figure that out, they will find that I am correct when I say the duty levied on dutiable goods imported from the United States was 27 as against 30 per cent of duty levied on goods imported from Great Britain. This means paying a bonus of 10 per cent of duty as an inducement to importers to purchase goods in the American market rather than in the markets of the motherland.

This has had its effect on our trade with the motherland which they profess to love so well. In 1893-94 we sold in Great Britain of the products of Canada—I do not include in this amount products we sent on as carriers, but the products of our own country—the value of $60,000,000, and we purchased their goods, dutiable and free, to the value of $38,000,000. In the same year we sold in the United States of goods the products of Canada the value of $32,500,000, and purchased their goods, dutiable and free, to the value of $53,000,000; in other words, we sold in Great Britain products to the value of $60,000,000, buying only the value of $38,000,000, and taking $22,000,000 in cash to balance our account. We sold in the United States products to the value of $32,500,000, and spent all that sum there in the purchase of goods of American production, and we left them over $20,000,000 in cash besides.

The iniquitous discrimination of the tariff against British trade was long since denounced by Liberals, and in 1892 the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), moved:

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

On division it was found, however, that the House was not of this opinion, that the Liberals only were of this opinion, and that the Government and every hon. gentleman in the House supporting them was of the contrary opinion and believed that the discrimination should be continued.

The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) moved the following motion:—

That if, and when, the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

Not content with the admission into British ports of our products free of duty, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and friends in this House would have Great Britain tax the food supply she draws from the nations to whom she sells her goods—tax that food supply, admit ours free, and in return we would not remove the duty levied on goods imported from England, but grant substantial reductions.

Well, she will never do it. We send her 6 per cent of her whole supply. It is rather too much to ask her to tax 94 per cent and admit 6 per cent free in return for such advantage as a substantial reduction on the duties laid against her goods would be. England knows too well the blessing of free trade to ever consent to such an arrangement as that. The noblest statesman England ever had, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone—I am sure it is unnecessary for me to mention his name—has said:

You might as well attempt to overthrow trial by jury. You might as well attempt to overthrow the right of petition and of public meetings. You might as well try to tear out of our social and political system any one of the most cherished ideas that Englishmen have inherited from centuries of history, as to overset our free trade.

And well might he say it. Mightily has England prospered under free trade. It has become the fashion of hon. gentlemen opposite of late to decry the motherland. Driven from protectionist countries, tens of thousands of men every year find their way to the shores of England in search of that employment which they cannot find at home, and if hon. members will analyse the ranks of the unemployed in England, they will find that almost every man unemployed is a foreigner, who has come to England seeking that employment which he cannot obtain in the protectionist countries of Europe; and, when people hold up the fact that four millions of people are to-day wanting employment there, it is no argument whatever against the system of free trade which has so long prevailed in England.

They say, however, that free trade is killing England; and the Minister of Justice declared in this House that she, driven from the civilized markets of the world, is forced to spend millions on her army and navy to enable her to force her manufactured goods on the uncivilized nations of the world. And yet with England in this pitiful condition, compelled to spend millions to enable her to force her goods on unwilling customers, they will not open Canadian ports to her. They even tax her 3 per cent more than they do her great rival, the United States.

Wealth has increased in England under free trade. The national debt has been reduced, pauperism has decreased, crime has decreased, and trade has mightily expanded. The United Kingdom exported, in 1840, $255,000,000 worth of goods; in 1893, she exported $1,348,000,000, an increase of over 500 per cent. These $1,348,000,000 worth of ex-

ports were so profitably sold abroad, so profitable were the voyages of the ships engaged in distributing those exports throughout the world that they were enabled to bring back in these same ships, goods in exchange to the value of $1,970,000,000, showing a profit on that year's transactions of $400,000,000.

Wealth, as indicated by taxable incomes, increased from $1,255,000,000 in 1840, to $3,461,000,000 in 1893, an increase of 250 per cent. The wealth of the English people, as indicated by their savings—and this will commend itself, I am sure, to hon. gentlemen opposite, who are fond of quoting such statistics as an evidence of the prosperity of this country—the wealth of the English work people, as indicated by their savings rose from $122,500,000, in 1841, to $220,000,000 in 1894.

While this wealth was rolling up in the hands of the people of that nation, the nation paid off $650,000,000 of its national debt, paid off $200,000,000 of the Crimean war debt, and paid the millions which the Minister of Justice said she was forced to spend to compel the uncivilized nations of the world to buy her goods. Pauperism decreased in England and Wales from 201,000 able-bodied paupers, in 1841, to 107,000 in 1893. While the population of England increased during that period 45 per cent, the number of able-bodied paupers decreased 45 per cent. Crime decreased in England, the convictions for indictable offences being 34,000 in 1841, and 13,000 in 1893.

Now, as to the foreign trade of England. I will compare the trade of free-trade England with that of some of the principal protectionist countries of the world, and I will give the latest year for which a comparison is possible, 1891. In 1891 the population of the United Kingdom was about 38,000,000, and their exports and imports aggregated $3,600,000,000. The German Empire, with a population of about 50,000,000, had a total trade of $2,000,000,000. The United States, with a population of 65,000,000 had a total trade of $1,717,000,000. The total trade of Germany and the United States scarcely exceeds that of England alone, with one-third of their population. France and Russia, with four times the population of the United Kingdom had a foreign trade of $34,000,000 less, and Italy and Spain, with ten millions more population have a trade in value less than one-sixth that of England.

Mr. GRIEVE. And all these are protected countries.

Mr. DAWSON. These are the great protectionist countries of the world. Not one of them has a trade in any way equal to that of England. All of them are hopelessly behind her in her foreign trade. It is not likely then that the statesmen of England can be induced to turn back the hands of the clock of time for fifty years, and to re-enact the Corn Laws, for even so loyal a man as the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and his friends in this House.

The Government now in power in Canada still stick to protection. They say that the "duty imposed on imported articles does not increase the price of articles manufactured in this country." Mr. Speaker, it does increase the price of every one of them. Competition among our manufacturers, there is none. The moment competition appears, combination kills it at once, and every member of this House who is engaged in mercantile pursuits knows the answer which is given to him if he demurs at the price of any article of Canadian manufacture. The answer is a shrug of the shoulder, and "I cannot help it, it is the combination price." The combination price! A sufficient answer always for the representative of a commercial house to make.

Prices on articles of Canadian manufacture are kept up as high as the duty will let them go. The moment you lower the duty, that moment you lower the price. This was proved last session by the very slight attempt the Finance Minister made in the direction of tariff reform. The prices of binder twine, coal oil, agricultural implements, and general hardware dropped when the tariff was touched.

The benefits of having manufactures in our country was preached to our farmers up west by members of the Government on their missionary tour last fall. Senator Ferguson, speaking of the competition our farmers had to meet, from India and the Argentine Republic, declared:

> You cannot enter into competition with such producers. The only thing you can do is to keep your own markets for the products of Canadian farms.

According to the Hon. Senator, the English market is no good, the foreign market is no good, the markets in the other parts of the Empire are no good, for he declares that we cannot enter into competition with the producers from the Argentine Republic and India, and that we must keep our own markets for the products of the Canadian farm, and cease striving for any extension. The Senator evidently has given up hope of our extending our export trade. He says further:

> I desire for a moment to call your attention to where you must get your market. You all know you cannot sell an article to an idle man, who has no money to buy it. * * * In order to have your consumer in the position to buy your products, you must give him work.

The farmer has to do at all. First, he must give work to the person to whom he hopes to sell, and then he has the privilege of selling to him if he can. He says:

> Give him work by getting him to make exactly what you want at your own doors.

But not at your own price by any means. The manufacturer who employs him and

gives him work at your door is permitted by the tariff to charge just what he likes, up to the limit fixed by the tariff for the product of his labour: but the farmer must sell to him at the prices that are fixed in the open markets of the world.

The same Senator had declared a moment before:

Now, I want to show you, no Government can keep your prices up.

No Government can keep prices up for the farmer, but this Government has been very successful in keeping up prices for the manufacturers. He continued:

I desire to show you that we have the market that I have been speaking of. We have it in the manufacturing industries of this country. According to the census of 1891, the number of industrial establishments in this country was 75,741, the hands employed numbered 370,104, the wages paid was $100,656,502. Now, that $100,000,000 paid finds it way where? To the butcher shops, and every kind of establishment, and into the pockets of the farmers of this country.

Senator Ferguson did not tell his listeners that the wage sheet had been stuffed by the addition of industries that were not reckoned when the census was taken in the preceding decade. He did not tell them that in spite of all the stuffing, the wage sheet of the manufacturers of this country had increased only $40,000,000 since the dawn of protection.

It has increased $40,000,000 since that time, and I have not the slightest doubt, and I do not think that any self-respecting Canadian would doubt, but that the manufactures of this country would have increased, and largely increased, had they never had protection at all; perhaps not the forty millions, but a large part of that amount. To get our consumer into a position to buy our farm products we have been forced to give him work, but we have enacted a law that has empowered the manufacturer giving him that work to charge so much more for the product of his labour than it is fairly worth, so as to do away entirely with the benefit that the spending of his wages might otherwise have been to us. The wage sheet has increased under protection, but the more it increased the lower fell the price the farmer received for his products.

Now, in substantiation of the truth of what I have said I will give the House an object lesson, one that is easily understood, an object lesson on sugar. Sugar enjoys a protection of 64 cents per 100 pounds. Do the refiners take advantage of this, and increase the price of sugar under cover of this protection? The low price that has prevailed during the past year has blinded the eyes of the people to the fact that, although the price was low, vast sums of money were being wrongfully taken from them in an overcharge. Protection, it was said, was simply to enable the manufacturers to start up; and, as soon as they got their machinery in running order and their capital secured, they would be able to sell as cheaply as the manufacturers in any foreign country. It was said that sugar could be refined here as cheaply as in any other country in the world, and I cannot see why it is not so refined. The Canadian refiner and the English refiner pay the same price for their raw material; it can be delivered in ships at the port of Montreal and at the port of London at the same rates. So that refiners here get their raw material at practically the same price as the refiners in London; but what is the difference in price to the consumer?

I had the curiosity to look through the files of the London "Times" and the Montreal "Gazette" to obtain the prices for the last thirteen months, and I have made the following table which shows the average prices of granulated sugar at those two places every fortnight during that time:—

Date.	Price in London per 100 lbs.	Price in Montreal per 100 lbs.
1894.	$ cts.	$ cts.
April 6	3 63	4 31¼
do 20	3 58	4 18¾
May 4	3 53	4 12½
do 19	3 53	4 12½
June 1	3 47	4 12½
do 15	3 47	4 25
do 29	3 53	4 18¾
July 13	3 36	4 12½
do 27	3 36	4 12½
Aug. 10	3 41	4 25
do 24	3 53	4 25
Sept. 7	3 53	4 25
do 21	3 36	4 25
Oct. 5	3 31	4 18¾
do 19	3 20	4 18¾
Nov. 2	3 20	4 25
do 16	3 09	4 12½
do 30	2 88	4 00
Dec. 14	2 88	3 87½
do 28	2 88	3 75
1895.		
Jan. 11	2 72	3 62½
do 25	2 77	3 50
Feb. 8	2 83	3 50
do 22	2 88	3 37½
Mar. 8	2 83	3 31¼
do 22	2 77	3 31¼
April 5	2 83	3 31¼
do 19	2 83	3 31¼
Total	89 19	110 19
Average	3 18	3 96
		3 18
Difference in price per 100 lbs. in favour of London		0 78

The average price during those thirteen months was $3.18 in London and $3.96 in Montreal, a difference in favour of London of 78 cents per 100 pounds. So we find, although sugar can be refined in Montreal as cheaply as in London or anywhere else in the world, that the refiners take care to sell at the highest price which the tariff will permit them to extort.

On the 300,000,000 pounds consumed by our people, this difference of 78 cents per 100 pounds in price means that they paid $2,340,000 more last year than was charged in England for the same quantity. While they were paying this excessive tax or tribute to the refiners, our public treasury received only $23,000 in the form of duty collected on refined sugars. If we removed the duty, the English refiners could lay down sugar in Montreal, freight paid, for 60 cents per 100 pounds less than the average selling price there throughout the year. This would effect a saving on the 300,000,000 pounds of $1,800,000 a year.

But Senator Ferguson says: "In order to have your consumer in a position to buy your products, you must give him work." The men employed by the refiners are the consumers of products. The wage sheet of the refiner is the measure of the benefit their employees may be to the food producers of this country. Now, the refiners employ 1,927 men altogether, and pay them $709,811 a year in wages. This $709,811 finds its way, according to Senator Ferguson, " to the butcher shop and every kind of establishment, and into the pockets of the farmers of this country," and in return the same butchers and farmers pay 2½ times that amount more for their sugar than they would have to pay if there were no sugar at all refined in the country.

But we are told that without protection the refiners would have to be shut down. I would be sorry if they were; but, as the consumers are forced to pay $2.50 to the refiners in unearned profits for every dollar which the refiners pay in wages to their men, I may be pardoned if I even say, let the refineries go. If they shut down, many of the hands now employed would be required to handle the imported article. But would they shut down? As I have said, raw sugar can be laid down in Canada at the same price as in England. The half cent per pound of duty which is now on raw sugar would be also on refined. Then, the freight between London and Montreal would itself be a very large protection and ought to be sufficient to maintain this industry, even though the refiners have to pay higher wages than are paid in England. Whether they do or not I do not know. I do not think they do. But at the lowest rate the freight charges would amount to over half a million dollars a year on our present consumption, equal to over 75 per cent of the total amount of wages paid to the employees engaged in this industry, which is surely an ample protection for even the most timid refiner.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you take that into account in your calculation of the value of sugar in Montreal as compared with London—the increased freight rates on the raw sugar?

Mr. DAWSON. I have said they are the same. What does my hon. friend say they are?

Mr. SPROULE. You have been giving it yourself, and it must be considerable.

Mr. DAWSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will profit by the information I am giving him. Now, this object lesson illustrates the position of the protected manufacturers generally. In every case they take for their products all that the law will allow, and if competition threatens they simply combine and kill competition. We know now, after several days' debate, that it is the intention of the Government to stick to protection; and I must say that they display a large amount of worldly wisdom in so doing though little regard for the welfare of the country. They are wise politicians in sticking to the policy which has carried them through so far. They are wise in keeping up the class legislation which has served them so well. By their class legislation they have made rich men richer, but they have robbed the poor. They have kept themselves in power by the lavish use of boodle contributed by the men whom they have helped, for the reptile fund is the largest element in bringing about their success at the polls, as is well known to them and to us, and to the people of this country, and, I am sorry to say, to those in the beloved motherland also. But I think that the day has gone when they will again succeed in bribing the people with their own money. The people know that the money which the protected manufacturers contribute to the election fund of the party in power is money which has been taken wrongfully from them, under cover of special legislation, enacted in behalf of those interests. They know that it is their money which has been paid into the fund to be spent in their own undoing.

And I think the day is gone by when they will be so easily deceived as to consent again to return to power the men who have ruined the great mass of the people of this country and built up only a small and a favoured class.

Before sitting down I wish to congratulate the Government on having at last accepted the advice of their opponents in this House. Year after year, members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition have been pointing out to that Government how savings could be effected. They were laughed at for their pains. Game was made of the proposition of hon. gentlemen on this side by the subsidized press of

hon. gentlemen opposite. But this year, when the Minister of Finance brought down his Estimates, we found he had at last taken the advice of the Opposition and reduced his Estimates by some $1,682,000. Had he done so before, when the possibility of doing it was pointed out, time and time again, by hon. gentlemen around me, immense savings would have been effected of the people's money. Tens of millions would have been saved in the years that are passed.

But there is one scheme about which he has not very clearly declared himself, and that is the Hudson Bay Railway. We know that there was an Order in Council passed granting $2,500,000 to this road, but whether the Government will summon up courage enough to ask Parliament to ratify that Order in Council or not, is unknown to us. Surely, considering the finances of the country, considering the desperate condition in which the Minister of Finance knows them to be this Order in Council was passed in another of his many moments of weakness. I hope he has thought better of it, and that the Government will not ask this House to ratify that order. The time is not ripe, we do not know enough about the navigability of the frozen straits of Hudson. All we do know is contained in a little blue-book in our hand—the report of Lieutenant Gordon ; and this report is pleasant reading in the sultry days of July and August. We read of icebergs and fields of ice in every month of the year throughout these straits.

We do not know as a matter of fact, whether they are navigable or not : and until that is settled, it is too soon for Parliament to vote one dollar of money in aid of any such enterprise. There is another thing—the hon. gentleman should consider the temptations that may be lurking under that subsidy. He must not forget that there are milkmaids in his Cabinet. Expert, confessedly expert in the art of extracting, by gentle pressure, a golden stream from railway subsidies. The milking of bonuses is an accomplishment of which the Postmaster General is passing proud.

Do not put temptations in his way. $2,500,000—fancy what golden vistas that opens up before his enraptured gaze. What possibilities it suggests, just on the eve of an election. $2,500,000—would 10 per cent be too much to expect as the result of his expert manipulation ? That would be a round quarter million dollars in hand, just on the eve of an election. What a magnificent election fund that would make. And now that his old treasurer from Quebec West is safe in his seat in this House, he would be here to guard the money well and pay it out to the order of the Postmaster General to help him and his friends in their election, to give them the sinews of war in their day of need, their golden armour when they face the foe.

I hope the Minister of Finance will think better of it and not press this vote of $2,500,000 through this House. Let hon. gentlemen opposite for once face the Liberals in open battle and fair fight, and just so sure as the sun will rise on the day after the next elections, just so sure will it rise on our noble and gifted leader, crowned with victory, and just so sure will dawn better days for this country of ours.

Mr. SPROULE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to ; and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to : and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, it do stand adjourned until the following Tuesday, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

CHARLES GUY, OF PETERBORO'.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Does Charles Guy, of Peterboro', receive a pension ? if so, what for and how much ? When was it granted ? What service was he engaged in ? What is his occupation, and is he now in good health ?

Mr. DICKEY. Charles Guy, of Peterboro' receives a pension because he became insane in consequence of fatigue and hardship endured during the campaign of 1885 in the North-west Territories. The pension is 25 cents per diem. The pension was granted by Order in Council of 21st January, 1887. He did service with his battalion during the campaign. His occupation was that of a watchmaker at the time his name was put on the pension list. He has been paid the above-mentioned pension until now, on the receipt by the Department of Militia

and Defence of the required medical certificate showing that he still suffers from the disease in question, and therefore is reported not in good health.

MR. WEIR, OF KEENE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Does Mr. Weir, of Keene, receive a pension? If so, how much and when granted? Was he a volunteer? If so, to what battalion did he belong? Was he in the North-west rebellion? What engagements was he in? Was he wounded in battle or did he incur disease in the service? Why was he pensioned? What is his occupation, and is he now in good health?

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Weir, of Keene, receives a pension. The pension is 55 cents per diem, and was granted by Order in Council of 21st January, 1887. He was a volunteer, and belonged to the Midland Battalion. He served in the North-west rebellion, but he was not in any engagement. He was not wounded in battle. He incurred a neuralgia of the left side and chest in his military service. He was pensioned on account of such disease. His occupation was that of a carpenter. He has been paid the above-mentioned pension until now, on the receipt by the Department of Militia and Defence of the required medical certificates showing that he still suffers from the disease in question.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, "The Manitoba School Case, 1894," being a report of the proceedings before the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, edited for the Canadian Government by the appellant's solicitors in London.

Government House,
Ottawa, May, 1895.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask my hon. friend opposite if he sees any clearer light with reference to bringing the present debate to a close?

Mr. LAURIER. I see that light is constantly being shed upon the subject, but I do not know what is to come. I cannot at present see any prospect of having a division this evening or to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. SPROULE. After the lengthy debate which has taken place upon the Budget speech delivered by the Minister of Finance some time ago, and the amount of light which has been brought to bear upon the condition of the country, and the results of the policy of the present Government, I do not propose to take up a great deal of time in discussing the question further. I may at the outset with propriety congratulate the Minister of Finance on the very clear and able financial statement which he made regarding the condition of the country, both as to the past and the future. It was one that every citizen of Canada might well feel proud of, it was one so easily understood that there are none so dull that they could not comprehend it readily. The financial condition of the country since the National Policy was introduced in 1879, was briefly traced up to the present time, and it was shown in the most conclusive manner. I think, that the condition of the country was such as to command both the respect of the people of this country and the respect of the supporters of the Government. Whether we view the condition of the country from the imports and exports, or from the savings of the people deposited in the Post Office and other savings banks, or from the increased life insurance in the country, the increased trade that has been done, or from the industrial pursuits of the people, from whatever standpoint the country is viewed, I think it must be admitted that it has been making fair progress since 1879, that the people have been tolerably well employed, and that the financial condition of the country is such as ought to commend itself to the judgment of the people in general. If we take the increased circulation in the banks and compare it with 1878, and observe that in 1878 the amount was about $65,000,000, and in 1895, $174,900,000, that fact tells the tale that there is a larger trade being done, which necessarily requires a larger circulation of money to carry it on. If we look at the development of the country as found in the additional miles of railway constructed, that affords evidence that the Dominion is rapidly prospering. The mileage in 1878 was 5,000 as compared with 15,000 in 1894, and this is evidence of the fact that Canada has now three times the railway mileage it possessed formerly, and suggests that it must be doing three times as much trade. The earnings in 1878 were $6,000,000, whereas we find that to-day they amounted to $14,000,000 during last year, and this also indicates development. If we take the tons of railway freight carried in 1878, represented by 8,000,000, and compare it with the tons carried in 1894, represented by 20,000,000, that fact tells a very important

story. If we take the tons of freight carried by vessels in 1878, represented by 3,000,000 tons, as compared with 5,000,000 tons in 1894, this also indicates development. Taking the total tonnage of freight, vessel and railway, we find it aggregated in 1878, 11,000,000 tons, and last year, 26,000,000 tons. If hon. gentlemen will take any of these items they will find that it affords unmistakable evidence of the development going on in the country. And that development is going on under the fostering care of a protective policy or the National Policy, which is so strongly condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite. That development has taken place under the management of the Conservative party, which has been controlling the destinies of this country for the last sixteen or seventeen years. And people cannot shut their eyes to these facts which present unmistakable evidence that Canada has been fairly prosperous during the last sixteen years. Then if we make a comparison between our country and other countries it will be found to be in favour of our own. If we compare our country with the United States, and look back a few years, only two years, we find that in the adjoining republic during the period of five months no less than 565 banks and banking institutions utterly collapsed, that there was stagnation in trade and a condition of the people unparalleled in their history from the earliest period up to the present time. If we take our own country, lying alongside the republic, we will find that our banks are in a stable condition, that the pursuits of our people are carried on peacefully and satisfactorily and that, comparatively speaking, there is peace and plenty in the land. We find our banking institutions are doing well, our commercial interests are fairly prosperous, the number of traders breaking down in business from year to year has been much less in proportion to the population since the National Policy was introduced, and on every one of these lines we must admit the National Policy has been a success. If we look to the employment of our people and compare their condition with that of the Americans we find Canadians are much better employed, and if we compare their condition with that of the working classes in the mother country, that country to which hon. gentlemen opposite are always directing attention and with which they desire to make comparison as being a country having a fiscal policy admirably suited to Canada's needs to-day, we must remember that a few days ago it was reported that over 4,000,000 people there were out of employment, while at the same time our industrial pursuits are being vigorously carried on and are increasing from year to year and our people are fairly well employed. These are some of the evidences that show the condition of the country under the management of the Conservative party, which has been in control for the last sixteen years. But when hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to criticise the policy inaugurated in 1878, which has been perfected from time to time since then up to the present and which is carried out to-day, we believe, in the interest of the country as it was in 1879, we naturally ask, what are they offering the country instead of the National Policy, provided they were returned to power. We can only answer that question by referring to the resolutions which they have from time to time offered to this House as embodying the policy by which they would be guided in the event of being returned to power. I take the various resolutions embodying that policy, and in connection with them there is one significant fact which will occur to any one perusing them, namely, that while hon. gentlemen come to this House and crystallize their policy in a few words, which they call a resolution, and which they present to the House as showing what they would do if returned to power, when they go out into the country and elaborate and explain their policy, telling the people what they would do if returned to power, there is a marked difference between the resolutions and the policy, the resolutions meaning one thing and the explanations of the policy meaning something entirely different. I will read to the House some of the resolutions submitted by hon. gentlemen opposite since 1879. In that year, when the National Policy was introduced, Mr. Mackenzie moved an amendment as follows :—

That the said resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, That, while this House is prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service, and the maintenance of the public credit, it regards the scheme now under consideration as calculated to distribute unequally, and therefore unjustly, the burdens of taxation ; to divert capital from its natural and most profitable employment ; to benefit special classes at the expense of the whole community ; tends towards rendering futile the costly and persistent efforts of the country to secure a share of the immense and growing carrying trade of this continent ; and to create an antagonism between the commercial policy of the Empire and that of Canada that might lead to consequences deeply to be deplored.

What was the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite in 1888 ? It is embodied in this resolution, moved by the hon. member for South Oxford :

That this House views with alarm the extremely rapid increase of the debt and taxation of the Dominion, especially in view of the fact that there has been contemporaneously a very great reduction in the debt and amount required for necessary taxation by the United States ; and that this House is of opinion that any considerable addition to the debt or taxation of the people of Canada will work very great hardship to the great bulk of the population, and will tend powerfully to place them in a position of great disadvantage as regards the people of the United States, besides seriously prejudicing their chances

of securing improved commercial relations with the people of that country.

The hon. member for South Oxford, in the same session, moved the following amendment :—

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible measure of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries, should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other.

Hon. members will observe that in 1879 hon. gentlemen opposite were afraid that the action of the Government might disturb harmonious relations between Canada and England by interfering with the trade policy of the Empire, or free trade ; and in 1880 they go to the very opposite extreme—they are not afraid of destroying our harmonious relations with the Empire, but they demand unrestricted reciprocity or continental free trade between Canada and the United States, and there is not in the whole resolution a word with respect to England or how the policy might affect her interests. The one goes in favour of England, the other is the very reverse. In 1889, the Liberal party in this House moved another resolution which declared that :

In the present condition of affairs it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted trade.

We were told by the leaders of the Opposition party then that this meant trade without any restriction whatever. They told us that we were to have no custom-houses along the frontier, and no barriers between the two countries. Their cry was, that there was to be perfect freedom of trade between the United States and Canada. They had no regard or care for the mother country then. In 1890 we had another resolution from the Liberal party in this House which proposed :

To abolish or reduce the taxes now imposed upon the articles of prime necessity to farmers, miners, fishermen, and other producers of the country.

Then in 1891, the Liberals set forth their platform by resolution in this House, as follows :—

The situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artisans, miners, fishermen and farmers, and further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open in Washington in October next, should be conducted on the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, in manufactured, as well as natural products.

That resolution of the Liberal party does not say anything about a tariff for revenue purposes, nor does it say anything about free trade with England, about which the Liberals are now very solicitous. That is a straight declaration for unrestricted reciprocity. The Hon. Mr. Davies, who I see sitting before me, in 1892, moved the following resolution :—

That inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

The hon. gentleman would throw off the duties entirely upon goods coming in from the United States, but he would only reduce the duties a little on goods coming from England. That policy certainly must have been very consoling to the mother country, and to those loyal members of the Opposition who are now protesting to be so solicitous for the welfare of England, and for the promotion of our financial relations with her. In 1893, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That the present customs tariff should be at once thoroughly reformed in the direction of free trade, and that the amount of taxes collected be limited to the sum required to meet the necessities of the Government, efficiently and economically administered.

That was out and out free trade. Before that, their policy was commercial union, but it was feared that we might endanger our relationship with the mother country, because we had departed from the free trade lines which she followed in her relations with other countries. In 1894, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved an amendment on the lines of the resolution of the Ottawa conference, and they were all to this effect :

That the tariff should be reduced, should have eliminated from it the principle of protection, and should be imposed for revenue only ; that it should be so adjusted as to make free, or bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and to promote freer trade with the whole world, particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Now we come down to the present amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and let us inquire what it is. It practically declares that a tariff for revenue only with every vestige of protection taken out of it. That is the Liberal policy to-day. Now, let us go back to last winter, when it was thought we were going to have an election, and when hon. gentlemen opposite were travelling around the country, endeavouring to enlighten the people as to what their policy was, and what they were prepared to carry out if they were returned to power. Let us see what their leader told the people then. I have here a speech made by the leader of the Opposition at Toronto, and as it is one of his latest addresses to the electors, I think it may fairly be taken as embody-

ing his views. He first talked about various questions connected with the policy of the present Government, and, after condemning them in no unstinted terms, he said :

But before I sit down there is another question upon which I wish to say one word or two. I have told you the policy of the Liberal party. We want a party which will collect the greatest amount of revenue with the minimum of taxation. Now, what is the method in which this policy will be carried out ? I am not a revolutionist. I am a Reformer of the English school. I know it is impossible to make changes without time. But we have the great precedent of Sir Robert Peel, who carried the change from protection to free trade, and did it by a gradual process. This is the programme which we intend to follow. This is the precedent. There never was a time in my career when I did not proclaim myself a disciple of Fox, of Peel, a disciple of John Bright, and a disciple of William Ewart Gladstone. (Cheers.)

The Hon. Mr. Laurier in those remarks said : I am not a revolutionist. Some people might have thought he was from what he said previously. He told the people : We are going from protection to free trade; that is the programme we intend to follow; that is the precedent we will be guided by in the event of the electorate of Canada returning us to power. It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that after this declaration, the Liberal party should come to this House to-day, and, in their declaration of principles, say scarcely anything about free trade, but only refer to a revenue tariff. There is another feature about the policy of the Liberal party to which it is as well to draw the attention of the people. They tell the people that while it is intended to collect a revenue they will have a tariff which must be divested from every incident of protection, or, in other words, if the requirements of the country should demand protection, and if the needs of the country should require protection, the Liberals declare that they will have no protection, because their principles are the very reverse. They tell the people of this country that they will not give the country protection, though they could do it, for their policy is against protection, and if they are returned to power they say they will sweep away every vestige of it. Here, then, we have a great difference between the platform of the Liberal party, as laid down in the House and the platform which they have preached to the people in the country. At Toronto, the leader of the Opposition declared for a free trade platform, but here they announce themselves in favour of a revenue tariff, and they desire to catch the votes of the people upon one or the other issues. If these gentlemen of the Opposition go to one section of the country, and if it is said to them : Oh, your policy is free trade ; then they turn up their records of the House of Commons and they answer : Oh, our policy is embodied in that resolution, and that says that we shall have a tariff for revenue only. If, in another part of the country it is said to them : You are not in favour of free trade ; then they can turn to the speech made by the leader of the Opposition in Toronto, and say : There is our motto, Mr. Laurier told them that his precedent was established by Fox, and Peel, and Gladstone ; he was in favour of the free trade of England, and the Liberals were bound to have a tariff in Canada the same as they have it in the old country. The resolution of the Liberal party here declares for a tariff for revenue only, but the speeches of their leaders pronounce for free trade as they have it in England. Mr. Speaker, it is quite plain that the Liberal party of Canada is endeavouring to ride two hobby horses, either one of which they are willing to accept if it would only ensure their getting to the treasury benches. Their position reminds me of the story of the Wisconsin boy and the missionary. In the early history of that state, a Wisconsin missionary, one of the pioneers of the country, and a very good man, was travelling around from place to place, and he carried his worldly effects with him on a very poor specimen of a horse. He met a man on the road, and he asked : Which way he should turn to take the road to Bloomington, but he afterwards forgot whether the man told him to turn to the left or to the right. There was a boy standing at the corner, the usual specimen of a youth out there, with one suspender and a straw hat, but he had an eye for a good horse, and he paid great attention to the animal which the missionary was riding. He thought it was about the ugliest nag he had ever seen, and so when the preacher rode to the corner, he inquired of the boy, which way he should now turn to reach Bloomington. The boy was watching the horse, and did not answer. Then the missionary called out again : Are you deaf, boy, which way now to Bloomington ? The boy said : Who are you, and where are you going ? And the missionary replied : " I am a follower of the Lord." Well, the boy retorted, I do not think it matters much which way you take, for you'll never overtake Him on that horse. So it is with the Liberal party. I do not think it matters which of these hobby horses they will ride, because the people of this country are too intelligent, and they will never overtake the electors on that horse. They will never get into power by riding on either or any of their hobby horses, and, after the electorate poll their votes next election, I have not the slightest doubt that they will just be as far from power as they have ever been for the last fifteen years. Now let me turn my attention for a few moments to some of the criticisms directed against the National Policy by hon. gentlemen opposite. I take first the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) : what does he say ? He says : " I deny in toto

that the farmer needs protection or that the farmer got protection." The farmer does not think so; he has said, on several sucessive occasions, by his vote and his voice, that he does not think so. Then, the hon. gentleman said: "The free admission of grain in 1878 was not detrimental to the interests of the farmer; it did not in the slightest degree interfere with the farmer." Well, he voted differently. The hon. gentleman said further: "The importation of Indian corn was a distinct advantage to the farmers of Canada." Then, we had the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), who, instead of advocating the policy laid down by his leader, free trade as they have it in England, said: "We can never have free trade as they have it in England, because our conditions are different." I take it, therefore, that the hon. gentleman must come into our ranks, because if his party are advocating free trade as they have it in England, he cannot be one of them. Then, I take the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), who spoke last night. He told us that everything was made dearer in Canada by the National Policy, and that the danger of the situation to-day is that we are drifting into boodling and corruption, and that we want a pure and economical Administration. I wondered at the time if the hon. gentleman had considered what was the result of the searchlight of the courts being thrown upon hon. gentlemen opposite after the last general elections. He said: "We may expect, if that Order in Council relative to the Hudson Bay Railway is carried out, that the Government may get 10 per cent of the money for election purposes;" and, therefore, he said, speaking to the country, "You want an economical Administration and one that will not indulge in boodling, but that will honestly and faithfully attend to its duties." Now, when the searchlight of the courts was thrown upon the hon. gentleman's friends after the last elections, was it found that there was no boodling among them, and that they were pure? I have here a list of the men who were unseated; and, as there are fewer representatives of the Opposition in this House than on the Government side, if the proportion on both sides were the same, the number ought to be larger on the Government side. But what do we find? We find that the courts decided that there were evidences of corruption sufficient to unseat the Reform members for the following constituencies: Lincoln, East Bruce, Soulanges, Peel, Queen's, N.S., Lennox, North Victoria, Digby, N.S., King's, N.S., Ontario South, Huron West, Vaudreuil, East Simcoe, London, South Perth, Monck, Montmorency, Northumberland West, Carleton, N.B., Prescott, Welland, North Perth, L'Assomption, Pontiac and Chicoutimi. Twenty-five of those men who were so pure, went down when the searchlight of the courts was thrown upon them.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the politics of those twenty-five men?

Mr. SPROULE. They were all on the Reform side, and they were the men who the hon. member for Addington says should be put in charge of the affairs of this country, because they are so pure and honest and free from boodling. The courts said they were not, and unseated them because of corruption, and what did the electors say when they went back for re-election? The electorate said: "We believe you are not pure; we believe you are dishonest," because they left at home the Reform candidates in the following constituencies: East Bruce, Soulanges, Lennox, North Victoria, South Ontario, West Huron, Vaudreuil, East Simcoe, London, South Perth, Monck, Montmorency, Northumberland West, L'Assomption, Pontiac and Chicoutimi. To sixteen of those twenty-five men, the electorate of the country, when asked their opinion, said: "We believe you are not as pure as you ought to be," and left them at home, and put Conservatives in their places. Now, how many Conservatives were unseated by the courts? There were thirteen in all, although if they had been unseated in the same proportion as the members of the Reform party, there would have been more than twice the number. And when those Conservative candidates who were unseated went back to the people, what was the result? They were re-elected for the following constituencies: Glengarry, Richmond, N.S., Cumberland, N.S., Halton, Halifax (both members), Prince Edward, East Middlesex, Victoria, East Elgin, Montcalm, Brome and Soulanges. Only one out of the whole number failed to be returned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question? Do I understand his argument to be that those respectable Conservative gentlemen who were unseated were impure and dishonest?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about Conservative members. I am talking about the argument of the hon. gentleman who spoke last night. He said: "If the country wants purity and no boodling, return the Reform party to power." Where did the courts leave them after the last elections? They left them out. Where did the people leave them when they returned for re-election? They left them at home. Both the courts and the people said they had no confidence in their professions of purity and honesty. But the hon. gentleman said, "The Government have an Order in Council before this House to subsidize a railway to Hudson Bay, and what does it mean? It may mean that they are going to get out of that subsidy money to run the elections. "If

they get 10 per cent of the subsidy," he asked, "what will that amount to?" But he said, "Return the Reform party to power, and we will do away with this boodling and corruption, and these big steals from the country." I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he remembers what took place in the province of Quebec before the last general election, in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs railway scheme? And has he any remembrance of what was revealed when the purists who handled the money in that transaction were brought before the courts? Has he any remembrance that $15,000 of that money was taken to retire three notes made by E. Pacaud and endorsed by Mercier, the two Langeliers and Senator Pelletier, one of these being a gentleman who occupies a seat in this House? Has he any remembrance that $8,000 was taken to retire two notes made by E. Pacaud and endorsed by Mercier, C. Langelier, Pelletier, and the honourable and immaculate Tarte? Has he any remembrance that $6,788 was taken for payments made to Mercier, or that $9,301 was taken for "ditto" to C. Langelier? Has he any remembrance that $1,582 was taken for payments to members of the legislature who were not members of the Cabinet? Has he any remembrance of the $2,000 that were used to take up Mr. Tarte's note, which was endorsed by the Hon. Mr. Langelier? Has he any remembrance of the $27,900 that went to Pacaud for personal expenses? But, of course, this is all purity; no corruption in all this. Has he any recollection of the $24,456 that was passed over into Mr. Pacaud's hands? or the $25,000 that went to Mr. Geoffrion? Or the $24,500 that went to the credit of Mr. Pacaud in connection with another deal? No, he has not any recollection of these, and, of course, everything is going to be pure if the people will only return them to power. In connection with that election, there is a great deal to come out. The hon. gentleman said that members supporting the Government talked a great deal about their loyalty, and ran their last election on loyalty and attributed to the Opposition disloyal motives. I have here an extract taken from a Buffalo paper which discloses some information, but which shows, to my mind, that there is a great deal more behind which the Canadian people ought to know. The people ought to know where hon. gentlemen opposite got their money, for although they got some from the Baie des Chaleurs Railway and other schemes, we believe and are credibly informed that they got a large portion from the United States. How did they get it? Because they were allied to men over there whose sole aim and object was the annexation of Canada, and who, in order to accomplish that, were prepared to dive deep into their own pockets and pay out money freely to the Canadian Reform party. Let me read this despatch from Washington to a Buffalo paper, dated 1st May, 1895:

Washington, D C., May 1.—Special to the Buffalo "Commercial":—Behind the late resolution of the New York Legislature in favour of the annexation of Canada, was this interesting story, the material facts of which are as follows:—In the fall of 1893 a French Liberal member of the Canadian Parliament, accredited by ex-Premier Mercier of Quebec, and accompanied by a delegation of other Canadian politicians, came to New York to see if a campaign fund could not be raised there to put the question of annexation, as they said, fairly before the Canadian rural constituencies. The business embarrassments of Mr. Ras Wiman, who had heretofore financed the annexation propaganda——

What does that mean?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a shame that this should be lost, and I would advise the hon. gentleman to wait until the representatives of the Conservative press come back to their places in the gallery.

Mr. SPROULE. We will have a sufficient record to supply the hon. gentleman and the press and the country, whether the members of the Conservative press are here or not:

——the business embarrassments of Mr. Ras Wiman, who had heretofore financed the annexationist propaganda, was the assigned reason for seeking broader and more direct relations with American friends of Canadian annexation. The delegation was successful in enlisting the support of Messrs. Charles A. Dana and Andrew Carnegie, who brought in so many other adherents that, as the result of a series of conferences, the delegation went home with the assurance that $50,000 should be immediately supplied to put the movement on its feet, and afterwards as much more as might be needed to keep it in successful operation. After the departure of the French Liberal and his compatriots, Mr. Carnegie, who had agreed to look after the financial end of the international alliance, concluded he would make some independent and confidential inquiries in Canada to ascertain if Messrs. Mercier and company might be trusted with the disbursement of the annexation fund, and whether their political influence was sufficient to put the question of annexation effectively before the Canadian electorate. He was informed in reply that Hon. Wilfred Laurier, the leader of the Liberal party, who was the only politician who could give the question a practical standing, positively refused to openly adopt annexation as a part of the Liberal platform,——

He would not openly adopt it. What are we to assume from that? Evidently we must assume that he would scarcely adopt it. Yet these hon. gentlemen talk loyalty, and boasted of the great loyalty on that side of the House:

——positively refused to openly adopt annexation as a part of the Liberal platform, though favourable to closer and friendlier relations with the United States, and to a continental policy in all matters short of actual political union.

He would go the whole length; he would do away with the whole tariff to satisfy the

American people, if they would only furnish the financial assistance requisite to enable his party to carry out that policy :

Mr. Carnegie and his friends were not satisfied with this limited programme, they were advised to drop the whole matter, as any fund sent to the guerilla wing of the Liberal party would be simply wasted and misapplied. Messrs. Carnegie and Dana then drew out of the movement. Their friends followed suit, and the international alliance came to an end.

What is the case ? They are without funds to-day. I only give this as an evidence to show that the very men who were talking about the Government providing funds to run an election were supplied with funds by Mr. Wiman—undoubtedly the evidence is conclusive—for the last campaign, and they are in hopes of being supplied with funds for the next campaign by the annexationists on the other side, who are moving resolutions and showing their willingness to raise the funds, if the money be only put into the hands of reliable parties. They have put at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite $50,000, and are prepared to go on and raise sufficient means to enable them to carry on the party warfare.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman tells us there are $50,000 deposited. I want to know where it is.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). He did not say deposited.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that the information disclosed in this correspondence from Washington to a Buffalo paper is that $50,000 was raised and at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that the annexationists on the other side would raise much more if hon. gentlemen opposite could only prove their bona fides, and that the money would be put into the hands of responsible parties who would use it in the interests of annexation. I did not say deposited. Then we had a speech from the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), and I was very much amused at the line of criticism that hon. gentleman indulged in. As I looked at that hon. gentleman and remembered the man whose place he has come to fill, the exclamation of the poet was recalled to my mind : " Shades of the mighty dead, what calamities befall a nation !" Think of the great man, the noble character who preceded him, and whose untimely death in the house of his Sovereign, at the very moment when he was receiving the highest tribute which could be paid to a colonial statesman for his integrity to the Empire, think of his good work and his great ability, and of his untimely end which drew forth the sympathies, not only of the Dominion, but of the united Empire—think of that great man, and how dwarfed must not his successor appear. The country has to bear not only the calamity of this great loss, but the spectacle of the vacant place being filled by the hon. gentleman who regaled our ears with the flow of speech we had to listen to last night. Compare the calm dignity, the clear and cautious presentation, the logical reasoning, the matured judgment, the legal acumen, the plain and candid advice of the late member for Antigonish (Sir John Thompson) with the turgid, uninteresting stream of invective, windy declamation and morbid imagery to which this House was treated last night by his successor, the present member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). " Oh, what a falling off was there !" There was in the hon. gentleman's whole speech, no evidence either of logic or reasoning, or calmness, or dignity, or ability, and it is not to be wondered at that the country should lament the change. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) should say nothing about corruption or dishonesty. It does not lie in his mouth to speak of it so glibly as he has done. What does the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford mean to the Canadian people ? It announces to the Canadian people—if you return us to power we are going to give you, if we can be believed, free trade as they have it in England. It means to the manufacturer that Canada will be again made a slaughter market for American goods, as it was in 1878. It means to the mechanic and labourer reduced work because of the reduced output of the factories, reduced wages and a reduced supply of the necessaries of life. It means to the farmer the destruction of his home market by the competition of western farmers—by Armour and Company of Chicago ; by Swift of Chicago ; by those men who injured us so very much in the past. But we are told by the hon. member for North Norfolk that protection is of no use to the Canadian farmer. It is against his interest that grain is not allowed to come in free : the duty on pork was of no advantage to the Canadian farmer. And the hon. gentleman says : If the country returns our party to power, we will do away with that protection and will bring the people of Canada back to the condition in which they were in 1878. Let me give one item in which the Canadian farmer is interested, and which, to my mind, proves most conclusively that the theory of the hon. member for North Norfolk is entirely foundationless. I find by the returns that in one year Armour, Swift and other similar houses sent into Canada to feed Canadians 29,000,000 pounds of meat, fresh and salted. Then a protective policy was brought into play and a duty was put upon meat. The result was that last year these firms brought into Canada only 8,000,000 pounds of meat. That is to say, 21,000,000 of meat was shut out. How many Canadians would that feed ? What increased market would that mean to the Canadian farmer ? Would not that market be taken away from him if we did away with the protective tariff that shuts

out the products of the American farmer? It is not necessary to argue this question in order to convince intelligent Canadian farmers of the advantage they receive from this protection. Hon. gentlemen say the people want to go back to free trade as it is in England. I do not think they do. Take the case of grain. I find that in one year the tariff shut out from this country American grain to the extent of 12,000,000 bushels, as compared with the amount which had formerly been brought in. The result is that the Canadian farmer has an increased market to that extent. I am willing to leave it to the farmers, for they are too intelligent to be deceived by the argument of gentlemen opposite. We are told by our opponents that the policy of this Government is class legislation, that they are legislating distinctly in favour of the manufacturers. What class of manufacturers, I would ask? The farmer is a manufacturer who is manufacturing products to go into consumption abroad as well as at home. If the Government are legislating for the manufacturer, they are legislating for the farmer, and they are doing so directly by putting a duty on such articles as the farmer produces. But we are told that the Canadian farmer wants free trade as they have it in England. The resolution before the House declares for a tariff for the purpose of raising a revenue and for that purpose alone, the element of protection being entirely removed from it. Before the Canadian people can judge of the value of the English system, they must know how the public revenue is raised in England. I have here a few items giving some information as to that point, and I read them so that the Canadian farmer, the Canadian artisan, the Canadian labourer may ask himself whether this system would be suitable to our conditions if it were applied. Great Britain raises a revenue of $100,000,000 by customs duties. That is much the same plan as we adopt here. But they have also direct taxes. We have often told the Canadian people: If you return the Reformers to power they will adopt a policy which means direct taxation upon the Canadian farmer, labourer and artisan. Now, the Reformers tell the Canadian people: We are going to give you taxation upon the same principles as are applied in England, for the leader of the Opposition declares that to be the model, the aim of his party. In England they levy taxes upon the land. We have often told the Canadian farmer that if the Reformers were returned to power there would be a direct tax upon the lands of the country. How much do the English people raise by a direct tax upon the land? Under this system, which the Reformers tell the Canadian people would be suitable for our conditions, Great Britain raised $5,134,000 last year by direct tax upon the land. Ask any farmer if he favours such a system. In Great Britain they levy a direct tax upon houses. Ask any man living in a house in any of our cities, towns or villages, or upon any of our farms if he wishes to pay a direct tax upon his habitation? If he does, tell him to vote for hon. gentlemen opposite, for their policy leads to that, as it has led to it in England, and these hon. gentlemen say they will give us the same principles of taxation as in England. The inhabited house duty is levied at the rate of twopence on the pound for houses of a certain value, fourpence in the pound on another class and sixpence in the pound on another class, and last year, the total amount raised by this duty was $7,205,000. Then in Great Britain they have a tax upon the right to kill game; a tax upon the right to carry a gun; a tax upon every male servant—fifteen shillings for ach; a tax upon every carriage that is owned; a tax upon solicitors—I do not know that that would be such a great evil to the country, but however that may be, the tax is levied; a tax upon life insurance; a tax upon the right to sell patent medicines—hon. gentlemen might go into that extensively and collect a great deal of money; a tax upon bills of exchange; a tax upon receipts; a tax upon contracts—and so on. I would like to ask the Canadian people if they would like this to be the principle upon which our taxes are to be raised. Tax the land and you reach the farmer; tax the house and you reach the tenant; tax the servants and you reach the class who employ servants; tax the right to carry a gun and you reach the sportsman. Let the people understand the facts and I think they will realize the benefits which accrue to them from the policy of the present Government. I do not wish to continue this debate further, because I have taken up more time than I intended when I commenced. But I can only say that, in my opinion, the electorate of Canada only require to be well informed as to the policy of the Opposition to go and vote against that policy as they did in the past. Every time they have presented a policy in antagonism to the National Policy, since 1879, they have been defeated, and I believe they will meet with the same fate when they go back to the country again. They sometimes express an anxiety for an election. It is well for them that the election is kept off, because the sooner the election comes, the quicker they will be confounded, the quicker they will be relegated, for the fifth time, to the cold shades of Opposition. I say that the Canadian farmer only wants to know that the policy of the Opposition contains no protection for him, then he will not endorse that policy; the labourer only wants to know that it reduces his wages, that it reduces his opportunities of employment, then he will not endorse that policy; the manufacturer only wants to know that it brings him into competition with the slaughtered goods of the United States, that it destroys

his capital, that it wastes his means, then he will not endorse that policy. No class of the electorate will vote for them. If they take the manufacturers, these must distinctly vote against them, because they have called them thieves and robbers; if they take the farmers, they make no provision for the protection of the farmers in their policy, therefore they will be against them. If they take the labourers, the labourers know that their policy will reduce their opportunities for work, therefore the labourers must be against them. The artisan must be against them, the commercial class must be against them, and, certainly, all the intelligent classes of the community will be against them. Then, where do they expect to get their support? I say they will find, in the future, as they have found in the past, that the policy they have laid down to-day will relegate them again to the cold shades of Opposition; and the Conservative party, I am quite satisfied, will be returned to power again, as they have been several times in the past, with an overwhelming majority of the people of this country at their back.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In rising to discuss the issues that are presented to the House this afternoon, the question of how we shall raise the necessary money for the purpose of administering the affairs of this country for the ensuing year, and the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford, as opposed to that of the Minister of Finance, I have only to say that I am distinctly in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford. In that respect I differ somewhat from the hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who has just taken his seat. I differ from him in several other matters, but I am able to agree with him when he lays a tribute of respect upon the grave of our departed Premier; because, I hold that the members of the Opposition respect the worth of that hon. gentleman, and realize the loss that Canada has sustained in his death, just as deeply as the hon. member for Grey ever could. While I congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his promotion to the leadership of this House, I have also to express my regret that, for the first time in my parliamentary experience we have been deprived of the presence of the actual leader in our midst, and I have found these double duties devolving upon the Minister of Finance. Now, I believe that, however much that hon. gentleman may display his ability in handling the finances of this country, it is not in the interest of his political party, nor of this country, that such a combination should exist. We now find the Premier sitting in another Chamber which is in nowise directly responsible to the people, and entirely independent of them in any form, and he is accompanied by the hon. gentleman who controls the one department that, perhaps, involves greater interests than all the other departments combined. I refer to the Department of Agriculture. When we find the lawyer who is the head of that branch of our service, is also located in the Senate, away from any contact with public sentiment, away from associations with the people's representatives, I think it will be found, under these circumstances, that the public interest will distinctly suffer. When I heard the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, deliver his singular utterance with respect to the people's choice of a man to represent the county of Antigonish in succession to the late Premier, it occurred to me that no more scathing criticism could be administered to his political party. Granted that half of what he said with respect to that hon. gentleman was true, which I do not grant, it merely shows that after the Minister of Justice went down into the county of Antigonish, and after they had put a family relative of the deceased Premier into the field to secure for him the sympathy and support of the circumstances under which the late Premier passed away, the people of Antigonish, in face of the policy advocated by that hon. gentleman, refused to elect their man, and sent my hon. friend here to support the Liberal party. And yet my hon. friend from Grey comes down, and he, of all men in this House, says: "How have the mighty fallen!" It is words, only words.

Before proceeding to criticise the mode in which the Minister of Finance proposes to raise money for the next year, I want to say a few words about the position my hon. friend assumes to our party on this side of the House. He told us a very amusing story about a man out in the Western States, who, astride of a very bad horse, was riding around the country in a very indefinite manner, and he thought it would be a long time before he would overtake the Lord in that way. It occurred to me that that incident might have been applied a good deal nearer home, and not so very long ago. I remember when there was an enormous activity in political circles; I remember when this Government was hastening the preparation of the voters' lists of this Dominion, and circulars were sent out to the revising officers to get their work done at the appointed time. An extra staff of printers were employed in the department for the purpose of hastening on the preparation of these voters' lists, and have them all ready. For what purpose? Presumably for an appeal to the people. Every other kind of business was suspended, but suddenly there came an Order in Council to call us together here in session; and the Secretary of State has presented a Bill to the House to make these voters' lists good and valid for the current year, so that we need not take the trouble to revise them during this summer. Was all that gone through

to enable the Minister to introduce this Bill? Did it not look very like as if hon. gentlemen opposite were mounted on that very scaly horse, and were meandering about in such fashion that they did not know where they were going? But, finally, instead of going to the people, they suddenly made up their mind it was not safe to trust the people, that they had better face the people's representatives once more in session.

Now, Sir, I want to draw attention to one or two statements that were made by the Controller of Customs to his address to the House the other day. I do it because naturally the utterances of an hon. gentleman occupying his position, who controls the Customs, the one large revenue-paying branch, are likely to attract attention and receive consideration at the hands of the people. What do we find that hon. gentleman said with respect to the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government, as compared with the expenditure on public affairs to-day? I read from the official report:

> The total expenditure of 1872-73 was $19,174,000. When the Reform party came into power in 1874, that expenditure jumped up to $24,448,000, or an increase of $5,318,000 in one year, in spite of their professions of economy.

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to moralize and prophesy. He said:

> And I think it would require no prophet to assure us that, if they should come into power to-morrow, we would find history repeating itself.

Turning to the Public Accounts issued for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1894—what do I find? I find that the quotation made by the hon. gentleman does not quite agree with the official statement in the Public Accounts. The hon. gentleman said the expenditure in 1872-73 was so and so. So it was. But it so happened that the whole of the year 1872-73 was passed before the Mackenzie Government came into power, and four months of 1873-74, and that the Estimates for 1873-74 were passed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister, and one-third of the year had passed. The Controller of Customs concealed the fact that between those two periods we had added another province to confederation, and that the whole of the expenditure for Prince Edward Island was added to the expenses of the country. I am not surprised that the hon. the Controller has got himself into trouble in this House. I am not surprised that when the Minister of Railways and Canals was confronted with his campaign speeches during last fall, he found himself compelled to repudiate not only the statements of gentlemen who heard him make the statements attributed to him, but also the statements of his own official reporter. Let me draw the attention of the House to one more statement: That taking the whole of 1873-74, the Estimates for which were furnished by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in regard to which the preceding Government had expended four months of the revenue out of the twelve before Mr. Mackenzie came into office, during that year the total expenditure under the Mackenzie Government was only $23,316,000, and when that Government went out in 1878, after administering public affairs during five years, the expenditure had only risen to $23,503,000. The last year's expenditure of hon. gentlemen opposite has risen to the enormous sum of $37,585,000, and yet the Controller of Customs has the cheek to come and tell this House about his economy as compared with the Administration of the Mackenzie Government. The debt statements are another example. We assumed in 1873 along with the administration of Prince Edward Island, a debt of $4,700,000, which came into the accounts for the first time during the first year of Mr. Mackenzie's Government. Yet the Controller of Customs was not fair enought to make that statement.

But let me take another method with which hon. gentlemen opposite deal with the finances. We have heard considerable to-day from the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) with respect to certain expenditures in Quebec, and we heard a beautiful fairy tale about $50,000 which was being contributed for some Liberal annexation fund from the American side. I think the hon. gentleman should have listened to the statements of the Finance Minister the other day, when he told the House that the credit of the American Union was so low that while we could borrow money in England at 1⅛ per cent, the United States had to pay 3¾ per cent; and yet the hon. member for Grey makes himself believe that they would spend $50,000 for the purpose of annexing Canada to the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. That is why they are so anxious to get us annexed.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I admire the abiding faith of the hon. member for East Grey. If he can accept that, it is clear that his faith could remove mountains if necessary to make an impression in a political campaign. But I come back for a moment to the statement made by the Controller of Customs with respect to provincial expenditure. He gave the House a table showing increased expenditure of various provinces, and then he held up his hand in horror, and said, Look how these Grit Governments have increased the expenditures in the various provinces of the Dominion. The $9,132,000 it took in 1894 to collect the revenue of the Dominion is the best answer to that statement; but he did not go so far as my respected friend, the member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), who told the House that Ontario had a debt of about $1,500,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has it any debts?

Mr. CHARLTON. Do you say it has ?

Mr. IVES. They have been selling securities.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has it any debts ?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yesterday there was an election in North Brant to fill a vacancy, and so low had the political strength of the party with which the hon. gentleman is allied sunk, that they did not put a man in the field to contest the election, and allowed a supporter of Sir Oliver Mowat to be elected by acclamation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think I may rise and say that that answer is not only disingenuous, but very unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman gave way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The dignity of Parliament is not preserved by these interruptions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I trust the same ruling will be applied——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The Secretary of State must admit that I am not guilty of interrupting hon. members across the floor of the House. What are the facts with respect to provincial debts—how does it tally with the political record of Ontario for the last 22 years ? Sir Oliver Mowat has been Premier and administered the affairs of the province for 22 years. What is the strength of the Conservative party in that province to-day compared with the strength in its early history ? Take the last session of the legislature, and on two occasions they succeeded on mustering, on a party vote, 23 and 25 respectively, out of a division list of 62 and 66 against them.

Mr. IVES. Let me ask the hon. gentleman : Did the proportion represent the popular vote of Ontario ? How about the gerrymander ?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I shall have a word to say about the gerrymander, if the hon. member for Texas will wait till a little later.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Has any one ever seen the Premier of Ontario go to London to borrow a dollar ? Has there ever been a prospectus of the province of Ontario presented on the markets of the world to borrow money, as the Finance Minister of this Dominion has been doing at intervals of two years in succession lately ?—and he will have to go there again before two years are over. That is the best answer. There is no province in the world of this broad Dominion that can present so fair a record in that respect as the province of Ontario. Let me present to hon. gentlemen opposite two short extracts from the two last budget speeches made by the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario. I presume, that no gentleman here will deny that the Provincial Treasurer knows about the affairs of that province, probably quite as well as the Controller of Customs here or the member for King's, P.E.I., (Mr. Macdonald). The Hon. Mr. Harcourt says in his budget speech of 1894 :

> Since confederation up to the close of 1893, our total grants to railways amount to $5,959,000. The present value of our annuities outstanding is $1,319,775, and at this very hour we have at our credit in the banks hard cash to the amount of $1,550,000.

That is the province that these gentlemen tell us is in debt.

Mr. INGRAM. How did they get it ?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). They did not get it by going over to England and borrowing money as the Finance Minister whom my hon. friends support has been in the habit of doing, at intervals of every two years. Here is a quotation from the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario, delivered on the 28th February, this year, and I will read it for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite :

> All told, deducting present liabilities from our schedule of assets, we had at the end of last year a comfortable surplus of $5,269,000.

That is the record of the province of Ontario. That is the record of twenty-two years of Liberal Administration under Sir Oliver Mowat ; and where to-day is the political party that opposed him in that province ? I have not a word of disrespect to say to my Conservative friends in Ontario, but I point to this : That after a prolonged siege, advancing the interests of that party, their last leader—and he was a gentleman of irreproachable personal character, and a first-class lawyer—retired on the Bench. He was succeeded by another gentleman at the last session of Parliament which met in February last, and I see it stated in the papers of the day that that gentleman is now anxious to be relieved from the cares of this little fragment of a political party up in the province of Ontario. Is not that the best evidence that the people of Ontario are satisfied that the Administration of Sir Oliver Mowat and his Liberal friends has been in the interest of the province ?

Just about the time we assembled for the opening of Parliament, there was an election in the county of Haldimand. There was a revolt in the Orange order in Canada of which the Controller of Customs is the Grand Master. There was some trouble in the family because there was a section who were in open revolt and put a candidate in the field against

the present Secretary of State. Where was the Grand Master of that organization? In that hour of trial for his friends and for the association of which he was the presiding officer, where was he? Was he on the field of battle to counsel and guide and advise those gentlemen who had given him an office of high trust, and made him for the time being their commander-in-chief? No, Sir, he tells us himself, that of all places on this earth, he was away down at Washington. I do not know whether he made that trip in the Government car "Jamaica," that is said now to be gone to California with another ex-member of the Cabinet, or not: but at all events the Controller of Customs tells us, that he was down in Washington. If a Grit goes down there, there is trouble at once: he is declared to be plotting for the ruin of his country, but it appears that when the Controller of Customs goes there he is not open to that charge. Well, Sir, I want to draw attention to the statement made by the Minister of Finance respecting the United States loan. After telling us that he had placed his Canadian loan on the market at such favourable terms, that after deducting all the costs and expenses, and all the other charges in connection with the loan over in London, he placed it at 3½ per cent. Then he goes on to say:

> A short time after that the United States put an issue of bonds upon the market, and the rate of interest which those bear and which the United States have to pay, is within a fraction, in fact I think it is absolutely, 3¾ per cent, while the Canadian loan went on the British market at 3½ per cent.

Subsequent to that we had a little discussion with the Controller of Customs over the same question, and he confirmed the statement that our loan was made at the net value of 3½, the loan made by the United States bearing 4 per cent interest on the 30 years coin bonds for which $65,000,000 was obtained. Now, whatever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) went down to Washington for, he certainly did not secure much information about that loan. Sir, what were the facts? Twice in 1894 the Secretary of the Treasury issued bonds, but in November, at that particular period referred to by both the Finance Minister and the Controller of Customs, those 30-year old 4 per cent bonds were issued. The bonds that were placed on the market then, were bonds that ran for only a little over nine years, that bore 5 per cent interest on the face, and were sold for gold at a rate that netted a little under 3 per cent to the banks that purchased them, and the loan of February was selling then on the market currently, paying 2¾ per cent to purchasers. What led to the difficulties? It was simply this: That in the United States Congress there was a section of members who were determined to make the payments of the United States silver equivalent to gold, at the rate of 15½ to 1, when that coin on the market was only worth 33 to 1. The gold was flowing out of the United States treasury as rapidly as it came in until on the 28th of January, when the President sent his message to Congress, there was not enough of gold in the treasury available for three days' draft at the rate at which it had been going out of the treasury for the ten days previous. It was becoming a crisis in the United States. A contract was then made, after a great deal of negotiation, with not only the New York bankers(but also the Rothschilds of London, for the delivery of 3,500,000 ounces of standard gold coin of the United States, at the cost of the parties tendering, to the United States Treasury. It is true, those bonds were thirty years 4 per cent bonds, and they were sold to the bankers to yield 3¾ per cent, because the bankers took the risk of not being able to prevent the draft on the treasury, and they were bound to import half the gold required. Here is an important factor in that transaction which both hon. gentlemen omitted to mention. Why did they not tell us that the proposition stood upen for ten days, which was made to Congress by these very same bankers, that instead of leaving the word "coin" in the contract, as it was gold they were supplying, they would take a 3 per cent gold bond at par in place of those very bonds? What did the New York "Tribune" of the 10th of February say about the refusal of Congress to endorse that proposition when it was laid before them by President Cleveland? It said this:

> The President has made the necessary proposals to banks, but most judiciously has left ten days' time in which Congress, if it has the needful wisdom, can save the country $14,000,000 by passing a proper Bond Bill. Pass some Bill with the proviso that the Secretary of the Treasury shall contract to pay the same kind of money that the Government asks from lenders. If it wants to borrow silver, let it pay silver. If it wants to borrow gold, let it be honourable enough, and also shrewd enough, to pay gold. Why not authorize the payment of the same kind of money that the Government actually borrows, with 3 per cent interest? Nothing but blind and stupid partisanship, it must be admitted, prevents this.

And yet, for the purpose of making the people of Canada believe that our credit was so much better than that of the United States, the Finance Minister was either misled by those who made up that statement, or he suppressed what was essential in a fair statement of the facts to the public. Sir, I have as much attachment to my country as the Finance Minister or any one else; I have lived in the riding I represent as long as I can remember; the whole of my interests are in this country; I take no back seat to any man in this House for attachment to my country and its institutions; but I have not seen the day when I would stoop so low as to misrepresent a neighbour for the purpose of advancing the interests of my own coun-

try. Hon. gentlemen opposite talked to us very freely about railway transactions in which the Liberal party have figured discreditably in the province of Quebec. I have nothing to do with the local financial affairs of the province of Quebec; but I want to remind the House that the gentlemen who shout so loudly about that transaction took the Hon. Mr. Mercier into court and endeavoured to establish the charges which they made against him so freely, and they signally failed.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The grand jury gave the verdict, that is, the people.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, we appealed to the people of Antigonish the other day, and we saw the result.

Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to a case that was before the courts of Montreal only a few days ago, and I will quote from the Montreal "Gazette" of the 14th of May, 1895, a statement made by Judge Desnoyers upon the application of the Solicitor General with respect to the suit against the contractor on the Curran bridge for a refund of money which the Solicitor General claimed he had got unfairly from this Government. Let me call attention to some of the details of that transaction. It related to two bridges across the Lachine Canal and the Grand Trunk Railway. The Government engineer's first estimate of the cost of completing those bridges was $160,000. But they proposed to make certain changes, to enable them to deepen the canal and improve the works, and the highest figure which the Government's own engineer gave as the cost of the work was $223,000. Although the work was within two or three hours run by rail of the headquarters of the Government at Ottawa, what did they do? They paid $394,000 for that work which their own engineer had estimated would cost $223,000, and then they instituted a suit against their own contractors to try to get $170,000 out of him. Let me make a few quotations from the statement of the judge upon the evidence placed before him with respect to the terms of the contract made by the department with the contractor, Mr. St. Louis. Here is a specimen of the wages which this precious economical Government contracted to pay to that contractor: A stonecutter foreman was allowed $4 a day for day time and $6 for night time, $8 a day for Sunday, and $12 a day for Sunday overtime.

Mr. STEVENSON. You need to take breath after that.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). You will need to draw your breath when you tell the people of Peterboro' that you contracted to pay a superintendent $12 a day for Sunday work. A double team got $5 a day, and, when religiously at work on Sunday, it got $10. What else do we find? We find that a derrick was worth $2.75 in the daytime, but the same instrument was worth $3.75 at night, and it was a religious derrick, because when it had to work on Sunday its conscience had to be appeased by giving it $7.50. That was the contract made under the supervision of the Minister right here in this House. I am not speaking of what occurred outside, but of the contract that these gentlemen made with Mr. St. Louis. He went to work to carry out that contract. What does the judge say in addition? He says:

> And on the same scale for stonemasons, stonesetters and skilled labourers, Mr. St. Louis' bills must have been tremendous, when it is remembered the job lasted four months, and that at times there were 2,000 men at work in the daytime and 1,500 men at work at night. The men were paid alternately every week. Mr. Michaud tells us that some of the pays amounted to $34,000, some $10,000, some $15,000 and some $20,000.

And yet that went on for four months, although all that time the Minister and his responsible subordinates could have left this House and run down to the work any afternoon, inspected what was going on, and made things right. That went on until, instead of paying out $233,000, the Government paid nearly $400,000, and yet they ask us to believe that they did not know anything about it, and that the whole thing was economically administered. Let any hon. gentleman go to Ontario and present those figures to the electorate and try to make them believe that this expenditure was a really honest, just and fair expenditure of public money. When we find that the contractor destroyed his books because his safe was not big enough to hold them after he got through, and when we find him declaring under oath that he had given contributions to aid the party in power, need we go any further to find a reason why this extravagance was allowed to go on unchecked? What did the judge say? Did he instruct Mr. St. Louis to pay back this money? No; he goes on to say:

> There was no proper surveillance by the officers of the Government on two of the jobs at least, viz., the Grand Trunk bridge and lock No. 1 of the Lachine Canal. The time-keeping on the two latter jobs seems to have been left to take care of itself, as far as the Government officers were concerned, so much so that two prominent public officers, high in office, lost their situation on that account. Mr. St. Louis procured all the workmen that were asked of him. He did not keep time personally, he had several clerks to do it, and one of them stuffed the lists. This was sworn to by himself, to his own disgrace; and when these lists were so made and cooked, they were certified blindly and as a matter of form by the officers of the Government.

And yet this is the Government which undertakes to tell us that they are administering the affairs of the country carefully. The judge thus sums up:

In my opinion, the main causes of all the trouble in this matter are :

1st. The extortionate prices stipulated for labour in Mr. St. Louis' contract, and, 2nd. the almost unlimited number of men on the said works, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

And the judge ruled that St. Louis had only worked up to the contract of the Government, and declined to order him to pay back the money. I ask if you can parallel that record in Ontario, or any other province of this Dominion under the administration of the Liberal party ?

But hon. gentlemen opposite have undertaken to show that the policy of the Opposition is unfavourable to the farmer. They have told us that protection has been a blessing to the farmer. I wish to glance at that statement for a moment. You remember, Sir, that when the National Policy was inaugurated, we were told that it was to create a home market which would consume our farm products raised at home. Hon. gentlemen opposite declared that to be the best market, and they said further that, in consequence of the stimulus afforded by the National Policy our manufacturers would be able to manufacture what we wanted at home. In short, we were to put an end to our foreign trade by consuming our farm products at home. The enormous population of operatives, which the National Policy was to place in our midst, would consume our farm products, and then we would be under no necessity to import from abroad because we would make everything at home. What are the facts ? Last year we exported nearly $50,000,000 worth of farm products after we had fed all the operatives which the National Policy had brought into Canada. I ask you, Sir, as a business man, how long it will be before, at the present rate, we will have sufficient consuming population established in the country to overtake the production of our farmers, even supposing our farmers stood still and did not increase their production at all ? What are the facts with respect to the protective policy as it affects the farmer ? These hon. gentlemen talk to us about taking off the duties and allowing the Canadian market to be flooded with American agricultural products. Do these hon. gentlemen know that to-day beef is being shipped from Toronto to the market of Buffalo to meet the wants of the people on that side of the river ? People do not ship products into a lower market from a higher and pay a heavy duty besides. All winter long the hog market, about which they make much fuss, has been higher in Buffalo, has been higher even in Chicago, than it has been in Toronto. And yet these hon. gentlemen, in the face of these facts, will maintain that the National Policy protects the farmer. Sir, I was amused when the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) made that beautiful statement of his, with respect to how the National Policy operated to protect the farmers of Canada. He said :

One way is by grinding down the wages of employees and the profits of capitalists, so that we can produce more cheaply in this country than any other country in the world ; that is the way of hon. gentlemen opposite. Another way is to put up a tariff which will make outsiders who wish to come into this market, pay something for the privilege ; that is the Conservative way—the way in which we propose to keep our market for our own people.

Sir, how do they tax those who wish to obtain access to our markets, so far as the farmer is concerned, when this is the position of affairs to-day ? What is the use of telling us that there is protection in it for the farmers ? Why, Sir, the fact is that these hon. gentlemen are dealing with a condition of things that, if it ever existed under the National Policy, existed long ago, and the fact is that the hon. gentleman has got far behind the times and is entirely astray from the facts as they apply to us to-day. So far as the farmers of to-day are concerned, the effect is all in the other direction. Here is what a farmer says with respect to the influence of the National Policy upon one industry, that is the butter and cheese industry. During the last session of the Ontario Parliament, Mr. MacPherson, of Glengarry, spoke thus :

A careful study of the expenditure and returns of the business shows that the price of machinery and other modern appliances for butter-making has been increased by the Federal tariff sufficiently to raise the cost of producing butter from 1 to 2 cents per pound, and ventured the opinion, that, with improved methods and reduced taxation, butter in a few years could be produced in Ontario at from 8 to 10 cents per pound.

Did he believe that the National Policy was good for the farmer ? Did he believe that the protection that was afforded to them was any benefit to them ? Certainly not ; and every intelligent farmer will share his opinion. The fact stands out fair and plain that in the year 1894 nearly $50,000,000 of a surplus had to be shipped out of Canada after providing for the wants of our own population.

But they tell us that the price of wheat has gone up to-day. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has gone up ; but what are the circumstances under which it has gone up ? Sir, I supposed that when we developed our railway system in the North-west and gave sixty-two and a half millions of Canada's hard coin to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, we should have had a great highway that would have brought our western produce down within our own borders and brought it to our own seaboard, shipping it entirely over Canadian territory. But what are the facts ? Every one knows that the bulk of the wheat of the North-west went

out of the hands of the farmers last fall at from 38 to 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds, of the finest grade of hard wheat that is raised anywhere on the face of the earth, and that, so far as the Ontario farmer is concerned, the bulk of his crop was marketed at about 50 cents per bushel. A large proportion of the surplus of our North-west grain found its way down on the American side from Duluth. And why? Simply because American bottoms gave cheaper rates to outside markets than our own lines would give, though they had been bonussed so freely by Canadian money. What was the result? Two large milling companies, the Lake of the Woods Company and the Ogilvie Company proceeded to corral all the surplus wheat in the North-west that they could lay their hands on. Meantime, the farmers in the older provinces, with wheat below a cent a pound, fed it freely to their stock and used it up in various ways, making the most economical use they could make of it. To-day the price of wheat is high because the companies I speak of have cornered the market and the stock is not in the hands of the farmers. Is that a benefit to the farmers? Is that a benefit to the consumers? I venture to say that the only parties benefited by it are these speculators and a few small holders of grain scattered throughout the province of Ontario. With the latter I have sympathy, with the former I have none. These are the facts as to the National Policy as applied to the prices of grain to-day.

Our friends opposite are never tired of telling us about the relative position of the farmer in Canada and the farmer in England. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) told us to-day that the English farmer was in a difficult position, that he was being taxed right and left, and he and the Controller of Customs and the hon. member for East Hastings quoted to us long paragraphs to show that the British farmer was demanding protection. What is the position as between the Canadian farmer and the English farmer? All that we ask is to be placed on the same level as the English farmer to-day, and we do not ask any better protection than they have at the present moment, nor will we be satisfied with anything less. The English farmer to-day buys everything he consumes at the lowest possible rate. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that. But the Canadian farmer finds that his agricultural implements, such as reapers, mowers and binders are taxed 20 per cent; and the small tools he requires, such as scythes, forks, rakes, and the whole catalogue of smaller implements used on the farm are taxed 35 per cent. And taxes collected from the Canadian farmer are not for the benefit of the treasury. The Controller of Customs admitted the other day that when the question arose as to the value that should be placed upon these implements for duty when they were imported for the use of the Canadian people, he did not refer the matter to independent officers but to the manager of the combine in Canada that controls the works that manufacture these very implements. If any evidence were wanted to show that this Government is not an independent government of the people, but the servant of the combinations, we have it in that one simple fact. Take, for instance, the sugar that the British farmer consumes to-day, and what do we find? According to the London quotations to-day the sugar that cost 4½ cents a pound here is sold in England at 3 cents, and it is as good to the farmer there who buys it as if he paid 4½ cents per pound for all he consumed. And so with all the articles that he uses, he buys them at the lowest possible rates for he is in the market of the world where everything is sold at its fair value. And the only article he pays an increased price upon is his tea, which is dutiable at fourpence a pound, and his coffee, which pays 14 shillings a hundred, or 1½ pence a pound. The average consumption of tea in England is about 6¼ pounds per head; and, allowing the consumption of coffee to be one-third additional, the English farmer does not pay more than 75 cents per year duty on these articles more than the Canadian farmer pays, who has those articles free. I say that under these circumstances, all we ask is that the burdens shall be taken off the back of the Canadian farmer, and that nothing more shall be placed upon him than his fair and legitimate share of the necessary expenditures in connection with the economical administration of the public affairs of this country; and that the extra taxes that are rolled upon him for the maintenance of these combinations under this tariff, and of these various other protective institutions, shall be removed from his back, and that he shall be given the same kind of fair-play that the British farmer receives.

Let me say one word further as to the plea these gentlemen are making that the British farmers are asking for protection. Sir, it will be a sorry day for the National Policy in Canada if the British farmers succeed in getting protection imposed. I would like to see the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite who are telling us that the British farmer wants protection; I would like to see them go to the people, after their policy had been adopted in England, and tell the people that Canada's cheese was taxed 4 cents per pound to get into the British market; that Canada's beef was taxed 20 or 30 per cent to find its way into the British market; that Canada's wheat was taxed 15 cents per bushel to get there. Where would the shouting be about the protection that the National Policy gave our people? Do they believe that when Great Britain inaugurates the policy of protection, as they would lead us to believe, she is going to protect Canada? Won't she protect Great Britain first? And won't these protective taxes be imposed for the benefit of the

British public, and not for the benefit of Canadian farmers? Then our friends opposite and their policy will be wiped out, and they will find just where their arguments have landed them.

But, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired telling us about the effect of the National Policy in building up our industries. Now, I do not propose to deal with the broad statements about what has been done. I think it is wiser to start the machine, and see how it operates, where you know the facts. These gentlemen forget, when they make these statements, that there were active, energetic, and successful manufacturing industries in Canada long before the National Policy was inaugurated. Sir, I remember in my own town that in 1873, just at the time the Mackenzie Government was called to take power, we had a cotton mill, one of the earliest cotton mills started in this Dominion. It had been operated since 1859, and it had gradually grown up and developed with the country. At that time, the former proprietor died, and it was deemed necessary to enlarge the enterprise, and the public were appealed to take stock in it. The stock was extended then to $400,000; and this is the statement that was made as to the result of the operation of that cotton mill in previous years:

> The mills, with their present capacity, are now earning upwards of 12½ per cent, or more than 8 per cent upon the proposed capital of $400,000.

That was in 1873, under a 15 and a 17½ per cent tariff. Well, Sir, the National Policy came into operation, and what is the result to-day? That cotton mill has been closed for several years, the $400,000 capital has been dissipated, and not one dollar of it has been returned to the original investors. To-day, the men who, on the faith of the National Policy, and the development connected with it, invested their little savings in that town in building little homes for their future comfort, have had to sell these at a sacrifice, and, in the majority of cases, have left the country to secure employment and earn a livelihood for themselves and their families. What was the position of the Ontario Cotton Mill at Hamilton? I speak of what I know. A friend of mine, a gentleman that I know personally, lost $20,000 in that venture out of $30,000 he invested, and he was only one man. Another gentleman that I know had a couple of thousand dollars in another mill. We have heard a good deal about what these mills are doing for the employment of operatives. If you go back to the census of 1891, you will find there is a cotton mill in a town about twenty or thirty miles west of where I live, which is returned as employing 180 hands, and as paying out $42,000 a year in wages. When you divide that up amongst the hands, it comes to the magnificent figures of $4.25 each, per week. Last year, under the benign influences of the National Policy, even that pittance of wages was twice reduced, under the blessings of the administration of this cotton ring that now controls that mill. Do you call that a blessing to the operatives of Canada? Is that the way the National Policy was to give employment and develop the country? In the same town there is a wincey mill that figures in the census of 1891 as employing 100 hands and paying in wages, $20,000. It has been standing idle, and is closed. The $20,000 is no longer paid, and the operatives are scattered to find a living as best they can. But this mill figures regularly in the returns of the industries that the National Policy has brought into existence. Now, let me draw your attention to another result of the National Policy, as applied to the cotton industry. Our cotton mills in Dundas, so far as my recollection goes, went under the control of the Dominion Cotton Company, and I think their annual report of two years ago shows that the company controlled ten mills, scattered throughout this Dominion. What is the effect of that centralization of the cotton industries on the operatives in these various mills? I can speak again from personal observation. One mill, after running four days in the week for two or three years, finally ceased to run altogether, under the blessings of the National Policy, the operatives had to seek employment elsewhere, and they went to another mill under the control of this company. They left their families in their little homes in my town and went there to work. They tried it for a month or two, and what was the statement they made? They said, the wages are so miserably low that by the time we have paid for board, we have nothing left with which to maintain our families away from us, and to meet the increased cost due to the different members of the family not living in one household. What became of them? They had either to accept the pittance offered, or to take the other alternative and leave this country and go to a foreign land to earn the bread that the National Policy denied them. What has been the result as applied to the Dominion Cotton Company? They simply closed down the mills and regulated the output according to the consumption. But they exercised mighty good care to have the benefit of the full protection that the National Policy gave them. What is the amount of their last dividend? Here is a quotation from one of the Montreal papers of only last month:

> In spite of the bad year, the Dominion Cotton Company has earned $320,000, or 10¾ per cent nearly, on their full capital of $3,000,000. When it is remembered that at least half of this capital is watered, the actual earnings are very large.

And that amount is wrung out of the operatives because they simply have to take the

alternative of accepting the wages this combination chooses to give them or leaving the country, because if they leave the mill and go to any other mill in this country they are confronted with the same control. That is one of the blessings of the National Policy as applied to the cotton industry of this country, and that is one of the things for which we are asked to bow down and be thankful.

Sir, let me draw attention to one other institution, an institution organized in Toronto at the time the National Policy was brought into existence for the purpose of presenting to the people the great blessings the National Policy was going to confer on them. I quote from the Toronto "World," an orthodox journal on that side of the House:

> This institution started in with a paid-up stock of $200,000. They got from various friends in addition $100,000 more. Under the pretense of giving business men an equivalent for their money, they obtained $200,000 more, which altogether amounted to about $500,000.

The institution did not prosper—it could not meet expenses. Last November a fresh syndicate took hold of the institution, and did they offer its old stockholders 100 cents on the dollar for their investment? Not at all. They asked them to hand over their stock without receiving one cent, and in return the new syndicate was to rejuvenate the concern and put it on a paying basis. They started in November to put this establishment on a paying basis. They operated it for some weeks, and what became of it? It died a natural death.

An hon. MEMBER. Unnatural death.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, it was strangled. Nobody would furnish money any longer to run it, it could not earn enough to run itself and pay the management. What did they do? They superannuated one public officer in Toronto and appointed the manager in his place at $3,000 a year, and on 6th February, in the middle of the cold winter, they opened their doors and turned out all the operatives and left them on the street to shift for themselves. That is the history of the "Empire" journal, the great organ of the political party opposite.

What is the history of the National Policy as applied to the agricultural implement industry? You can scarcely go into a town or village of any importance throughout western Ontario but you will find an establishment lying idle, the whole capital invested lost and the proprietors doing—what? Either going into other lines, or acting as agents for the great central combination which controls that industry. Has that been a blessing to the people of Ontario? Has it been a blessing that the various establishments scattered over the country should be closed and the business centralized at two or three points? I think the majority of the people of western Ontario will agree with me in saying it has not. You cannot go into a town or village of any importance in the west but you will find one of these dormant industries. The chimney will be standing there all right, the building will be there but the operatives have gone and the capital—where is it? Just a few months ago I had occasion to visit an active town in the centre of a good agricultural district in the county represented by the Secretary of State, old Haldimand. I happened to walk into a large brick building, and I said to the gentleman in possession: For what purpose was this establishment erected? His answer was, this was erected for a shoe factory. I asked, how much capital was put into it? He replied, about $25,000. I asked, did they make any money? He replied, no; we did not make any money, the capital is all gone, and I have rented the building for $70 a year as a place in which to carry on my little business. That is the revenue arising from the investment of $25,000. I do not select this as a special example, because all over the province there are such examples. I venture to say that more capital is locked up in dormant industries in Ontario than was ever locked up in any other enterprise, except one enterprise promoted at an early date by this Government in connection with the North-west, and that was when they started that great boom that was going to make everybody rich—the Colonization Companies. Sir, there are thousands of Ontario people to-day who are paying interest on money that was invested in those companies, who have a lively recollection of the wild goose chase led them by hon. gentlemen opposite when booming these enterprises. There never was a time in the history of Canada as last winter when the banks were so crowded with money, not seeking employment, but gathered in from active industry until the bankers were driven almost to despair to know what to do with it, and yet parallel with this is the fact that there never was a time in the history of Canada when so many men honestly seeking for labour on the street were denied such labour and thereby their daily bread. This is another proof of the effect of the National Policy as applied to-day.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired of telling us about the development of the trade which is being secured to us outside of Canada, and the benefits that accrue to us in consequence of the development of that trade. What are they doing on that agricultural implement manufacturing industry to-day? Only a few months ago the Government passed an Order in Council providing that when a manufacturer exported one of these implements outside of Canada, and sold it to the competitors of the Canadian farmers in the United States, the Argentine Republic, Great Britain, or anywhere else, the manufacturer should get back 99 per

cent of the duties that he paid upon the raw material that entered into the production of that implement. How did the Government treat the Canadian farmer with respect to that implement? Let me quote to you on that matter, a few words from the organs of the Patrons of Industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that the Patrons are not farmers? Do you think that they have not got intelligence the same as we have? I heard one gentleman on that side of the House use the term "illiterate Patrons, if there are any." You did not hear it from this side of the House, but he qualifies it: illiterate Patrons, "if there are any." Sir, I say it is an insult to the agricultural population of this country. It is an insult to the Patrons of this country. What is the reason that the Patron institution is in existence to-day? It is simply as a protest against the burdens that this Government have imposed upon the farming community. They feel that things are out of joint, that they are not getting fair-play under the present administration of public affairs, and like everybody else they band themselves together for the purpose of advancing their own interests. Sir, I remember when gentlemen opposite cultivated that organization very carefully, just a little less than a year ago. All the nice things they could think of were said about the Patrons and their policy; but for how long? Just while they tried to use them for the purpose of defeating the Ontario Government, and when gentlemen opposite did not succeed in making the Patrons a tool for that purpose, then they turned around, and now they call them "illiterate Patrons." I point to the existence of that organization as an evidence of the feeling of unrest that is abroad to-day, because of the conditions induced by hon. gentlemen opposite and their policy as applied to the country. Now, this is what the Patron organ said on the 1st of May, so that it applies to the present time, and it is none of your seventeen-year old fairy tales such as we have heard from that side of the House:

> The low tariff makes it more profitable for England to trade with them than with Canada. It is obvious the Canadian farmer, taxed by the tariff and combines till his back is sore, is in no position to compete with Argentina. Not content with imposing those drawbacks on ourselves, we have recently ordered that the Canadian manufacturer of implements, who imports his pig iron, coal, steel, &c., and pays high duties thereon, shall be allowed a remission of 99 per cent of the duty when the finished goods are destined for Argentina, Australia, United States, or any other foreign competitor, but shall pay the whole amount of duty and charge it to the Canadian consumer, with interest and profit added, when the machine is sold here at home. To "promote Canadian industry: keep Canada for the Canadians."

And this is to promote Canadian industry and to keep Canada for the Canadians. I recommend hon. gentlemen opposite to wrestle with these facts, and I ask them if they are not literally true? The pig iron that goes into these implements has been taxed at the rate of $4 a ton, and if it is Canadian iron there is $2 a ton bounty added to enable the Canadian manufacturer to produce it. All his other articles are taxed in the same ratio from $10 to $13 a ton on the other various grades of iron that enter into the manufacturing of these implements. Everything is taxed for the benefit of somebody else, and just as the paper I have quoted from says: If that implement is sold to the Canadian farmer, he has to pay every cent of that duty, whereas if it sold to his competitor down in Argentina he gets every cent off. Do you call that keeping Canada for the Canadians?

Now, just let me look for a moment at the competition the Canadian farmers have to face. We have to find a market outside of Canada for $50,000,000 worth of our Canadian products, and who do we compete with? We compete with Argentina, for example, that last year, according to the British official returns, sent 13,000,000 cwts. of wheat to the British market, sent 30,000 live cattle, and sent one and a half million carcasses of frozen mutton. Under what conditions do the people of the Argentine Republic ship these products to the British market? The River La Platte is navigable for 2,000 miles for large vessels up into those great plains of Argentina. They raise that wheat and those cattle almost in sight of the ocean steamer that takes those goods on board and delivers them into the English market where they meet us on exactly even terms. What is our position in Canada? We gave $62,500,000 to build the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry our products from the great plains of the North-west down to the ocean, and we have charged such high rates on that railway that the bulk of that wheat last fall found its way through American channels down to the seaboard. We have to meet the Argentine farmers in that open market of England under those conditions, and, Mr. Speaker, do the Government call that keeping Canada for the Canadians? In addition to that, these gentlemen in Argentina have this advantage, that while we are taxed at from 30 to 35 per cent on what we buy and consume, their duties run from 5 per cent on cottons up to 10 and 15 per cent on other goods. They do not pay half the duty that we pay to begin with, and they sell goods against us in the world's markets on even terms. And yet gentlemen opposite tell us that the National Policy is a blessing to Canada, when we have to sell in face of that competition, and when we have that competition more intensified by the action of this very Government in giving the Argentine farmers their imple-

ments at a rate of duty cheaper than what is imposed on the raw material that enters into our implements. Sir, let me quote to you one statement made by an American as to the energy and development of that country as our competitor. He said :

> Before long Argentina will yet eclipse Chicago as the meat-packing centre of the world.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, and we are selling those men implements cheaper to-day than we sell them to our own people, and our Government calls that protecting the Canadian farmer. Let me draw your attention, Sir, to another advantage that the farmers of Argentina have over us. I quote from an Englishman who is an ardent advocate of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as applied to England. I quote from Mr. Howard Vincent, with whom we are all familiar. He speaks of the internal economy of Argentina, and he says :

> A paper money now depreciated between 200 and 300 per cent, now secures nearly as much labour and food as it did when it was at or nearly par. The premium on gold is of the greatest advantage to the agriculturists. They pay for their labour, food, and indeed for their holdings, in depreciated paper, and they receive gold for their exported herds and crops. Its reduction will be firmly resisted by them by all possible means, and, if sudden or violent, would entail serious disaster. To the merchant it is different. He has to pay gold for what he imports, and can with difficulty obtain its equivalent in paper when he sells, and people cannot understands why he wants so much more "national" money for his goods than before, and buy sparingly or dispense with the article.

And this is the kind of competition that our Government is encouraging to-day by taking the duty off the implements that we sell to them and putting it on the Canadian farmer who has to compete with them.

In connection with that matter let me draw attention to the methods this Government have adopted for the increase of our trade. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1888, foreshadowed the idea of stimulating our West India trade by subsidizing a line of steamers for that purpose, and in 1890 our present Minister of Finance took a trip down to the West Indies with the aid of his private secretary, and at the cost of nearly $1,300 spied out the land to see how the trade was. In the following season the Jamaica exhibition was opened and we spent $22,000 in pushing our products before the people of Jamaica. We sent, as our commissioner, our old friend, whom we all remember and whom we liked to see so well for his genial ways, Mr. Adam Brown, of Hamilton, and spent some $5,000 for his services and expenses as our agent. In addition to that, we subsidized a line of steamers to develop that trade, to the extent of from $73,000 to $97,000 a year for the last four years. What has been the result of all this labour, and this liberal expenditure ? Let us compare the trade with the West Indies in the five years from 1874 to 1878, with the trade which has been developed under this National Policy boom from 1890 to 1894. For the first five years, our average exports were $3,720,000 per year, whereas, in the latter five years they were $3,195,000 a year. So that, notwithstanding these subsidies of about $90,000 a year, we have not created much of a market for Canadian products in the West Indies. But what does the comparison show with regard to our imports from the West Indies ? During the five years from 1874 to 1878, our average imports were $1,678,000 per year, and during the five years from 1890 to 1894, they were $3,666,000 per year. That was a magnificent development, was it not ? We had increased our imports to more than double. But let me draw your attention to a little event that intervened in the interim. We had taken the duty off raw sugar altogether ; and if you examine our trade in detail, you will find that great development to be due to that fact, and not to the subsidies given to the line of steamships.

Mr. WELSH. Free trade.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It was free trade as they have it in England applied to sugar —that free trade which hon. gentlemen opposite are so worried over, and which they are so anxious to ascertain the meaning of. On these imports the average duty per year collected, in the first period, was $646,000 ; and in the last period, $687,000 ; but the average of the last three years, after the duty had been taken off, was only $293,000 ; showing that the increased trade was not due to the subsidies, but to the fact that we afforded the West Indies a better market for their sugar by removing the duty. As a result, we have sacrificed about $400,000 a year of revenue, besides the subsidies of $90,000, without succeeding in getting a market for one dollar's worth more of Canadian products. What are we doing in regard to the Australian trade that we have heard so much about—another mode in which it is proposed to protect Canada for the Canadians ?

The Prime Minister inaugurated the efforts of the Government to develop a trade with Australia by going out there and travelling around on a pleasure trip, which cost us $2,745. We have also sent an agent to Australia. This Government, it appears, can do nothing to develop a trade anywhere without sending out an agent, and we have Mr. Larke out there, at a salary of $3,000 and expenses, to look after our interests and develop our business. In addition to that, we are paying $121,000 a year by way of subsidy for nine trips of steamers between Canada and that country. As a result of these efforts, we are developing a trade with Australia without doubt : but we are not going to be able to send any cotton goods there,

if we are to judge by last year's exports of our highly protected cotton combine, because I find that they sent just $8 worth of cotton goods to the whole of Australia. Whatever goods we do send to Australia will be agricultural implements and machinery, on which our people have to pay the full tax under the National Policy, while it will all be taken off to enable the Australians to get cheaper machinery than our own people. Now, what does Australia send to us? Everybody knows that it is a great wool-producing and mutton-producing country. Let us look at the goods we got from Australia last year. They do not amount to very much; but the chief imports I will mention. We got $6,250 worth of green apples. Now, we raise apples in Canada, and we consider them pretty good ones. We imported from Australia, also, 59,000 pounds of butter, valued at $10,421. I do not think we need to bring butter into Canada from Australia, and to subsidize steamers in order to do so. Of lard, bacon, salt beef, &c., we brought in $1,300 worth, and we brought in 61,200 pounds of mutton, valued at $1,797. I think it will be admitted by all hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that these are not articles which we should spend money in order to bring into Canada; and yet these are the chief imports that came to us last year from Australia. Now, how does the National Policy protect the farmer in the matter of wool? It carefully puts a duty on such wool as we produce a surplus of in Canada: but it does not charge one farthing upon the wool which the Australians send into Canada; that comes in free. Now, what does the Dominion Grange think of this attempt to promote trade with Australia? Hon. gentlemen opposite sneered a little while ago at the name of the Patrons of Industry, when they were mentioned in this House; let them sneer at the Dominion Grange. I can only say that that organization was brought into existence because of the pressure of circumstances that drove together men who felt that they were being unfairly treated under the policy of the Government; and what do they say? This is not the history of seventeen years ago, but the history of to-day, dealing with the live issues of the moment:

> We desire to enter our most strenuous protest against subsidizing a line of steamships to Australia. As the products of that country are similar to the agricultural products of Canada, but are produced at a very much less cost, this would be a blow at our home market, and taxing ourselves to destroy our interests.

I think the majority of thinking men will say that is a fair estimate of the efforts the Government are making to develop trade by taking money out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers to subsidize lines of steamships to bring into Canada goods to compete with the products of our own people of which we have already a surplus. Under these circumstances, it would be a wonder if organizations of this kind had not grown up in our midst, and if they did not feel that the pressure was more than they were willing to endure.

But, Sir, I want, for a moment to glance at the process by which the Government are now working out the details of the National Policy. They told us that they proposed to tax the goods of those people who want to find their way into the Canadian market, and they proposed to do this for the purpose of keeping Canada for the Canadians. That might have been true some years ago. Is it true to-day? What is the history of the changes of taxation as developed under the administration of the present Government? Let us look for a moment at the mode in which they have developed our taxation. When the Finance Minister first entered on his office this is the statement which he made on the 27th March, 1890:

> I stated last year, that, looking at the condition of the country and looking at the munificent contributions which have been given by this country for her public works—it seems to me that we ought not, after the close of the year 1889, to increase the public debt. That we ought not to increase the public expenditure for ordinary purposes, and that it was possible to meet the capital obligations we had already assumed, and to go to the year 1892 without adding to our net debt. After that we might consider whether or not we could not gradually decrease the debt which we have assumed and placed on ourselves.

He was then referring to the year 1889, and he repeated and emphasized that statement. He said:

> Now, Sir, I am here to-day, one year after the time of making that statement, to affirm with equal truth to-day, $36,500,000 of ordinary expenditure from our Consolidated Revenue Fund is sufficient to carry our debt, pay our interest, pay all our ordinary expenditures, and leave $2,000,000 in the hands of the Minister of Public Works each year to build new and necessary public works.
>
> To carry her present burdens Canada is amply sufficient, but for any further increase I believe good reasons are demanded and good reasons must be given.

Did he confine the expenditure to that $36,500,000? Look at the Estimates for 1895 of $38,517,000 and judge for yourself.

He boasts to us of the expenditure made on our public works. Look, he said, at our railways, at our canals, see the development of our resources by these means. What are the returns that they present to us? The expenditure on these public works was somewhere about $149,000,000, as the hon. gentleman correctly stated. On the Intercolonial, the expenditure was $44,966,424. On our canals the expenditure was $44,709,038: on the Canadian Pacific Railway our expenditure on capital amounted to $62,601,535, making altogether $149,000,000. Now, these are in the investments about which the hon.

Minister is so proud. Let us see what revenues flow into the treasury from those various investments. Look at the Intercolonial of last year. Our revenue was $2,987,000, and the working expenses $2,981,000, so that we had a net revenue of $5,832. But on the expenditure of the $44,000,000, where does the country raise the money to pay the interest? The Government take it out of the taxpayers of the Dominion. Even the small pittance of a revenue from the Intercolonial is not left us, because in operating the Prince Edward Island Railway we are $66,000 short of revenue to meet the current expenses; and that is an improvement for which I give the Minister of Railways credit. What is the revenue from our other great works? Take the canals upon which we spent nearly $42,000,000, and on which we are still spending millions of dollars for the year 1894, our revenue was $387,000. The expenses of maintaining the canal staff and making the repairs necessary to keep the canals in working order, without providing for the renewals or improvements, was $534,000, leaving a net deficit of $147,000. And besides we have to pay every cent of interest on the original $149,000,000, the cost of the construction of those works. How does the case stand in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon which we have expended $62,500,000? Who owns that road? Does Canada own it or control it? Has Canada anything to say in the administration of that great public work? No, Sir, that $62,000,000 belongs to a distinct and independent company.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was reminding the House that a few years ago we on this side of the House were accused of not desiring a through line of railway upon Canadian territory, and we were continually lectured upon the disloyalty of a system that made connections with the North-west Territory through the United States. I referred to the fact that we had contributed $62,600,000 of good solid Canadian money to the Canadian Pacific Railway and that the line was now the property of the company. I want to draw your attention, Sir, to the developments that have taken place since these early days of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. That road covers a distance between Montreal on the east, to Vancouver on the Pacific Ocean, of a little over 2,900 miles over Canadian soil. What do we find to-day in addition to that? We find that what is known as the "Soo" branch of that railway runs from the main line to American territory at the foot of Lake Superior, where a connection is made with an American system of railway. From that point we find two railway systems running westward controlled and operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, one system known as the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic, operating, according to the last report, 584 miles of road, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Sault Ste. Marie system operating 1,167 miles, or a total of 1,751 miles of this grand national Canadian railway system operating on American territory. And we find in addition that the security of this grand enterprise that Canada has so liberally bonussed in order to put it on a sound financial footing is pledged for the payment of the bonds of these systems. According to Poor's Manual of Railroads, the most recent issue of which I was able to consult was that of 1893, I find that the bonds of these two companies for which the revenues of this system of ours are pledged, amount to no less a sum than $53,000,000. And what further do we find? We find this Canadian system giving connection from Montreal by way of Sault Ste. Marie and St. Paul and west through the great American state of Dakota and northward until it strikes the Canadian Pacific main line west of Regina at a small junction; and we find them running their through Pullman cars over American territory and giving that territory exactly the same railway facilities that they give to Canadians on our main line towards which we have contributed so much. And the men who have sustained and endorsed that system are the men who call themselves patriotic Canadians and who are very fond of crying "annexation" against gentlemen on this side of the House who decline to be bound by such expressions of sentiment.

Now let me turn for a moment as a matter of comparison, and ascertain what are the revenues derived by some of our sister colonies from the railways which they built and which they own and control. I showed before six o'clock that the $149,000,000 that we have invested in our Intercolonial Railway, in our canal system and in the Canadian Pacific Railway did not yield us one dollar towards payment of interest, so that every year the tax-payers of the Dominion have to feel in their pockets for the interest upon these great expenditures. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that on the canal system alone, in the payment for care and maintenance, we were $147,000 out of pocket. I turn to the Australian Government railways and in their Year-Book for 1894, giving their returns for the year 1893, the last returns available, I find some figures that should be interesting to Canadians. We find that in New South Wales the government owns and operates 2,351 miles of railway, constructed at a capital cost of £34,657,000 sterling. The gross revenues of that system for the year 1893 were £2,927,000, which, after paying all expenses left net earnings of £1,188,000, or over 3 per cent on the total investment for the construction of those railways. Lest

it should be said that this is an isolated example. I turn to the sister colony of New Zealand, the figures for whose railways for the year ending 31st March, 1893, the latest available returns, are before me. The government in that year operated 1,886 miles of railway, the total cost of which for construction was £14,733,000 sterling. The net earnings, after paying working expenses, were £449,380, or a return upon the capital invested of over 3 per cent. For another example I turn to the colony of Victoria. That colony owns 2,975 miles of railway. These railways are reported upon in four divisions. The northern division has a mileage of 836. The net revenue of this system after paying working expenses was sufficient to yield a return of 2·97 per cent on the capital cost. The north-east division, covering 603 miles of road, earned a net dividend of over 4¼ per cent. The eastern section of 500 miles was operated at a slight loss. The western section of 1,018 miles yielded a net dividend of over 3 per cent, and the balance, the Hudson Bay Railway, 4¾ per cent on cost. And let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the further fact that the year for which these figures are given was the year of the great financial crisis in the Australian colonies, and the reports of the Victoria system speak of decreased freight and passenger traffic, while they state that the regular equipment which was sufficient to transact the ordinary business had been maintained. Mr. Speaker, I point to the position of our sister colonies as compared with that of this Dominion, and I ask, in all fairness, whether the producing population of Canada to-day are receiving returns from these investments compared with the burdens that are placed upon them thereby. The fact that we are receiving no revenue from so large an expenditure is not creditable to the administration of public affairs here, as compared with that in these sister colonies.

Now, Sir, let me turn for a few moments to some of the statements made by the Finance Minister with respect to the taxation that he said he had taken off the shoulders of the tax-payers of this country, and as to our financial position to-day. You remember, Sir, when, in 1891, the hon. gentleman came down to the House and intimated to us that he had decided to take three and a half millions of taxation off the backs of the Canadian tax-payers. That was an exceedingly liberal proposition on the face of it, to be presented in one session to any legislative assembly such as we have here. But, Mr. Speaker, how was it that the hon. gentleman became suddenly so generous to the tax-payers of the Dominion of Canada? I do not think we need to go very far to ascertain the reason. On the American side, for reasons best known to themselves, sugar was made free, and it was an object lesson in taxation that no Government could stand very long, to see a staple article of consumption like sugar sold just across an imaginary line at 4 cents per pound, while here it was 6½ cents. The Minister of Finance made a virtue of necessity, and took off $3,500,000 of duty from the tax-payers of Canada. Here is how he announces it in his Budget speech of 1891:

> Sugar has always been looked upon in Canada as a large producer of revenue. Sugar in one respect is one of the best articles possible for distributing taxation. The rich and the poor use it largely in proportion to their means, and there is, possibly, no article upon which a part of the revenue of the country can be more equitably placed. The Government has come to the conclusion to sweep away from the burdens of the great mass of the people, with one stroke of the pen, $3,500,000 of taxation.

"Of taxation." Those of us who were in this House previous to that time, remember the pitched battles that used to be indulged in across the floor of this House as to who bore the burden of this taxation. This time there was no hesitation on the part of the Minister of Finance in announcing that this was a burden of taxation, not upon the people outside of Canada who wanted to sell us sugar, but upon the consuming population of Canada who bought and used that sugar. But there is this remarkable feature in the matter to which I wish to draw attention, that the Minister always stops in his Budget speech at this point in his quotation. Now, I want to extend the quotation a little further down in that same speech. The next paragraph goes on to say:

> We propose to ask the House to allow us to put on $1,500,000, and the question is where to put it on.

And he proceeded to put on taxes thus: he added 1 cent per pound additional on malt, and he estimated the yield would be $500,000 revenue. He added 20 cents per gallon excise duty on whisky, which he estimated would yield $600,000; and he added 5 cents per pound more on tobacco, and he estimated the revenue from that at $400,000, making, in all, $1,500,000 of taxes that he immediately imposed, at the same time that he took off $3,500,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may be a little obtuse, but it does strike me that when a man takes credit for taking off $3,500,000 of taxation, and, at the same time, puts on $1,500,000 on other necessaries or luxuries that our people are consuming, it is not a very brilliant stroke of policy. I do not think it takes a very large-sized statesman to accomplish an operation like that, and I do not think it justifies the statement that at one sweep he had relieved the people of taxes to the extent of $3,500,00, when he immediately put on $1,500,000 without giving the people one breathing moment to realize what it meant to be relieved of $3,500,000. And, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that, he got the additional taxes that were imposed, for

that year when he was making his Budget statement, the inland revenue made a return of $6,825,000; for the next year, 1892, it had risen to $8,007,000; in 1893 it remained at $8,444,000. But then he took 1 cent per pound off the malt duty, relieving that article of $50,000 of taxation, and the next season, 1894, his collections from inland revenue were still $8,364,000; showing conclusively that instead of taking $3,500,000 of taxes off the back of the Canadian tax-payer, he only took $2,000,000 to begin with.

But, Sir, how do they set at defiance the principles of the National Policy in the present session as applied to their mode of providing for the present condition of things? Sir, I heard the Minister of Finance making merry at the deficits that existed when my hon. friend from South Oxford was Minister of Finance under the Mackenzie Administration; and he rejoiced at the idea of my hon. friend from South Oxford warming himself at a deficit of less than $2,000,000. But the hon. Minister of Finance tried to warm himself last year by admitting that he had a deficit of $1,200,000, but it did not seem to warm him up worth a cent; and this year, after figuring very carefully, he comes down to the House with this humiliating announcement that he has a deficit of $4,500,000 in prospect for the current year. Fancy if you can, Mr. Speaker, the condition of things if the two parties in this House were to exchange places, and we were to present a deficit of $4,500,000. Why, Sir, there would not be metaphors enough in the English language to express their indignation at the Minister of Finance who had so far forgotten himself and his country as to allow such an event to transpire. Now, the hon. gentleman turns around and he warms himself at a $4,500,000 deficit. I should think it ought to make him comfortable if he thought my hon. friend rejoiced in one that did not come half way up to it.

But we listened to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) the other day telling us about the Conservative process of providing for a revenue. And what was it? After sneering at what he calls the way of hon. gentlemen on the Liberal side of the House, he says one way is by grinding down the wages of the employees, and the profits of capitalists, so that we can produce more cheaply in this country than in any other country in the world. That is the way the Liberal party raise their revenue. Another way is to put up the tariff so as to make outsiders who wish to come into this market, pay something for the privilege. That is the way the Conservative party propose to keep our markets for our own people. Is that the Conservative way to-day? Sir, that is ancient history; that does not apply to the Conservative party to-day; that is not their policy, as expounded by the Minister of Finance from his chair across the floor of this House. I sometimes think that the dominant political party in this Dominion has fallen on evil times, that it has fallen into the hands of men who do not realize the capacity and fidelity that characterized their predecessors. If my hon. friend from East Hastings is an authority on this question, I think we must conclude that the Minister of Finance to-day has sadly fallen from grace, according to that principle of the Conservative party expounded by my hon. friend from East Hastings.

Now, what are the resolutions that are pending to-day in connection with this matter? Is it proposed to make outsiders who wish to come into this market, pay for the privilege of getting in here. Let us see how he has set about to provide for it. He puts another half cent per pound on sugar, and he goes back to his great sheet anchor, whisky, that has stood him good stead time and again, and has been more valuable to him than any other commodity he ever touched, either in his political or social career. Sir, it was the whisky question that brought him before the public, and gave him his position in the House to-day. The whisky question is the great sheet anchor of the Minister of Finance, and the leader of this House. To-day, after taxing sugar, what does he do? He goes back to whisky, and he puts another 20 cents per gallon on whisky. He expects to get $500,000 more out of this whisky tax, and $1,250,000 out of the sugar tax, or about $1,750,000 on whisky and sugar. How does the account stand, after taking off $50,000 from malt last year? He took $3,500,000 off the sugar in 1891, and he re-imposed on sugar, whisky and tobacco, $3,300,000 between then and now. That is the way he carries out the Conservative policy. I say, Sir, if the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) is the correct exponent of the Conservative policy, he ought to hasten and take the Finance Minister in hand and bring him back to the position the party formerly occupied, for he has got altogether away from the good old Conservative path. But the hon. gentleman has got into the avenues of the people's pockets. I remember hearing of a little boy who was asked to write an essay on the natural history of man. He set about it after this fashion: Man is a little animal that walks on his hind legs and wears clothes; he is very quiet; you can put your hand on him anywhere and he won't kick, but you must not touch his pocket. Sir, when it came to the hour of necessity, with an ugly visaged deficit of $4,500,000 haunting the dreams of the Finance Minister, and dogging him day and night, he did not take the National Policy mode of securing a revenue, by taxing outsiders who wished to bring something into the country. Oh, no; he went straight for the pockets of the

Canadian consumers, and he placed half a cent on sugar that he knew they could not escape, and when they take a drink of whisky they have to contribute another 20 per cent to the purpose of creating this revenue.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. That is not enough.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have no objection to the whisky men contributing it. But I have to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this, that if the principles expounded by the Finance Minister in the early and callow years of his political life were correct, we are making it more and more difficult every year for the people of the Dominion to reach that point which the hon. gentleman formerly said meant the well-being of the people, wiping out this revenue from liquor and prohibiting its consumption in our midst. That is the direction in which we are drifting.

But this does not cover the whole of the question. I want to draw attention to the difference between the policy of the Liberals and the National Policy, and I think the sugar question will illustrate it about as effectively as anything I can present to the House. The Americans under the McKinley Act of 1891, struck off the duty on raw sugar and sugars up to No. 16 Dutch standard, and left the duty of half a cent per pound on refined sugar for the benefit of the American sugar trust. At one operation they took $60,000,000 of taxes off their people. What is the position to-day of the sugar tariff here in Canada? Does the half cent a pound going into the treasury represent the amount of duty that the people of this country pay for their refined sugar. ? No. We have another tax, and it does not come out of the Americans either, it comes out of the consumers of sugar in Canada—it is a tax of 64 cents additional on every 100 pounds. For the protection of whom ? The Canadian consumer ? No—the Canadian refiner of sugar. Let us apply that to the sugar imports of last season, and see how it will operate. We imported in round numbers a little over 300,000,000 pounds of raw sugar in 1894. Say that 50,000,000 went direct into family consumption for ordinary purposes, and that 250,000,000 of that importation passed through the hands of the refiners. What is the result of the application of this system of protection to-day ? Why, Sir, the McKinley tariff, as an engine for securing revenue for the sugar trust, is nowhere, it is not in it ; and I will show you why. Take 250,000,000 pounds of raw sugar imported into Canada last year. The protection to the refiner on that sugar under the American tariff would have been $1,250,000. What is it under the tariff we are operating here to-day ? No less than $1,600,000. Last summer when the fight was on in Washington with the sugar trust, and it took all summer to settle the question, the difficulty was over the amount of protection the Americans would give the sugar refineries ; and at the close of that contest where were the sugar refineries placed ? They were given one-eighth of one per cent of duty extra on refined sugar imposed for their protection ; instead of 64 cents per 100 pounds given in Canada, they were only allowing 12½ cents per 100 pounds. We sometimes reach results better by comparison. For the last three months the dividend of the American sugar trust, with that protection of 12½ cents per 100 pounds, was 3 per cent in the quarter on a capital of $75,000,000, and experts on the American side say the whole of the sugar could be refined with a plant not costing over $15,000,000. Yet one-eighth of one per cent gives a sufficient return to pay on this enormous capital 3 per cent per quarter, or 12 per cent per annum, whereas our refiners are protected to nearly five times that amount, and instead of getting $312,500, as the American extra protection to the trust would give them on our imports of sugar, they received $1,600,000 protection from this Government. There is a line of cleavage between the policy represented on this side of the House and the policy represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not object to bearing the burdens sufficient for the necessary maintenance and for the expenditure of this country ; we are willing to carry the burdens necessary to pay interest on our public debt, heavy as it is ; we are willing to bear the burdens imposed for the necessary working expenditure, but we are not willing to become burden bearers for specially protected industries after this fashion.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that free trade as spoken of in Britain is impracticable here. I, for myself, and I speak for myself, say we are perfectly willing to bear the burdens imposed on our goods by a tariff that will enable us to meet our current expenditures ; but so long as I am in a position to protest I will protest against being called on to maintain industries that cannot stand on their own legs. On this point I desire to draw the attention of the House to an article printed in the "Mail" a short time ago, an organ that cannot be accused of leaning towards popular sentiment, and this article was printed after it became the organ of the Government. It is as follows :—

> The plea of those who want to locate newcomers here at any cost is, that we cannot expect them to come unless inducements are offered. This policy has been sufficiently illustrated in Ontario. Again and again it has been necessary for the legislature to do something to check the evil.
>
> There have been peripatetic industries, the proprietors of which looked out for a "good bonus," started their mills, worked up the subsidy, and then looked out "for fresh fields and pastures new."
>
> If the natural and commercial advantages of a place are not sufficient to attract manufacturing enterprises, it had better wait till they are.

It is no use trying to grow the plant of commerce by the aid of the expensive manure of subsidies. It wastes the substance of the people in uncertain speculations.

It wastes the substance of our country to-day in bolstering up industries and supporting institutions that are not able to stand upon their own limbs.

Sometimes, they tell us, that our Canadian industries would not be able to take care of themselves. Sir, I do not endorse that doctrine. Let me quote one example—and I have to acknowledge my indebtedness again to the Toronto "World"—to show what is done every day by Canadian industries which have never asked the Government for drawbacks on goods which they have exported, but who honestly consume Canadian iron in their industry and pay the burdens that were imposed upon them, and sell their goods to the community in open competition. Here is what the Toronto "World," in the month of March said with respect to one of these industries. Speaking with the representative of a new establishment in Toronto that was entering into the manufacture of bicycles, it says:

I am every day becoming more firmly convinced that we can manufacture bicycles and machinery just as well and cheaply in Canada as in any other country in the world. In proof of this I may say that we have just received from Messrs. Bertram & Co., of Dundas, a consignment of lathes, special tools and formers for use in the manufacture of our bicycles, which cost us one-third the figure tendered by some of the leading United States manufacturers. These tools and machines were made from the models of these in use by the Beeston, Humber Company, of England, acknowledged to be the most accurate and perfect in design, perhaps, in use at the present time. I sent the same specifications that went to Bertram & Co. to the United States firms, and the difference in the tenders sent in fairly staggered me, I can tell you. We, of course, then awarded the contract to the lowest tenderers, and we are now more than pleased at the manner in which the Dundas firm carried out their work.

Here is an establishment that has not asked to be bolstered up and protected. They are friendly to the National Policy, staunch supporters of it; but, in the face of all those facts, here is the evidence that they do manufacture successfully to-day, and that they put cheaper goods upon the market than can be bought on the American side. These are men who have pluck sufficient to attend to their business, and they do not belong to that type of manufacturers who have to go around and lean on this Government for aid and support.

Sir, with respect to the question of how Canada should be developed and our industries advanced, I want to present the House with a quotation from a journal that has never been accused of being Liberal in its political antecedents or associations, and which has been known as the organ of a section of this community which has been solidly and staunchly Conservative. Let me read from that article briefly, for the information of the House. I think it puts the question in better form, and it answers the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite much better than I can do. It was dated the 14th March, 1895, and it says:

Canada ought to be one of the greatest and most progressive nations of the world. The Dominion covers one-fifteenth of the earth's surface, embraces about 40 per cent of the British Empire, and is only exceeded in extent by Russia, and its resources are in keeping with its extent.

But it does not progress as it should. We are supposed to have drawn 800,000 immigrants from Europe in the ten years ending 1890, yet our net increase of population was only 500,000 as against 19 per cent in the previous decade.

There are several reasons, but the chief one after all for the slow advancement of Canada is found in the trade conditions that exist.

We want consumers for the products of our fisheries, forests, mines and farms far beyond the capacity of this country to supply.

This want could be supplied by the United States to a certain extent, but their terms—free trade with them and discrimination against the mother country—are such as no loyal citizen of the Empire could accept.

Across the sea, in the British Isles, is a market for all, and more than all, that we can produce. Why do we not furnish a larger portion of her supplies? Because it is a natural law of commerce that trade cannot flow all one way—one nation cannot sell to another without buying something in return.

And as we in Canada by an almost prohibitive tariff on British goods restrict our purchases in Great Britain, we, by that very act, restrict our sales to that country also.

What should be done, therefore, is to make a sweeping reduction in the customs duties now levied on manufactured goods imported from the United Kingdom. The adoption of this policy would vastly cheapen many articles that are used daily by our people. It will, by increasing our purchases in the mother country, add to our sales there as well, and it will make the cities of Canada the purchasing market for hundreds of thousands living just across the border.

Two objections to this policy may be anticipated. The alleged difficulty in raising a revenue and the interference with local manufacturing enterprises. In reply to the first objection: The increase in the consumption of British goods would more than make for the national treasury for the reduction in the rate of customs taxation, besides reducing the expenses of the Government. Canada is offering $750,000 of a yearly subsidy for a fast steamship service on the Atlantic, and the treasury is now being drawn upon for what is virtually a subsidy to increase our butter exports to England. Withdraw the artificial barriers against trade with the mother country erected by ourselves, and there will be a sudden bound in the commercial intercourse between us that will make both of the above expedients unnecessary.

Sir, that is not my language. That is the language of the Orange "Sentinel," a journal which has never been accused of Liberal proclivities. I commend it to the gentlemen opposite who are wandering around in the gloom and darkness of the past by-gone years, wondering what free

trade as they have it in Great Britain means. Here is one of their own friends who has no difficulty in expounding the policy we are advocating with respect to developing and advancing the interests of our people in Canada.

But, we are sometimes told that we are not very consistent in our advocacy of trade relations, and that one time we talk reciprocity, and continental free trade, and trade with Great Britain, and lots of other statements are made like that. I want to give to you, Mr. Speaker, an authority on the advantages to our people of trade with the United States that will not be disputed by even the Minister of Finance himself, when I quote it. It is the opinion of a gentleman who has been in this House for many years, and this is the statement he makes before his electors, gathered last summer for the purpose of discussing the selection of a candidate for his county. He said:

He had a duty to perform before leaving Parliament, and he had already induced the United States Government to reduce the tariff on horses, barley and coal, and he was still in communication with an agent of the United States Government to bring about a further reduction in the American tariff which would benefit the farmers. He further stated that no person would be more disappointed than Sir Mackenzie Bowell, if he did not receive the nomination.

Is that not rank heresy to proceed from any gentleman who is a supporter of the National Policy? Why, Sir, it is worthy of a Grit of the deepest dye. He says that it is a benefit to the Canadian farmer to have the United States tariff reduced, and that he is securing reductions on horses, barley, and coal. Why, Sir, it was my respected friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) who said this; and I am quoting from a report in an organ of the Government of the day, written by a friendly hand.

Sir, I have been grieved and ashamed to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing day in and day out the position of the mother country—the country that has never failed to stand by Canadian interests, that has given us the shelter of her protection and the shelter of her name through good report and evil report. Yes, these men are never done telling us that in free trade Britain distress prevails everywhere, and that people are suffering and in want, and are travelling towards a protective policy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are preaching blue ruin in England.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, preaching blue ruin in England. They carefully quote to us some of the campaign speeches of the Conservative party in England, made a year or two ago; but they do not quote to us the divisions of the House that have recently taken place on any of those questions. It may do to go into the country and tell the farmers that they are oppressed, that competition from the outside is straining their resources and reducing the income of their estates; and if you apply that statement to the proprietors of those estates, it is perfectly true; but if you look back through the history of England for a few generations, you will find that some of those gentlemen gave very little, indeed, for the estates from which they are drawing large revenues to-day. Suppose the prices of the products of the farm were doubled to-morrow, and kept so for a few years, how much of the increase do hon. gentlemen suppose would fall to the average tenant farmer? Would not the aristocracy who control their lands immediately proceed to put up their rents to match?

But I want to call attention to another quotation, bearing on this very question, from a journal which cannot be accused of Grit proclivities or of being unfriendly to the Government of the day; and I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite the sturdy and vigorous language in which it characterizes their conduct in thus belittling the mother country that has done so much for us. If they turn to the "Orange Sentinel" of the 25th April last they will find this paragraph, headed, "Distress in Great Britain":

Many United States and some Canadian papers are constantly telling us that great distress prevails in Britain. The British Parliament appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of affairs. The inquiry included the period of the great storms in Britain, storms unpecedented for more than fifty years. In spite of this terrible weather, the people of Great Britain suffered less actual distress and have been more prosperous than those of any other country under the sun.

The commission sent out inquiries to all localities in England, and received 1,194 replies from districts representing over 20,000,000 of a population, with these results: 569 localities, with a population of nearly 7,000,000, report no exceptional distress; 454 localities, with a population of over 10,000,000, report that there is exceptional distress, due solely to the severity of the winter; 144 localities, with a population of 3,700,000, report exceptional distress from want of employment, due to slackness of trade, depression in agriculture, or particular local or industrial causes.

Scotland, Wales and Ireland are dealt with separately, and show that, apart from the severity of the weather, no exceptional distress prevails.

The returns prove conclusively that the mass of the British people are not suffering. Britain holds her own in everything that tends to make a people great, and lying telegrams to Yankee papers are only sent to help the combines and commercial thieves in the United States, who find it pays to abuse Britain.

We regret that any Canadian paper should reproduce these lying despatches and try to bolster up Canadian combines.

That, Sir, is no statement from my side of the House. It is a statement from a journal that has never staggered in its allegiance to hon. gentlemen opposite; but the force

of the truth compelled it manfully to administer this scathing rebuke to those of hon. gentlemen opposite who are perpetually belittling the country which is the birthplace of many of us and the land we are all proud to be associated with. Sir, we are sometimes told that the National Policy has developed the country, has kept our people from leaving us, and has built up in our midst industries that have been of advantage to our people.

There is just one thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the House before I conclude, and which I think does not quite correspond with this statement. I refer to the redistributions that have taken place in my own province of Ontario and throughout the Dominion generally. You will remember, Sir, that after the census of 1881, when there was a Redistribution Act passed in 1882, Ontario had so far advanced in population and development that she was entitled to four additional members. Manitoba had also grown in the short period between that and the time she was constituted a separate province, and had one member added to her representation, and the confederacy was entitled, by increase of population, to five additional representatives in the House of Commons. Ten years of the National Policy passed over the country. We took the census of 1891, and we came to the redistribution of 1892, and what did we find? We found that in the premier province of Ontario our population had not gained at all, but had simply kept step with that of the province of Quebec, which is the standard province of confederation, and that if we had not gone back, at any rate we had not gained. This showed conclusively that Ontario had not retained her natural increase of population during the ten years of the National Policy, from 1881 to 1891. What was the case in the other provinces? Manitoba had gained two members, showing that notwithstanding the wealth that we had freely poured out, and the temptations we had held to Europeans to come and settle on the broad prairies of the North-west, Manitoba was only able in ten years to gain two additional representatives, whereas in five years, under the old regime, she had gained one. How was it with the maritime provinces? Nova Scotia was not able to retain her population, and her contingent will come back after the next election one member less. New Brunswick will have two members less, and the tight little Island of Prince Edward —the little gem that lies out in the gulf by itself, and there is no finer agricultural country on the continent—will have to content itself with a reduction of one member. This shows that in the aggregate the eastern provinces by the sea have lost population, since they are not able to retain the number of members they formerly had. British Columbia was entitled to no increase.

As regards the province of Ontario what are the facts? Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the building up of our population by the National Policy, and point with pride to the growth of some of the larger cities. But, Sir, Toronto has grown at the expense of the smaller towns and villages, within forty miles of it, and the only part of Ontario where the population has increased is the new district of Algoma, and there the increase is due to the development of its mining industry. What was then the action taken by the Government. They were in the position that they had to redistribute some of the constituencies in order to equalize the representation, whereas if the National Policy had done all they promised it would, instead of diminishing they would have required to increase the representation. Not only would the older constituencies have retained their representation, but they would have increased it. Two of the older constituencies, however, in the Niagara peninsula, had to be blotted out, and their record, dating back to the early history of the province disappears. By the action the Government took they might just as well have passed an act declaring that the part of my constituency attached to North Brant should not vote at all. For what reason? In the constituency to which they are attached, candidates of the party opposite, during the last two general elections, lost in both cases their deposit; and for fear the Liberal element of that constituency should not continue to do that sort of thing, we find the Government adding to it a section of another riding, which gave 350 of a Liberal majority at the last general election. They did this to enable the electors to still make sure that any candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite who would have the temerity to again test that constituency, would again lose his deposit. They might just as well have passed an act declaring that Conservatives and Liberals alike added from North Wentworth should be deprived of the right to vote because they were put where their votes could not be successfully used.

But, Mr. Speaker, you may change the outlines of a constituency, you may readjust your boundaries, but you cannot control the free and independent electors who reside within those boundaries. The population of Ontario, be they Conservatives or Liberals, have at least minds of their own; and I shall be very much mistaken if the Government do not find that their policy has done nothing to strengthen them in the estimation of the best thinking men of the Niagara peninsula. You may change these boundaries and adjust these schemes, but the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1882 indicates that the people are free in their choice and will suit themselves when the time comes.

I apologize to the House for the time I have taken, and I thank the House for the kind attention it has given my remarks. We are willing to bear all the necessary burdens in order to pay our debts and maintain our credit and good name. We are willing to bear the taxation imposed upon us to meet the necessary expenditure of this country; we are willing to give our native industries every benefit of that protection up to that extent; but for myself I am not willing that any man should deliberately put his hand into my pocket and take more or less money out in order to bolster an institution that has not backbone enough to stand on its own legs, and I shall be found voting for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) I have listened with a good deal of interest to the address of the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. I do not know whether it is in very good taste, on either side of the House, to find fault or to try and exaggerate in any way the distress prevailing in Great Britain to-day. But I think that when hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to rebuke members on this side for telling the country that there is distress prevailing in Great Britain and that things are not as they should be in that centre of free trade, they ought not at least to depreciate the institutions and condition of their own country. When I entered the Chamber, I think the first remark I heard the hon. gentleman make, who has just taken his seat, was with reference to the Hon. Mr. Mercier, of Quebec. I do not know whether he felt happy that the proceedings which were taken against him were not successful, but he was careful to tell us that Mr. Mercier was not convicted. Whether the hon. gentleman meant that Mr. Mercier was not guilty or whether he meant to express his pleasure at Mr. Mercier escaping conviction, I cannot say, but anyhow it seemed very gratifying to him that Mr. Mercier was not convicted. And no doubt he was very happy to taunt this side of the House with the fact that he was not convicted. On the other hand, he told us that the late contractor escaped, and that we had failed in convicting him. Well, I believe that the evidence was presented in both cases before the tribunals in the province of Quebec; and I may say for myself, and I think I speak for every honest man in this Dominion, that, whether it was the fault of the evidence, or whether it was the fault of the tribunal, or whether it was the fault of the laws, if we believed the evidence against them, it was a great pity the contractor and Mr. Mercier were not convicted of offences of which, I think, they were guilty, according to the evidence given against them. The hon. member told us first that everything was produced in Great Britain much more cheaply than it was here, owing to free trade. He said the people over there could manufacture to greater advantage than we could. Then he went on to tell us that in the republic of Argentine the people could produce wheat much more cheaply than we could—I think he said from 15 to 20 cents a bushel cheaper. Then he told us the manufacturers here were not prospering as well as they should, and that our farming was not paying those engaged in it. And, as well as I could understand, the only remedy that he proposed was that we should open this country to the manufacturers of Great Britain, and to the wheat growers of the Argentine Republic. He found fault because the Government allowed, on articles exported, a rebate of 99 per cent of the duties paid on materials entering into the production of those goods. Sir, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that manufacturers should come into this country and manufacture for the republic of Argentine or for the United States or Great Britain, and not charge them a cent of duty on the materials they use in the production of their wares. I am perfectly willing that we should manufacture for the whole world, if possible, and that to the extent that we do manufacture for other countries we should return duties paid by the manufacturer. I believe that in the case of liquors sent abroad, the excise duty is returned; I know that it is so in the case of tobacco, because a common way to evade payment of the duties is to send the tobacco down to St. Pierre and then smuggle it back into the country. That was at one time quite an industry in the maritime provinces, and in some parts of Quebec, though I understand that it is now very largely put a stop to. Now, I propose to show that in the period of distress that we had from 1873 to 1879, in the highly protected country to the south of us, the export of home products increased year by year, while our exports of home products decreased:

	United States.	Canada.
1873	$505,000,000	$76,538,000
1874	569,000,000	76,741,000
1875	499,000,000	69,709,000
1876	525,000,000	72,401,000
1877	589,000,000	68,030,000
1878	680,000,000	67,989,000
1879	698,000,000	62,431,000

These figures show that while the exports of home products of the United States increased $193,000,000, ours decreased $14,000,000. In the highly protected country to the south of us, these exports increased by almost two-thirds, while ours decreased almost one-sixth. Now, let us make a comparison between Great Britain and Canada, during these years. I will give you the figures of the export of home produce for these countries, 1874 and 1879:

	Great Britain.	Canada.
1874	$239,000,000	$76,741,000
1879	191,531,000	62,431,000

So, in Great Britain, a free trade country, and in Canada then under a tariff of 17½ per cent, these exports decreased pretty much in the same proportion. Contrast this with the period from 1890 to 1893. We find that in Canada the exports of home produce in 1890 were $85,257,000, while in 1893 these exports had increased by no less than $20,541,000. In Great Britain, the exports of home produce were $263,530,000, which, in 1893, had declined by $45,500,000. I think the trade in home products exported abroad is about the best test of a country's prosperity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there is nothing that our friends on the other side dwell upon more than upon the amount of taxes that are being taken out of the people. I often see it quoted, and I think I have heard it on several occasions in this House, that in 1878, under the old regime, the revenue was $22,375,000, while in 1894 the revenue was increased to $36,374,000. That is perfectly correct, and the increased amount was received by the Government. But in 1894 we received from the post office, from railways, and from interest on investments, the sum of $8,795,500, whereas, in 1878, we only received $4,533,000 from these sources. Here is a gain in these three items alone of $4,262,000. This is not a matter of taxation. This is what we receive in revenue from the post office, and from railways and canals. Now, the excise is not considered as a matter of taxation. It is not levied upon imports that are brought into the country, it is simply a tax upon whisky, tobacco and some other articles. In 1878, from tobacco and whisky we received the sum of $4,858,600, whereas in 1884 we received $8,381,000, that is a gain of over $3,500,000. Now, customs alone, in 1878, yielded $12,782,800; in 1894 they yielded $19,198,100, the actual increase being $6,415,300. It was natural that there should be an increase from 1878 to 1894; it is not supposed that the country would stand still; it is not supposed that we could build the great works that have been undertaken and finished between 1878 and 1894 without a large revenue. Now, the actual increase per cent on the imports from 1873 to 1878, was considerably larger than it has been from 1878 to 1894. If we had the same rates of duty in 1894 as we had in 1878, we could have collected $15,867,085 additional, whereas the actual increase was only $3,331,000. Now, we have been collecting a revenue largely upon articles that are not necessaries of life for a vast number of our population, we have been collecting largely from what are called the luxuries of life. Take, for instance, ale and porter, I do not think the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) would consider those articles necessaries of life. I have here a table showing the duties collected on various articles in 1878 and 1894, respectively:

DUTIES COLLECTED.

	1878.	1894.
Ale and porter	$ 43,863	$ 65,661
Spirits	1,000,864	2,086,559
Wines	207,566	309,339
Tobacco	188,530	287,703
Patent medicines	29,744	62,937
Perfumery	5,953	10,280
Playing cards	4,014	10,013
Plate glass	14,467	66,668
Gold and silver manufac...	41,496	79,418
Silks and satins	246,669	743,402
Jewellery	46,404	51,124
Totals	$1,829,570	$3,772,549

The hon. member for Wentworth complained of the condition of the farmer. Well, in 1878 we imported of produce that is largely grown in this country, a total of $15,222,050; in 1894 we imported of the same articles $2,866,483. In breadstuffs alone, in 1878, we imported $13,452,460; in 1894 we imported $1,211,210. In all these articles, that is animals, breadstuffs, eggs, hay, provisions, plants and trees, vegetables and fresh fruits, in 1878, the imports amounted to $15,222,000 and in 1894, to $2,866,483. But if we imposed the tax that existed in 1878 upon five articles that are very much used in this country by all classes, we would have collected $9,028,304 of revenue, which have been remitted within the last four or five years. In 1878 there was a duty levied upon black tea of 5 cents per pound, of which we imported 9,772,334 pounds in 1894, which would have yielded a revenue of $488,616. There was a duty upon green tea of 6 cents per pound, which would have yielded a revenue in 1894 of $566,133. There was a duty upon coffee of 2 cents per pound, which would have yielded a revenue of $59,312. There was a duty of $2.45 per cwt. upon sugar, which would have yielded a revenue of $7,442,945. There was a duty upon coal oil of 7 1-5 cents per gallon, which would have yielded a revenue of $471,298, if the same duty were imposed as in 1878. But instead of that sum, the duty collected was only $392,748 from coal oil. So that the people were relieved, taking the same importations of those articles, of $8,635,000 from 1878 to 1894. Now, we are often reminded that the taxation is very high upon several articles in this country. But hon. gentlemen forget that in the year 1894 there were over $51,000,000 worth of free goods entered in this Dominion. In the first place, we had anthracite coal to the value of $6,355,285, admitted free; then we had 950,000 tons of salt imported into this country free. We had cork wood, largely used by fishermen, imported free to the value of $19,661. We are often told that taxes fall upon those who are least able to bear them; but I see that of silks, raw and unmanufactured, we only had $206,325 worth imported. We had broom corn, fibre, vegetable fibre, fruits, hemp (undressed), seeds, sugar, tobacco, trees and other articles, making up at least over $10,000,000

in value. Besides, there were cotton wool, cotton waste, cotton yarn for use in certain manufacturies, drugs, dyes, ducks for belting, jute cloth, a very large amount of cocoanut oil, rubber, and many other articles of that kind, were imported into the country, to the value of $51,831,459. Of the imports of 1894, $69,873,571 were taxed, and $51,883,000 were left untaxed. The next question we often hear discussed in this House is the question of the exodus. We must not forget that the country to the south of us was settled early in American history. From England and Ireland, and other parts of Europe, in the last century, and in the century before, there was a stream of emigration to that country. People went there, and their friends followed them. No sooner were people settled here, particularly in the lower provinces, than they commenced to find their way to the United States. So long as I can recollect, even before confederation, one political party always charged the other with driving the people from the country. Well, Sir, they have been going to the country to the south and settling there, until now, I believe, the United States themselves are beginning to find that they have too many people. They had factory establishments in the Eastern States, they had lands in the western country, and people from the provinces took up lands vacated by people of the States to go out and take large tracts of land in the west. It is not a very easy matter to divert immigration from a country to which people have been accustomed to go, and where relatives and friends reside. But we hope in a very short time the tide of emigration that has been going to the United States will be directed toward our great heritage in the west. We often hear talk about 60,000,000 people to the south of us. The United States have 10 or 15 millions of Africans; and the opinion is generally expressed that the republic could get along very well supposing those ten or fifteen millions would take their departure and return to the country from whence they came hundreds of years ago. The United States also have a large number of what is called the Latin race, Spaniards and Italians, and there is a general consensus of opinion among the people of the United States that the country could get along just as well if those people returned to their homes. We have in this country a hardy people, a thrifty people, and a class of settlers of which any country ought to feel proud. One point which is very frequently overlooked in this debate is this: What will be the effect of a change of policy such as hon. gentlemen advocate? We saw in the United States a few years ago, an attempt made to change the tariff. We all know that the changes made fell very far short of what the people expected, and very far short of what we expected at

that time. But the very fact that changes were taking place caused capital at once to be withdrawn. I think it makes very little difference whether we were right or wrong in 1878, because, for seventeen years we have followed the course then laid down, and have given protection to our native industries. We are importing the raw material and manufacturing it in the country. Capital is shy, and will not be invested where a country is subject to sudden and frequent changes in tariff. Although very few changes were made in the United States, yet the people distrusted the corporations, even private individuals distrusted the banks. In 1892 you could hardly take up a newspaper but you read that some tramp or gang had got hold of the hard-earned accumulations of some unfortunate individual in that country who had taken their money out of the banks, fearing they were not stable, and would not return it when demanded. There are many things we have undertaken, there are many courses we have pursued. On the great question of confederation itself a great many people, and probably a very respectable minority, supposed it would be a great injury to each of the provinces concerned. But no one would think of going back to the old position. A great many people were opposed to buying the North-west. But I presume there are very few people who would go back to the position we occupied before. Many people were opposed to the terms made with British Columbia. But I presume there are very few who would like to let British Columbia go, and return to our former position. Whether the Conservatives, in 1878, were right or wrong, we would have to begin over again if the tariff were changed. But I do not apprehend that any very radical changes would occur. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, seemed to be determined that the manufacturers of this country shall be destroyed; they tell us that the manufacturers are making too much money. I should like hon. gentlemen opposite to reconcile the statements made by them during this debate. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) produced figures and submitted them to the House the other evening to show that our manufacturers were not making as much money in 1891 as they were in 1871, and these are the figures he produced: In 1871 the wages paid to men and those employed in factories amounted to $40,851,009; raw material, $124,907,846; total, $165,758,855. The product was of the value of $221,617,733, the balance of profit was $55,858,918; capital, $77,964,020; and the percentage of profit 73 per cent. The hon. gentleman went through a similar calculation in regard to 1881, and he stated that the profits were 42 per cent. He afterwards came down

to 1891, and showed by his figures that the profits were 33·06 per cent; in other words, that the profits of the manufacturers of this country had been reduced 50 per cent in twenty years. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) went on to show us that the manufacturers were making a very large percentage in profits, and that, in fact, they were extracting money, not only from the pockets, but from the faces of the people of this country; and that they were making a profit of 33½ per cent, which he thought was something almost criminal. Now, Sir, I shall leave himself and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to reconcile these two statements. One hon. member says the profit has decreased from 73 per cent to 33⅓ per cent, and the other hon. gentleman states that under the National Policy the manufacturers are taking millions and millions of dollars out of the people of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, probably every member addressing this House might feel that his own particular locality is the one that he should confine his remarks more particularly to. The coal industry is the principal industry in the locality in which I reside. I have not heard one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House state that if the Liberals came into power, the duty would be left upon coal. We have had an experience of free coal from 1871 or 1872 to 1879. The development and prosperity of the coal industry not only affects the immediate localities where the mines are situated, but it affects the whole province of Nova Scotia so far as its commerce is concerned. Large sums are paid to the men in wages; our schooners and steamers are profitably employed, and a large number of men are engaged, not only in the mines, but in handling the coal around the shipping piers. In the clusters of villages around the coal mines, the people of the surrounding country are enabled to find a very profitable market, which if destroyed in any way would injure the agricultural prospects in many counties of Nova Scotia. In addition to that, the revenue derived from the coal by the local government is very material, and it would be greatly affected if the duty were taken off coal and its production lessened. In 1878 the royalty collected on coal in Nova Scotia was $50,531.07, while for the nine months of 1893, the royalty collected was $174,810.07. The amount estimated by the Provincial Secretary for the year ending 1879—I cannot get access to the journals for that year, so as to show what it realized—but the amount estimated was $60,000 of revenue from this source, while in 1894 the Provincial Secretary estimated that the revenue from coal royalty would be $250,000. While the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) was addressing the House last night, I was thinking that perhaps if the revenue of the province of Nova Scotia had remained as it was in 1878, there would be grave doubts that that hon. gentleman would now be sitting in the House. With an increase from $50,000 to $250,000 in coal royalties, the Government of Nova Scotia have been able to deal very liberally with respect to roads and bridges in the province. The county which my hon. friend represents was not forgotten, and I have no doubt that that was a very large element in contributing to his success in the various elections from 1876 to 1895. I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) would have had a seat in this House were it not for the increase in revenue which enabled the provincial government to expend a considerable amount of money on roads and bridges in his county. We all know what advantage the local members in the province of Nova Scotia can reap from this expenditure, and the material assistance which it gives them in their elections. I am not finding particular fault with the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). I am not aware of anyhing he has done personally with reference to this, but I know as a general rule, when $30,000 or $40,000 is voted for a county to build bridges, and $20,000 or $30,000 to repair the roads, and when it is absolutely under the control of the local member representing the county, it is an element with which we have to contend at every election.

Mr. McISAAC. How much was voted last year for the county of Antigonish on roads and bridges?

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I do not know the estimate.

Mr. McISAAC. Not one dollar.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). Oh, well, I know how it is. I think that the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) probably acted more wisely than they did in the county I have the honour to represent. The amount was large and the people were needy in Victoria, and they were promised large sums, and I think that the amount was completely used up. But I do not believe that the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) did that because I think he had a reserve. If I am not mistaken, I hardly believe that he would use it up in so short a time as the members in other counties did. I am not finding fault with the hon. member, but what I mean to say is this: If the Government of Nova Scotia were confined to the $50,531.07 bounty from coal which they received in 1878, I believe that it would not be so easy for their supporters to find their way to the local assembly or to the Dominion Parliament as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said by gentlemen opposite in reference to the corruption of the Conservative Government, but I will leave it to gentlemen on the other side who may follow me, to tell the House and the country what benefit accrue to Canada

from the following expenditures by the Mackenzie Government:

Steel rails	$2,000,000
Fort Francis Locks	250,000
Fort Pelly works	64,000
Georgian Bay Br., Central Ry.	109,000
Neebing Hotel and land	69,000
	$2,492,000

I shall be very glad to know from gentlemen opposite how much good Canada reaped from those expenditures while their own friends were in power. The hon. member from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) went into various calculations last night to endeavour to show to this House and to the country, and more particularly his constituents, that the sum of $7,000,000 had been stolen within the last seventeen years. Even suppose that were true, yet if we consider this two and a half millions wasted by the Mackenzie Government, and for which the country received no value, then we can make a fair comparison between the periods the Conservative and the Liberal Governments were in power. In his calculation he attempted to show that this $7,000,000 would build a net work of railways all over the province. Does he forget that when his own friends were in power they expended $11,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway and built exactly 189 miles, or at the rate of 37 miles a year? If that $7,000,000 had been used in building roads as expensively as they were built under the Liberal party rule, he would be a long time getting home over them. Now, I have listened carefully to the hon. gentlemen on the other side who have addressed the House, to see if there was any article or any line of articles from which they propose to take the duty in order to place it on other articles; but I listened in vain to ascertain from any of them what they propose to do. It is all very well to talk about taxes; we must have a revenue; but I was very glad to find that every one of those who spoke intimated that they were not in favour of free trade. But they tell us that we are not extending our trade. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) found fault with us on that ground, and ridiculed every attempt that is being made to extend our trade with other countries; he told us that we should extend our trade to the south. Well, if there was any question about that, or if there had been any lack of effort on the part of any Canadian Government, either Liberal or Conservative, in that direction, I should forgive him for saying what he did. But does he not know that even before we had responsible government in the Dominion, representations were made to the home government to induce the United States to give us reciprocity of trade? Does he not know that as early as 1847, after responsible government was granted to Canada, similar attempts were made, and that almost every year since successive governments have striven to obtain reciprocity with the United States, and that we only succeeded once? That was in 1854. Afterwards, the United States, not Canada, put an end to the treaty. Do they not know that in 1875-76 the Hon. George Brown—and I do not think I am speaking disparagingly of any Liberal in Canada when I said that he was probably the ablest man that ever belonged to that party—went to Washington in the effort to secure a reciprocity treaty; and if you read the correspondence, you will wonder whether, in all the offers he made, there was anything left that he did not offer. He first offered reciprocity in natural products, and then in manufactured goods, and at last he was willing to throw in all the claims under the fishery award, amounting to $5,500,000, if the United States Government would give him a fair treaty of reciprocity. All these offers were refused. We know that in 1866-67, every attempt was made on behalf of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the united provinces of Quebec and Ontario to revive the treaty on even less favourable terms than those of 1854. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us in this House a very short time ago that the Canadas were willing to accept very much less than we gave them in the treaty of 1854; and still Canada has as yet been unable to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with them. Now, the National Policy was inaugurated in 1878, not by the Conservative party alone, but with the aid of the ablest men in the ranks of the Liberal party as well. We all know that it was a matter of complaint on the part of Mr. Blake, who led the Liberal party for a number of years, that his friends deserted him in 1878 for a false principle. I find, in reading the debates, that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) were not the only men who were in favour of a protective policy in 1876. On the 3rd of April, 1876, Mr. Desjardins, who is now a member of the Senate, moved for copies of papers and documents relating to the sugar refineries. He said that after the Budget speech had been delivered in 1876, it was a well known fact that the most important sugar refinery in the Dominion had closed its doors, leaving useless an invested capital of $1,000,000, and throwing 300 men out of employment. The product of the refinery amounted to $2,620,000; and the value of the importations was $2,400,000; that the salaries then paid in the establishment amounted to $71,000; that $120,000 was paid annually for cooperage, and $14,000 for iron works and general repairing, and that when the establishment was in operation, 14,000 tons of coal, carried by our ships from the Pictou mines, were annually consumed. In view of these facts, he said, it would be idle to contend that in this case a private interest merely was concerned. He then went on to

say that the refinery had been compelled to close down. In the four years, when this refinery was in operation, our trade with the West Indies amounted to $25,000,000, being $16,000,000 exported against $9,000,000 imports, leaving a balance in our favour of $7,000,000. He then proceeded to show that after the closing of that refinery, the price of sugar instead of going down, had gone up. There was sitting in the House at that time, Mr. Jones, then representing Halifax, and who, I am sure, was not the least able among the members of the House at that day. Whether or not he was successful or a wise politician, he was at least a good business man. As far as I am concerned, in commercial matters I would rather take the opinion of a man holding the position he did, and does still, than all the authorities to be found on all the dusty books taken down from the shelves of our library. Mr. Jones said he regretted very much that as Mr. Desjardins spoke in French, all the members in the House could not understand him. He was very happy to be able to agree with Mr. Desjardins. This trade with the West Indies was not a provincial but a Dominion matter. Mr. Jones always held to the idea that schooners were better than sailing vessels, and objected to subsidizing steamers for the West India trade. The trade of the maritime provinces with the West India Islands, he said, amounted to $2,500,000. Previous to the existence of the depression, this branch of our commerce had been in a flourishing condition, but the change in the tariff had considerably interfered with it. He had heard that since the change, consumers in this country had been obliged to pay a higher price for their sugar. The French and Belgian governments having established drawbacks in favour of their refiners, a deputation representing the British sugar interests had waited on Lord Derby and represented that the trade relations of Great Britain with the West Indies would be seriously affected by their continuance. It appeared, however, that nothing could be done, and the British sugar industry was threatened with annihilation. While a free trader, Mr. Jones thought they had abundant proof that whereas in this case, on the raw material 50 per cent duty was paid, only 40 per cent was paid on the refined article, affording foreigners a very considerable advantage. He went on to say that instead of the people paying more for their sugar when refined in this country, he believed that they were paying less; and he put himself on record as admitting that notwithstanding the duty, if the refiners were given a preferential duty, he did believe that the price of sugar would not be advanced any way. I must regret what happened afterwards. He was taken into the Cabinet and nothing more was heard from him on this subject, but I believe that those were his honest convictions at the time, and I am disposed to give them great weight because of his experience in business matters. But the Finance Minister of that day would not make the slightest change or give any preference to a home industry. Mr. Jones's statement with regard to the price of sugar corresponds exactly with what was said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) yesterday. Notwithstanding the small difference in the duty, the duty being rather greater in the United States than in Canada, that hon. gentleman showed conclusively that although the duty was slightly larger in the United States on entering than here, still there was a difference of 44 cents per cwt. in favour of Canada than there was in New York, allowing for difference in duty. Now, among the business men and clear-sighted men who had a seat in the House in 1876, was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I know that in this House there is no man who is listened to with more respect and attention. He then told us:

> I am one of those who believe that to have the American market open to our products would benefit our farmers. I do not suppose there is any one in this House, and very few in the country, who would not believe that, if our farmers should send their products to the United States, it would be a benefit to them. We do not know whether negotiations tending in that direction may soon be opened or not, at least members of this House are not aware of it. The question is, whether, in the event of future negotiations, the imposition of a tax on grain would operate in our favour.

He goes on to relate what he supposed would take place between the commissioners from Canada and the United States:

> Fancy the commissioner delegated by this House sent to Washington to negotiate such a treaty. The question would be asked, what he desired. He replies: I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our forests, fields and mines. The United States commissioner might ask: And what will you give us in return? Our representative would reply, offering our markets for the same products of the United States. The astute American would naturally say: We have that already; I do not see that you offer us anything. We must remember that we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up a new reciprocity treaty. I need not remind this House that the great lever we had before in negotiating reciprocity is no longer ours.

The hon. gentleman made, at that time, one of the best speeches on the question. He was frank, honest and sincere, and he opposed his party. Further on, when the motion was made to go into supply, it was supposed he would vote with his party in 1877-78, he said that he was of the same opinion still, that he believed the speech was perfectly correct, and the Government had plenty time to carry out his view, and he said that when he went on the hustings himself, when running his election, the peo-

ple came and asked that there should be some protection for the farmer, and that he had to promise it to them, and that if the promise was not carried out he must resign his seat. Still the hon. gentleman occupies his seat. There is another, and I am sure he is not the least among the members on the other side of this House. I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Why, Sir, he looked upon protection as having something like a divine origin. He declared his belief in protection to a certain extent, and within certain limits. He said :

> We have been told that a protective policy is one which could only be adopted by a patriarchal government—a government which could not only protect industries, but also limit production. I hold that a protective policy, on the contrary, runs through the whole legislative system of any country. To afford protection of life and property is the duty of government, and armies are raised and navies built to protect the nation. Prisons are erected for the protection of the public, and free grants given for the purpose of increasing the public wealth and adding to the population.

And he goes on to say, further :

> It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufacture without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself : and I think the assertion, that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of a nation, is incontrovertible.

And, Sir, the speech that the hon. gentleman delivered upon that occasion, I think, is well worth reading ; and, although I have often heard him explain it, and make other addresses or speeches in the House, I must say that I prefer the one that he delivered on the 29th February, 1876. I do not think he need hope to explain the speech away or to improve upon it. Now, we are constantly reminded of Great Britain and her free trade. Great Britain is in a far different position from that we occupy. They have their coal, their iron, their limestone, and other materials of manufacture in the country, and in close proximity. They can manufacture to-day cheaper than any country in the world. But they have to import very largely everything that they consume other than manufactured goods. Their bread must be brought into the country, as also must their meat. Is it any wonder they made these things free ? The farmers are a small class compared with the industrial classes in Great Britain, and their influence is as nothing in comparison with that of manufacturers, artisans, and non-producers. If I were a non-producer in Great Britain, I believe nothing would induce me to favour the levying of a duty upon those articles that cannot be produced in the country. They have a large population in Great Britain—from end to end we may call it one great city. The farming class is comparatively small, and probably will not be able to exert the influence to secure legislation, to impose duties upon breadstuffs. We are often told of free trade as it is in Great Britain. The customs taxes upon articles are very limited in number, but when they do put on a duty it is a pretty stiff one. We find that every pound of tea is taxed 7 cents. Tobacco, containing ten pounds of moisture is taxed 3s. and 2d., and if it contains less than that it is taxed 3s. and 6d. And on some kinds of tobacco and snuff, the tax is as high as 4s., and even 4s. and 6d. Now, the articles are very limited in number, but from them they raise a tax of about $100,000,000 a year. But in other respects, the taxes cover a great variety of articles. You cannot give a receipt there that can be produced in court without having it stamped. A man's promissory note would be no good unless it were stamped ; his draft would have to be stamped. Any agreement, in order to make it valid, must have a stamp. Every mortgage, every transfer of land, every legacy requires a stamp. Every lawyer who is admitted there has to pay into the treasury of Great Britain the sum of $250. A solicitor pays $125 ; a doctor, $150 ; a fellow or physician, $125 ; notary public, $150. On any agreement, or memorandum of agreement, not under seal, one has to pay 10 cents. Then we come to other articles, such as carriages. Any man who owns a carriage must pay 15s. a year—that is for a two-wheeled carriage. If it is a four-wheeled carriage, the owner must pay £2 2s. if for two horses, and £1 1s. if for one horse. Every man who owns a house must pay a tax. If the rental is £40 net, and not over £60, the tax is 4d. in the pound. If the rental exceeds £60, the tax is 6d. in the pound. Besides, there is a large amount collected on income. We know that there is a large amount of wealth in Great Britain. If the same taxes upon income were imposed here, we would find that they would yield but a small revenue. Public houses, restaurants, and beer shops are taxed, the tax increasing according to the number of hours they are kept open. If they are kept open on Sunday, the tax is very much increased. Another argument that is used here is the large amount of money that is made out of the different industries in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, any person can ascertain the amount of money in these industries by applying to get stock in the company carrying it on. I shall just read a few of the quotations. I may say, first, with regard to the sugar industry of this country, that not long ago, for every $100 invested in these refineries, no person would offer more than $55, and I believe that the highest quotation lately is about $85. Now, Sir, the Dominion Cotton Company's bonds are sold at par. The Dominion Cotton Company's stock, buyers will only give 98,

and sellers were asking 105. The National Cordage Company, about which we have heard so much, has shares of a face value of $100, and, apparently on the day this was quoted, nobody wanted to purchase any shares in that company. Now, for coloured cotton bonds, sellers want 99, and buyers are willing to give 92½. The Coloured Cotton Company, sellers are asking 60, and buyers are willing to give only 57. There is one industry in the city of Ottawa which I suppose has very little to do with the National Policy, the Electric Light Company. Their stock is quoted at 185, whereas many of the banks are quoted as high as 240 and 250. I think, therefore, the argument in regard to the large amount of money that is made by these companies, is largely overdrawn; and probably the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk is correct, that the cotton companies, the sugar and other manufacturing industries, are making less profits now than they were in 1878. Now, Sir, a large number of hon. members wish to speak on this subject, I will only say, that until hon. gentlemen opposite will satisfy, not only this House but this country, that they have a policy which will commend itself to the country, I think it will be a long time before they receive the confidence of the people, and that they will stand in opposition reviling and abusing the National Policy for many years to come.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, being forcibly bound to speak in a language foreign to that of the majority in this House and at so late an hour, especially after several hon. gentlemen have discussed so ably this question in this House, I think it my duty to crave very specially the indulgence of my hon. colleagues. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. McDonald, Victoria N.S.) spoke in such low tones during several minutes that I think he must have wished to put us in an utter impossibility to reply to him. In another part of his speech, the hon. gentleman seemed to me to be so little satisfied with the value of his own arguments, that I nearly came again to the conclusion that he did not wish us to reply to arguments urged in such a way. However, Mr. Speaker, I understood that, like all the other speakers opposite, he made an eulogy of the National Policy and he even seized the opportunity to bring into discredit the actions of the Mackenzie Administration; that he repeated many favourite arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite and that, like his friends and colleagues, he exclaimed: Where is the policy of the Liberal party, where is your platform, members of the Opposition, and tell us how, if ever you come into power, you are going to raise the revenue required for the public service? I intend, in the course of the observations I am about to make, to reply to the arguments contained in the speech just delivered by the hon. gentleman. In order to do that, I will have to go back some years ago. It was during the session of 1877 that Sir John A. Macdonald, the true founder of the Conservative party, deserted the ideas he had advocated during a quarter of a century and, from a free-trader became the father of a hybrid fiscal system since qualified "National Policy," and calculated, in his opinion, to "protect" our manufactures, while giving us the revenue required to meet the public expenditure. Three reasons seem to me to have induced Sir John Macdonald and, with him, the Conservative party at that time, to adopt the political system which he put before this House on the 7th March, 1878, the first year this campaign was entered into, as I will show by unexceptional evidences. Mr. Mackenzie, the leader of the Government, then into power, had pronounced himself a free-trader, and therefore in favour of a tariff for revenue only. Sir John Macdonald, with the flexibility which characterized his whole political career, declared in favour of a revision of the tariff, as a counterpart to the platform laid down in the statements of Mr. Mackenzie. The second reason is that Sir John Macdonald wished at that time to have the too famous Pacific scandal to be forgotten, which Lord Dufferin in terms never to be forgotten, qualified an "atrocious crime." The third reason is that, in 1878, the country was undergoing a most severe commercial and financial depression, and Sir John A. Macdonald wished to go before the people with protection as a war-cry. This war-cry was going to be popular and to lead him into power. Here are, in short, Mr. Speaker, the three reasons which brought us the National Policy. The hon. gentlemen opposite, as did the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) to-night, are incessantly asking us what our platform is. They are likewise incessantly charging us with too frequent changes of policy. My hon. friend and colleague, the member for the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) perfectly disproved this charge the other day, as also did yesterday evening, in such eloquent words, the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). These two hon. gentlemen have shown to an evidence that the Liberal party, contrary to the statement made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, has a well defined political platform which differs from that of the Conservative party in that it is its formal contradiction and condemnation, in that it condemns the protective system. I wish to go further than the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) and the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). I intend to carry the war into Africa, and I will try and show that the Conservative party is the very party which now disowns its free-trade tendencies and traditions, which now disowns its platform of 1877 and 1878. I assert, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative party, up to the time I have mentioned, al-

ways was the free-trade party in this country. I suppose no one will doubt that Sir George Etienne Cartier was a Conservative; I suppose likewise that no one will doubt the statement that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) has always been and is still a member of the Conservative party. At a dinner given to Sir George Etienne Cartier by the Quebec trade, on the 23rd December, 1869, Sir George Etienne Cartier, then the leader of the French section of the Conservative party, referred in the following words to the question of protection:

The Quebec manufacturers ask to be protected to the utmost. It is a preposterous proposition, as much so as are extreme ideas in connection with free trade.

This last system compels you to pay to the Government by way of a direct tax the same duties as before.

With unlimited protection, you strike a fatal blow at the foreign trade. Just inquire about that from the Americans. We will not commit ourselves to such a folly. We have decided to impose a revenue duty that will give at the same time a sufficient protection, reserving our right to change our fiscal policy according to circumstances.

In another part of his speech, in answer to a claim made for a foreign outlet by one of the audience, Sir George Etienne Cartier said:

You have got it: see what my hon. friend, Mr. George Stephen, of Montreal, did. He established a cloth factory at Cornwall, where, at the outset, he had to import labour by dint of money. Now he sells his cloths at lower prices than the Scotch or English manufacturers.

I was reproached by the Manchester and Sheffield people with giving too much protection to this industry. I replied to them that the maximum duty was 15 per cent, the same as the duty imposed on their own goods. How is it, then, they said, that you can sell at lower prices than we can? We are unable to manufacture as good and cheap cloths as those sent to Manchester by Mr. Stephens.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, this leader of the Ministerial party was opposed to an extreme protection. Cartier, a leader of the Conservative party, was in favour of a tariff for revenue and opposed to an extreme protective system such as the one we now have. As soon as 1873, Mr. Thomas White, who later was made a Cabinet Minister, said before the Dominion Board of Trade:

A 15 per cent tariff means more than 15-per cent in favour of manufacturers. We must add to that the rate of transport of the goods imported which represents 5 per cent on the average, thus actually bringing protection up to 20 per cent. This ought to be sufficient for any industry suited to this country. As to others, it would be a want of wisdom to keep them up through fiscal legislation.

I suppose Mr. Thomas White, who became a Minister, was surely a Conservative. But there is more, and I fancy no one will have any hesitation for a moment to acknowledge a Conservative in Sir Charles Tupper. Now, what did he say when, in 1878, the Mackenzie Government increased the duty from 15 to 17½ per cent? Sir Charles Tupper then said in this House:

I very much fear the Minister of Finance is going into the perilous path of protection, which will bring ruin and desolation unto us.

Not only was Sir George Etienne Cartier, not only was Mr. Thomas White, not only was Sir Charles Tupper in favour of a tariff for revenue and therefore opposed to a protective tariff, but even Sir John A. Macdonald had pronounced himself as opposed to protection. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) whom the Ministerial press calls an ally of the Opposition, which is false, the hon. member for North Simcoe, who has become a leader of a third party and wishes to be considered as a Conservative and a member of the Tory party, this hon. member, I say, has given out, since he has ceased to support the present Government, that in 1878, Sir John A. Macdonald had pronounced himself against protection and that he only launched forth the National Policy as set forth in his resolution of the 7th March, 1878, because Mr. Mackenzie had declared in favour of a tariff for revenue. He added that if Mr. Mackenzie should have declared for protection, he (Sir John) would have taken to free-trade. This statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe is corroborated by the hon. member for East York (Mr. McLean) in an editorial published in the issue of the "Canadian Magazine" for December or January last. We have moreover, a new substantiation of this fact in a letter from Professor Goldwin Smith, published in the Quebec press, in January last. Here is what one can read in this letter:

Till the election of 1878 was over, Sir John Macdonald disclaimed protection, and described his commercial policy as readjustment of the tariff. I had a personal interview with him a few days before the election, and I learned from his own lips that he foresaw the evil consequences of an application of protection to a country like Canada, as nearly as I can think myself.

And ever since we have seen the Conservative party changing its policy, for after the election in 1879, it did not revise the tariff by imposing at once protective duties ranging from thirty-five to sixty per cent as they now are. As an evidence of this, we have only to look at the statutes passed since 1879. We will find that these changes were brought about by degree, in proportion as protection did something for Sir John A. Macdonald and his friends. In the face of such facts, I have therefore a right to say that it is the Conservative party which has changed both its opinions and its platform; from free-traders the Conservatives became protectionists. But, as for that, what right have the gentlemen opposite to charge us with having no platform? The Opposition

may, no doubt, have one, but under the practice which obtains in Great Britain, it has a right to have none. Such is the doctrine professed by Todd in his work, "Parliamentary Government in England," vol. I, pages 415 and 417; I earnestly call the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite to this opinion in connection with constitutional law:

The opposition exercise a wholesome influence upon parliamentary debate, and upon the conduct of the Crown in Parliament, for they are constitutional critics of all public affairs, and whatever course the Government may pursue, they naturally endeavour to find some ground for attack. It is the function of an opposition to state the case against the administration; to say everything which may plausibly be said against measure, act or word of every member of the ministry; in short, to constitute a standing censorship of the Government, subjecting all its acts and measures to a close and jealous scrutiny. * * It is an old maxim, that the duty of an opposition is very simple: "It is to oppose everything, and propose nothing." And in the same spirit, Sir Robert Peel used to say that "he declined to prescribe until he was called in." The peculiar office of the opposition is, doubtless, "to watch with keen eye the conduct of the government they oppose, to see if anything be wrong or blamable, or liable to criticism therein—to trip them up before they fall—at all events, if they stumble, to mark their stumbling, and call upon them to set things right again." The originators of measures and inventors of a policy, the individuals who come forward with their schemes and suggestions for public approbation, are not the opposition, but the ministers of the Crown; we (the opposition) stand here to criticise the suggestions and schemes which they bring forward, and which are founded on knowledge wherein we cannot share, and inspired, no doubt, by the feeling of responsibility under which they act. But it is quite compatible with these functions for an opposition, under certain circumstances, to coincide with the policy of ministers and to ground their attack upon the weakness of the administration in carrying out principles which the sense of the country has approved.

Todd here quotes the opinions of Palmerston and Disraeli. Moreover, it was the doctrine supported by Sir John A. Macdonald when he was charged with failing to define with sufficient clearness his policy in the resolution he brought before this House on the 7th March, 1878. This doctrine was acknowledged as sound and constitutional, and here is what he stated at that time. I quote from his speech as reported in "Hansard," vol. I, page 853:

But, in the position I now hold, I think it is well that, at this stage of the debate, and in order to reduce the stream of discussion, which has been widening, into a narrower channel, I should lay before this House a resolution in amendment to the motion, which will be expressive of the policy of those with whom I am associated, and, I believe, the policy which will be acceptable to the country. In bringing forward this resolution, I am doing what, perhaps, I am not called upon to do. The hon. the First Minister very truly said, some years ago, that they, the Opposition, were not called upon to find a policy for the country; that the responsibility of finding such a policy rested with the ministry of the day; and that the constitutional duty of Her Majesty's Opposition, the constitutional duty that was thrown upon them was to criticise the administration and legislation of the Government, to hold them in check, to warn them when they were going wrong, to censure them when they had gone wrong, and generally criticise and observe upon the course of administration and legislation. If the Opposition chose to take a further step, they might do, certainly, but it is not forced upon them, and it is not forced upon them in reference to any subject.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party, which is unceasingly charging us with having no platform, ought in the future not to ignore the constitutional principle professed by Sir John Macdonald in 1878, when he was leader of the Opposition. Moreover, we have a platform, and what proves it, is the fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite, while contradicting themselves, are always impugning us in connection with that very platform. In order to show its advantages, I intend to evidence each statement set forth in it, by showing the disastrous results of the National Policy, just advocated by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald), since our platform is the counterpart of the National Policy and its condemnation alike. The first thing this policy was to achieve, in 1878, was to put a stop to the commercial depression then prevailing and to prevent its recurring in the future. This depression of 1878 has passed, no doubt, but at the present time, this policy advocated in 1878 has given rise to another one, and a more severe one, as I will show in a moment. The National Policy was to put a stop to emigration, and to increase our population. The result was totally different from the anticipation of its fathers. The figures, in their brutal eloquence, contradict the promises which the then Opposition, through its leader, Sir John Macdonald, made to the country. From 1881 to 1891, under the protective system, the population of the province of Quebec, that French race, so vigorous and so strong, which, in 1760, only included 76,000 souls, only increased by 129,508, or 9·53 per cent; while, from 1871 to 1881, under a tariff for revenue, it had increased by 167,511, or at a rate of 14 per cent. In Ontario, the increase, which had been 306,072, or 18·6 per cent from 1871 to 1881, only was 187,399, or 9·73 per cent from 1881 to 1891. In Nova Scotia, where the hon. gentleman who has just spoken before me tonight is living, I think, the increase had been 52,572, or 13 per cent under a tariff for revenue. Under the so eminently protective system of the National Policy, that progressive policy, the policy of industrial growth, according to the hon. gentlemen opposite, from 1881 to 1891, its population only increased by 9,824, or 2·123 per cent. But the figures relating to New Brunswick are still more disheartening. From 1871 to 1881, its population had increased by 35,639, or 12·4 per cent. Under the so beneficial system of the

National Policy, its population only increased by thirty souls! Of what crime were Nova Scotia and New Brunswick guilty that Providence, often severe but always wise in its decrees, should punish them to such an extent? I know not; but if I am to judge of their population by the deputation they send here, deputation composed of very nice fellows, no doubt, I think I am not mistaken when I say that these provinces only have what they desire, since the great majority of their representatives here boast of being good supporters and apostles of the National Policy just advocated by the hon. member for Victoria. For the whole Dominion, during the decade from 1881 to 1891, the total increase in the population was 508,429. During this period, however, we expended millions of dollars to bring here from the old countries of Europe, over eight hundred thousand immigrants. What was the result of this policy? We not only were unable to keep this immigration here, but we could not even keep here the natural increase in our population. If protection had been such a benefit to the country, it seems to me our people would not have left us. And if the population had increased under the protective system to the same extent as it had under a tariff for revenue, it ought to have increased by about two millions, instead of 508,429. As Sir John A. Macdonald used to say, moreover, a country that cannot keep its own people must necessarily be ruled by a wrong fiscal system. The National Policy was again, and they insisted on this, to give our farmers a local market. And in addition to that, it was to keep them in our country. The various censuses taken in 1871, 1881 and 1891 superabundantly show that instead of keeping our farmers in this country, this policy has unfortunately driven them out of it. Here is the number of farmers, as given in the various censuses. In 1881, we had 656,712 farmers in this country. In 1891, according to the last census, we had only 649,506 left. It is not necessary to comment at any great length the meaning of the figures I have here before me. Let me, however, give some particulars by the way. The farming population of New Brunswick, in 1871, numbered 40,306; in 1881, 54,485, and in 1891, it had fallen to 45,880. The farming population of the four original provinces of the Dominion, from 1871 to 1881, increased in number from 476,922 to 619,231 during the period of the tariff for revenue, thus showing during this decade an increase of 142,409. From 1881 to 1891, during which time we had protection to the utmost given to us by the hon. gentlemen opposite, we find that our rural population, instead of increasing, decreased by 7,206. If we now take the figures relating to the four oldest provinces of the Dominion, we find that the decrease in numbers was 36,277 souls. If the National Policy had given a profitable market to the farmers, it seems to me the farmer could better sell, and at higher prices, his products than in 1878. But, Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary is the case now. Here are the quotations taken from the Quebec "Chronicle," under date 17th February, 1877—and we all know that this is a Conservative paper, that it always had at least strong Conservative leanings, and that even now it supports the Government—and here are quotations taken from the "Moniteur du Commerce," under date 22nd February, 1895. The "Moniteur du Commerce" is known to be a purely commercial paper, but with Conservative leanings. The following table shows the prices realized by the farmers for their products in the month of February for each of the years 1877 and 1895:—

QUOTATIONS OF FARM PRODUCE.

	Feb. 17, 1877.		Feb. 22, 1895.	
Butter	$0.18 @	$0.25	$0.14 @	$0.21
Cheese	0.15 @	0.15½	0.08¾ @	0.09⅞
Eggs	0.30 @	0.35	0.11 @	0.26
Maple sugar	0.10 @	0.11	0.06½ @	0.07
Apples	3.00 @	4.00	1.50 @	3.00
Onions	2.00 @	2.50	1.75 @	2.00
Hay, 100 bundles.	7.00 @	8.00	5.00 @	6.50
Straw	4.00 @	5.00	4.00 @	4.50
Wood, 2½ ft.	3.50 @	4.00	3.70 @	5.50
Beef, 100 lbs., first quality	8.50 @	9.00	9.00 @ (per 200 lbs. salted.)	9.50
Fresh pork	7.00 @	7.50	5.25 @	5.25
do	0.10 @	0.12		
Salt pork	0.11 @	0.12		
Hams	0.09 @	0.15		
Oats, 34 lbs.	0.47 @	0.49	0.38½	

Mr. Speaker, when farming is prosperous in a country, everything is going well. Farming is the source, the basis of the public welfare and national wealth, that is acknowledged by all the economists. This not being true of our country, our farmers desert the Dominion and their produce do not sell. But, Mr. Speaker, not only has the position of the farmer changed with respect to the sale of his produce, not only has our farming population decreased in number owing to the protective tariff, not only has the value of farm lands decreased to the extent of at least 20 per cent, not only do farm produce sell cheaper as a result of the fiscal policy we now have, not only are the farmers powerless to realize for their products the proper and fair prices they ought to receive, but, owing to the protective tariff, they have to pay higher prices for industrial products. Owing again to such a tariff, our export of farm produce has decreased to the following extent: in 1874, 1875 and 1876, we exported for $59,897,000 worth of farm produce, or an average of $19,300,000 a year. Let us now see what the position is under the National Policy system. For the three years 1889, 1890 and 1891, our total exports of farm produce amounted to $38,988,000, or an average of $13,000,000 a year. Now let me give

you some figures relating to some particular products. During the three years from 1874 to 1876, our exports of ham and pork amounted to $4,369,000, and for the three years from 1889 to 1891, under the protective system, they only amounted to $1,695,000, or a decrease of $2,674,000 for the three years under the protective system. I would like to know from my hon. friends the Conservative members and in particular from those French representatives of the province of Quebec who support the National Policy, whether we owe this result to the protective policy? From 1874 to 1876, we exported butter to the amount of $7,498,000, and from 1889 to 1891, under the protective system, we only exported it to the amount of $1,274,000, or a decrease of $6,224,000. This falling off in the value of our butter exports, as shown by the figures I have just given, proves that the policy of the Mackenzie Government was more sound and more favourable to the agricultural interests than that of the party now into power, although the Mackenzie Government never thought of going like the present Government into the small butter business. To sum up, the position in which our farmers stand is this: They sell their products at a decrease of 25 per cent, and they buy the protected industrial goods at prices higher by 30, 35, 40, 45 and even 50 per cent than if we had a tariff for revenue system. Another great promise which was made in 1878, was that the population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, would in 1891, reach at least a million souls, owing to the results obtained from the protective policy. Now the last census only gives them 251,473 souls. Another promise was that made by Sir Charles Tupper. He promised that the price of wheat would go up, and that our far West would produce at least 640,000,000 bushels of it in 1891. Now, what has happened? In 1894, three years after the expiration of the prediction made by Sir Charles Tupper, which I need not say was not realized, they only reaped 180,000,000 bushels of wheat in these parts of our country. However, it was through such promises and false predictions that the voters were led to the polls in 1878. It was through such promises that the resolution moved by Sir John A. Macdonald was passed by the Conservative party then sitting in this House. It was with such arguments that the Mackenzie Government were opposed. They did not say at that time that they intended to raise the tariff higher than 17½ per cent. No, Mr. Speaker, they only referred to a revised tariff. They were also, by means of such a policy, to obtain reciprocity with the United States. It was the object, the tendency avowedly proclaimed by the promoters of the protective system in 1878: it was what the Conservative party then proclaimed. Since then, with respect to this as to any other question, the party now into power has deceived the electorate, as it did again in 1891, when it contended that it was in favour of reciprocity with the United States, and it obtained a majority under false pretenses. Never was the Government in favour of trade reciprocity with the United States. The hon. gentlemen opposite would not have it, for they are bound to the manufacturers, they cannot wish for any trade reciprocity with the United States, for they well know that this latter country will never accept any partial reciprocity such as proposed by them, because the Republic to the south of us would have a more extended system, comprising both farm produce and manufactured goods. Another promise which was made in 1878, was that the sale of the North-west lands would, as soon as 1892, decrease our debt by at least a hundred million dollars. In 1878, our national debt amounted to $142,000,000; in 1893, it had reached $241,641,039, or a deficit, compared with the hopes and promises of Sir Leonard Tilley, the then Minister of Finance, of two hundred million dollars. It is useless to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the two last years, our debt has increased to a truly alarming extent and that it now exceeds three hundred millions. One of the reasons given by the Conservative party in 1878 to catch the votes of the people was that under the protective system, taxes would necessarily be lower. On February 22nd, 1878, Sir Charles Tupper said:

> Inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power, all we ask is, not that the taxation of the people shall be increased, because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, they were to rule the country with less taxes than under the Mackenzie regime. I hope the hon. gentlemen opposite will not question these words of Sir Charles Tupper. In 1878, taxes amounted to $17,841,938; in 1893, they reached $29,321,367, or an increase of $11,479,429, and the expenditure was to be much less under the protective system than in 1878, when it amounted to $23,503,158. In 1894, it amounted to $37,385,025, or an increase of $14,081,867. Let me observe, Mr. Speaker, that a large portion of these taxes do not go into the public treasury, but in the pockets of the monopolists, the men protected by the gentlemen opposite. We, on this side of the House, denounce the tariff now in force as a system of robbery and fraud, in that it tends to form combines and monopoly coalitions such as now exist in the manufacture of nails, cotton, sugar, rice and coal oil. As I have stated a moment ago, the main argument of the Conservatives in 1878 had reference to a revision of the tariff and not

to a protective system. True, they referred to protection on the hustings, but they did not openly support it in this House. The revision of the tariff was the only argument that brought about the overthrow of the Mackenzie Government. Well, when I consider what has since happened, I have a right to say: It is you, Conservatives, who have changed your policy. And the statements of Thomas White, of Sir A. T. Galt, who had been Minister of Finance, of Sir Hector Langevin who must have approved of the statement made by Sir George Etienne Cartier in Quebec, since he was his colleague in the Ministry, go to show that all your leaders were free-traders, and since 1878, you have gradually changed your policy. You never intended, in 1878, to force on the country a tariff as high as the one now in force; you began by making concessions to one manufacturer, then to another, and little by little and in proportion as protection brought these gentlemen to your camp, you have given us the high tariff which we now have. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain), in a speech as elaborate as it was eloquent, delivered this afternoon, stated that the origin of the Patrons of Industry was due to the policy of the gentlemen opposite. I will add nothing to what he said in reference to this question; but let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the working classes also formed themselves into associations because the policy of the Government is not acting fairly towards them, because it gives them no work. They say the country is prospereus; that it is flourishing. Have they forgotten the labour demonstrations, in the months of January and February last, in Montreal? Have they forgotten the like demonstrations in Quebec? Let me quote here, Mr. Speaker, what the newspaper "La Presse" published on the 26th September, 1894, in consequence of a despatch received from Quebec under the head:

NO WORK—PAINFUL SITUATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES IN QUEBEC.

We find in a Quebec newspaper the following description of the painful condition in which happen to be several working classes of that city:—

The workingmen are not looking without fear at the coming of the next season. No works of any importance are talked about, except the proposed enlargement of the Château Frontenac, and thousands of men of all trades have been out of work for weeks and weeks.

Many will begin winter without any wood in the shed, without any bread in the chest, and having for all provisions arrears with the grocer and butcher.

Some of our leather establishments, such as Félix Gourdeau's, Bilodeau & Lamontagne's, Racine & Dion's, are closed down, and some others only keep open to conceal appearances.

True, there is the electric light station, on Prince Edward Street, and the new building of the cotton manufacture at Sault Montmorency, but it is only a mouthful to divide among a thousand people.

People are asking whether the time has not come for the public bodies to think about it, and start some extensive works. Our city council could perhaps consider the question of the building of the new city hall.

Such was the position in which stood the working classes, last fall and winter, in the cities of Montreal and Quebec. So I may assert that they are not now in favour of the fiscal policy of the Government. Let me quote, in support of the foregoing observations, a few statements taken from the report of the proceedings of the Trades and Labour Congress, held at Ottawa, during the month of September, 1894. We will see what they thought of our combines, as well as about the Conservative policy:—

It is not necessary for me again to call your attention to the many vital interests of those you represent, demanding, as they do, your most earnest and intelligent consideration. It is not only your particular organization and their interests, but the interest and welfare of the great masses of our country that we seek to improve and further. Particularly in these most trying times of depression is it necessary that we devote our minds to an intelligent consideration of the causes that have led to the very undesirable and far-spread distress and misery at present existing in our midst, and existing to a greater extent among our brothers to the south of us. The concentration of wealth in the grasp of a few has and is developing a power that, unless a halt is called, will inevitably lead to a more hopeless degradation of the workers than even at present exists.

Such is, according to this report, the cause of the destitution prevailing among the working classes. Such was, from a general standpoint, the policy of the Conservative party with respect to its results, as far as the farming community is concerned, and such is the opinion of the working classes about our extreme protective tariff, as expressed by their representatives in Congress assembled. Now, the present ruling party may be qualified the corruption party, corruption of which they gave us so many instances in the management of the public departments during these last years. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in his attempt to show that the Liberal party is not as pure as the Conservative party, because the Conservatives had less elections controverted and voided than the Liberals. Mr. Speaker, it is no difficult thing for the hon. gentlemen opposite to controvert an election. We know what are the means at their disposal. To controvert an election, they have only to apply to some of the big government contractors, to some of the big railway contractors, or to the contractors for public works given by the Government, and they are sure to get the necessary thousand dollars to make the deposit required in controverted election trials. This is how they were procured with the required money, while we, of

the Liberal party, have to take it out of our pockets. It does not come, as in the case of the Conservatives, out of the public treasury, as shown in many an instance. This is why the Conservative party, after the general election, had less controverted elections than the Liberal party. Is it a pure party, that which like the Conservative party expended, in 1887, in 22 counties of the district of Quebec, $117,000 robbed from the country? Is it a pure party, that which is composed of robbers such as are Larkin, Connolly & Co.? Is it a pure party, that which caused scandals to be given such as those I have referred to? Scandal of the commissions given out of the purchase of the plant of the Printing Bureau, amounting to $50,000. Scandal of the Curran bridge, amounting to $122,000, when the fair estimate of its cost made by the commission appointed by the Government amounted only to $160,000, while the expenditure incurred by the Government reached $430,000, making a net loss to the country of $270,000. Party of pure people, that which is composed of men who caused to be made four revisions of the electoral lists, under an Act passed for the purpose of disfranchising our people; revisions which cost the country the enormous sum of one million dollars. Party of pure people, that which is composed of men who gave us the scandal of the Sheik's Island wharf, which caused to the country a loss of $125,000. Party of pure people, that of the men who built the Little Rapid locks, which, according to the specifications, was to cost to the country $44,000 only, while the actual cost was $200,000, with unpaid claims to the amount of $90,000, or a difference of $256,000 beyond the price fixed by the specifications. Party of pure people, that of the men who built the Tay canal which, according to the specifications, was to cost $132,660 only, while its actual cost amounted to $476,123, or an excess of $343,468. Party of pure people, that which raised an election fund, afterwards refunded by means of a subsidy of $25,000 to the Lake St. John Railway, as admitted by the hon. the Postmaster General. Party of pure people, that which built the St. Charles Railway Branch, extending over a distance of fourteen miles, the cost of which was estimated at from $130,000 to $140,000, but the actual cost of which reached the sum of $1,750,000, or over one million dollars in excess of the actual cost of this railway branch. Party of pure people, that which caused the country to suffer all these losses and gave all these scandals. But I will, perhaps, be told that this party is one that punishes the robbers. In what way, Mr. Speaker, does it punish them? In 1891, a member of this House was driven away from it for having taken part in a conspiracy with a view to defraud the public treasury. A Minister was compelled to resign as such in consequence of one of the scandals. Proceedings were taken against the company charged with this conspiracy to cause it to refund the sum of $600,000. After four or five years, the Government settled this case for the sum of $100,000, and they accepted a claim for $45,000 on account of this amount. And at the time of the Kingston election, an account of $43,000 was paid to these same people against whom the Government had taken these very proceedings. Party of pure people, that which, after driving away this member charged with conspiracy, made their candidate of him and caused him to be returned to this House. Party of pure people, that which at the very moment I am speaking, is pressing this member to vote for the Government. Party of pure people, Mr. Speaker, that which allowed all the scandals I have just referred to, and which is willing to be a party to others still, provided it profits by them and be kept into power. But we have at last, it appears, the satisfaction to know that the country is prosperous, the manufactures flourishing, and that there is 75,000 of them in the Dominion. I will give only one word of reply to such an argument, for no voter who knows what is going on is not aware that the number of manufactures, compared with what it was in 1878,—and they were true manufacturing establishments at that time—is not larger now than formerly, and I am satisfied that there are no more manufactures now than in 1878. In the town of Sorel, where I live, we had more manufactures in working order in 1878 than we have now, and at the very moment I have the honour to address this House, our paper mill has likely closed down. The shoe manufacture which was subsidized to the extent of $15,000 by the town municipality of Sorel, had to shut down. But if there should be so many manufactures in the country, if the country should be prosperous, why should the trade, which in 1874 represented $58 per capita, have fallen to $53 in 1883, and to $46 in 1895, according to the admission of the hon. the Minister of Finance? In the face of such results brought about by the National Policy, what is to be said? We must have a change, and the country is now in favour of such a change. As soon as the governing party will give them a chance to pronounce themselves, I am satisfied the voters will know how to drive them away from the treasury benches, and punish the authors of the robberies and scandals committed under this administration and through their ruinous policy. We must have a change, and the change the country is anxious for is the one proposed at the Liberal convention held here, in June, 1893. It was attended by men of all classes, creeds and races. The Liberal party of this country met in convention in this town about two years ago and put a platform before the Canadian electorate. Contrary to the contention of our opponents, when coming into

power it will know what to do, and in order that the country, as well as the Conservative party, which is always attempting to make it believe that we have no platform, may well know that we have one, and as a punishment for the persistency with which our friends opposite deny its existence, I am going to inflict its reading on them. Our platform is formal and positive. The Liberal party intends to do the contrary of the Ministerial policy. The platform of the Liberal party, as adopted at the convention held here in 1893, reads as follows :—

We, the Liberal party of Canada, in Convention assembled, declared :—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service ;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations ;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property ;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few ;

It has checked immigration ;

It has caused great loss of population ;

It has impeded commerce ;

It has discriminated against Great Britain ;

In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force ;

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people ;

That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of an honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes ; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

That having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them ;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the Empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations ;

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies ;

That the pretext under which the Government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiations for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest, and intended to deceive the electorate ;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is maifest that the present Government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty ;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honourable to both countries ;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two people, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the Empire and the Republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity ;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

That the Convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The Government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys, of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrongdoing. We arraign the Government for retaining in office a Minister of the Crown proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to which, a member of the Government, with one hand, was receiving Government subsidies with the other.

The conduct of the minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world, and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the Government that have been continuously in power since 1875, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

That the Convention regrets that by the action of ministers and their supporters in Parliament, in one case of which serious charges were made against a Minsister of the Crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the Ministry contrary to the well-settled practice of Parliament ; and this the Convention affirms :

That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against Ministers of the

Crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions appointed on the advice of the accused is at variance with the due responsibility of Ministers to the House of Commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the House over the executive government, and the Convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.

That in the opinion of this Convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to the actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settlers.

That the Franchise Act, since its introduction has cost the Dominion treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties ;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million ;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights ;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction :

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barristers appointed by the government of the day ;

That the provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this Convention the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the provincial franchise.

That by the gerrymander Acts, the electoral divisions for the return of members to the House of Commons have been made so as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the number of electors supporting them would warrant ; to put an end to this abuse, to make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that in the formation of electoral divisions, county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put into one electoral division.

The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principle of popular government.

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

Such is the platform of the Liberal party as adopted at its convention held here nearly two years ago. It seems to me the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot ignore its existence, and they did not ignore it either, since they are always asking where we are going to get a revenue with such a platform. The Government organs have not the same fears with respect to this matter and some of them clearly state that it is possible to manage the affairs of this country with a tariff for revenue. In support of this contention, I will quote from the "Montreal Gazette" of the 21st February last. It undertook to contradict the statements of some of its contemporaries. Here is what it said :

An adequate revenue for the needs of the public service can unquestionably be collected by means of a tariff based on the principles of British free trade, that is to say, a tariff designed solely for the purposes of revenue, and from which every vestige of protection will be eliminated. Under such a system, commodities not capable of production in Canada will be taxed to the necessary revenue-producing point, and every dollar of duty laid on will find its way into the treasury.

That is indeed what we want, that every dollar paid by the tax-payers should go into the public treasury, and not in the pockets of the manufacturers. In order to give the hon. gentlemen opposite a foretaste of what is in store for them at the coming election, I may say that hardly a year ago, all the British colonies had a protective system. Since then the New South Wales, Queensland and Australia have adopted free-trade. Canada alone keeps to protection, but I am satisfied a radical change will be effected at the next election. We are asked what our platform is. I will answer this query by the declaration of principle made in Montreal by the late leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Mr. Blake, at a dinner in the Windsor Hotel, on the 29th March, 1881, which the Quebec Liberal party had been required to attend by its late leader Mercier :

For us of the Liberal party, our hereditary opinions are in favour of liberty, liberty of the nation, liberty of the person, and liberty of property. We believe that a cause which calls upon us to restrict any of those liberties requires us to believe and to profess the opposite of these principles. We believe that, prima facie, it is right for each one of you to be secured in the liberties to which I have referred, and amongst the most valued liberties in connection with property is freedom to sell or exchange it to the best advantage, freedom to dispose of it where you will, to whom you will, upon the best terms you can.

Our platform, our ideas, our opinions were formulated by our present leader in 1877, in the course of a speech which was much noted. And this platform, these ideas, these opinions, we hope to see them carrying the day under the leadership of the man who set them forth in 1877 in such eloquent words. The country is only waiting for the next election to assert that the present leader of the Liberal party is the only man able to shape its destinies and bring it out of danger ; that of all the political leaders who have a share of the public sentiment, he is the most upright in his public as well as in his private life ; that he is our greatest speaker and that by his noble, worthy, be-

yond all suspicion course, he has indeed deserved to become the Prime Minister of Canada.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons the Minutes of the Proceedings of the recent Conference between the representatives of the Governments of Canada and of Newfoundland, touching the union of Newfoundland with the Dominion, together with copies of documents in connection with the proposed union.

Government House,
Ottawa, May, 1895.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1895.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1895, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 21st May, 1895.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At this late hour of the night it is not my intention to trespass very long upon your time ; in fact, after the very able addresses which have been delivered by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Blain) and the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) there is very little that can be said upon the subject that is new. I would much prefer that some hon. gentleman opposite had attempted to reply to the arguments which have been addressed by these two hon. gentlemen, as I would then have had an opportunity of answering any points they might raise, if indeed they were able to raise any. However, the subject that we have been discussing for some days now is a very important one, and it seems to me that this is the time above all others that we should discuss the financial situation of the Dominion ; this is, as I take it, a sort of stock-taking time. We want to consider how Canada stands to-day, what progress she has made, if she has made any, and what is the best course to pursue. The Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, has again reaffirmed the policy that the opposite party have been advocating for a number of years past. The Liberal party, on the other hand, in the motion that has been submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford, has called your attention to what, in my opinion, is the very serious state of affairs in the Dominion at the present time, and that hon. gentleman suggests a remedy that I think would best meet with the approval of the people, and meet the demands of the situation. There is no doubt that we have reached a very serious condition of affairs. It is sufficient to say that the Estimates of this year, as submitted by the Minister of Finance, amount to over $38,000,000, to which another million and a quarter may be added by the estimates just now laid upon the Table ; and before we get through the work of the session, there will probably be another million or a million and a half more submitted for our sanction. If the Government follows the usual course that has been followed for many years past, there will be further supplementary estimates of a very large amount. But at all events, the Estimates which have now been submitted to the House, will amount in round numbers to $39,000,000, which are required to carry on the affairs of this country until the 30th June, 1896. Now, Sir, in my opinion this is altogether too much. I think that for a country with scarcely five millions of people, $39,000,000 are altogether too much to ask for to grease the wheels of state. You must bear in mind that not a solitary dollar of this $39,000,000 is proposed to be expended on public buildings, in digging canals, of bonussing railways, but it is all required to carry on the affairs of this country for one short year. Now, when we recollect that in 1878, when the Mackenzie Government went out of power, the expenditure for the same services then was only $23,500,000, you can readily see what an enormous increase has taken place in the burdens upon the people within the last sixteen years. I remember well at that time that Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Finance Minister, brought a charge against the Administration of the day that they were spending too much, that $23,500,000 were too much and that the Government ought to carry on public affairs with $22,500,000 ; but like all their other promises, it has not been fulfilled, and we find, year by year, the expenditure has gone up, until now it has reached the enormous sum of $39,000,000. This does not tell the whole story. If this were all, and it could be shown that this amount was necessary to carry on the affairs of the country, no person could object ; but, in that time they have increased the public debt from $140,000,000 until it now stands at $249,000,000. An increase of $109,000,000. In my

opinion very large sums are literally wasted and thrown away. When we bear in mind the fact that in 1878 it only required $23,500,000 to run the country, and the further fact that there is not one single acre more now to govern than there was then, and that there are only half a million more people now than then, it will readily be seen that there has been a very large increase, and one which, in my opinion, is altogether unnecessary in the expenditure of the country. I desire to point out a few directions in which a large amount is now literally wasted, which could be saved to the people. I find, according to the Auditor General's Report, that there are no less than 572 persons now receiving pay from more than one source. I will give some illustrations. J. H. Douglas, of Montreal, customs appraiser, receives a salary of $1,800, a handsome salary and one which should be sufficient remuneration for him during twelve months. In addition he obtained on account of customs seizures, $2,053, making a total income of $3,853 instead of $1,800. Then we have J. M. Bowell, of Vancouver, who is collector of customs there, and receives $2,000 a year. He has received in addition for Chinese immigration services $400, making a salary of $2,400. E. Marceau, of Montreal, acting superintendent engineer of canals, receives a salary of $3,000. He also received for translating the Geological Survey Report, $819, making his salary $3,819. A. R. Milne, of Victoria, collector of customs, receives a salary of $3,000. For Chinese immigration work he received $400 more, and for services in connection with the Behring Sea matter, another $400, making a total of $3,800. I think if proper economy were practiced, a very large saving in this direction could be made to the country. Although we have a printing bureau, which has cost the country a large sum, we paid last year to outside parties for printing, $44,690, and for printing and lithographing, $224,935, making a total of $265,625. Although we have a Minister of Justice drawing $8,000 a year, a Solicitor General drawing $5,000 a year, one deputy head in the office drawing $3,600, two chief clerks drawing $4,375, four first-class clerks drawing $7,175, four second-class clerks drawing $4,882, two third-class clerks drawing $1,500, and two private secretaries drawing $1,200, and messengers drawing $412, or a total in round figures of $35,000 for the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General, yet we paid during last year $101,000 for legal expenses and taxed costs. Of that amount D. O'Connor, of Ottawa, received $19,850, and Christopher Robinson, of Toronto, $21,783. It seems to me that with the Minister of Justice and a Solicitor General and all the staff necessary to carry on the business of that branch of the public service we should be able to get along without paying a lawyer in Ottawa $19,850. I think if we cannot get along without employing so much outside help, we should dispense with the Solicitor General and cut down considerably the staff of the Minister of Justice, and in this way save a good deal of money to the people. I find in every branch of the public service there has been an enormous increase during the last sixteen years. Not only so, but when an examination is made of the Auditor General's Report the conclusion must be arrived at that the greatest recklessness and extravagance reigns supreme in the department. I remember when the Colonial and Indian Exhibition was started in London, Eng., the estimated cost of a Canadian exhibit, as submitted to the House, was $75,000, but before all the bills were paid the cost reached nearly $500,000. So again, with the Columbian Exhibition at Chicago. The Canadian exhibit was estimated to cost about $75,000. The Minister stated yesterday that already $243,000 had been paid, and no doubt a great many bills were yet to come in, and in the Estimates for the next year and probably the following years large amounts will be needed to pay claims sent in under this head, and before all the bills are paid no doubt the total amount will run up to $400,000. Looking over the Auditor General's Report, I find there has been altogether too much expense in connection with that exhibition. There has been hardly a Minister, Deputy Minister or first-class clerk who has not been sent to Chicago and his expenses paid by the country, and if proper supervision had been had and the accounts properly audited there would have been no occasion to spend such large sums of money on that exhibition. I have the account of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) in regard to his charges at the exhibition. I find the first item is $957 for supplies to the Canadian pavilion, and it includes cabs, railway fares, porterage, exhibition entrances, extra dinners, sundries, express charges, cigars, &c. Then I take the personal expenses of the hon. member (Mr. Cockburn) and I find that he has been living like a prince in Chicago at the expense of the tax-payers of Canada. I will give you a few items of his bill to show the way the money was squandered. I find that from the 24th of June, to the 1st July, seven days, his bill at the Virginia hotel, Chicago, was as follows :—Seven days' board at $20.—$140 ; extra meals, wines, and liquors, $24.30 ; laundry, $6.40 ; livery, $11 ; messengers, 20 cents ; total, $180.90. The next day there are also porterage charges, and $3.10 for blackening his shoes. Then the next week we have board for seven days' at $20—$140 ; extra meals, wines and liquors, $46.25 ; laundry, $2.20 ; livery, $3.50; paid for flowers, $2.75 ; the next week, we have the same item of seven days' board at $20 a day, $140 ; extra meals, wines and liquors, $33.20 ; laundry, $1.65—his laundry bill was not so heavy that week—livery $5.

Then it was necessary for the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to have his hat pressed, and so he charges the country $1.25 on that account. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that his wine bill was pretty large that week, and although I cannot say as to whether there was any connection between the hat pressing and the large wine bill, yet it is rather singular that is was necessary to get his hat pressed at the expense of the Canadian people by reason of the alleged wine bill. Then we have a charge of $3.80 for flowers, and $1.25 for cabmen. The next week there is a similar charge for seven days' board at $20 per day—$140; extra meals, wines, and cigars, $14.50; laundry, $3.75; and livery, $1.50. So it is through his whole account, and I say that it is outrageous that our money should be squandered in such a manner for this exhibition. I would like to know what his constituents in Centre Toronto think of their member, living in Chicago at $20 a day and $5 a day for wines, liquors and cigars, besides having all his expenses paid. Yet the hon. member (Mr. Cockburn) had the audacity to tell this House that he had spent $3,000 of his own money in connection with that exhibition. I do not see how it was possible for him to spend any more money than he has charged up to the country. The amounts are all very large, and the Government are to blame for allowing the bills to run up in that way. If a proper supervision had been made of those accounts, and if they had been properly audited, it is my opinion that a very large saving would have been made to the tax-payers. You will find, Sir, that the greatest extravagance prevails in every department of this Government. It was stated here by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) in reference to the Department of Railways and Canals, although we have a Minister of Railways drawing $8,000 a year, a chief engineer drawing $6,000 a year, and with all the clerks and engineers necessary to conduct the affairs of that department, yet within one hundred miles of the city of Ottawa, a little work that should have cost $150,000 or $175,000 has cost the people of this country nearly $400,000. If, in any ordinary business concern in this country the man conducting it allowed such a waste as that, he would soon get his discharge. It is no excuse for the Minister of Railways and Canals to say, that he did not know that this work was going on. It was his business to know, and the people of this country are paying him to see that the works under his administration are properly looked after, and that the treasury is properly protected. If you follow up the contracts that have been let, and the Government work that has been done throughout the country, you will find that there has not been a single public building erected during the last ten or fifteen years in connection with which there has not been a large amount of extras charged. Right in front of this House we see the Langevin block, which should have been built for $450,000, but already we have paid $800,000 in round numbers for it, and Mr. Charlebois, the contractor, has still a claim against it for nearly $200,000. I have no doubt that that claim would have been paid by the Government if it had not been for the investigations which took place here in 1891. The other day we were told by one of the Ministers that there is a claim for $17,000 extras in connection with a public building in Toronto, the drill hall, and no doubt before the matter is settled, that claim will be swelled up to probably to $25,000 or $30,000. The Finance Minister has admitted to the House this session that last year we had a deficit of $1,200,000; that on the 30th June of this year we will have a further deficit of four and a half millions, and probably a deficit for next year of $1,700,000. Seeing this sad condition of affairs, and seeing that in the last fifteen years our expenditure has piled up by leaps and bounds, until it is now $40,000,000 a year, let me ask what is the proper course, in view of this deplorable state of things, for any prudent business man to take. Would he not first try and reduce his expenditure so as to bring it within his income. Instead of doing that, the Finance Minister takes an opposite course, and he goes to work to levy taxes and to increase the burdens on the people of the country. We find that the fact that the duty was to be increased on sugar was conveyed by a friendly hint to the wholesalers, the friends of the Government throughout the country. Read the Ottawa "Citizen," of 6th May last, an organ that is the mouthpiece of the Government here, and what does that paper say. In its issue of 6th May, speaking of Hamilton, it says:

> The wholesale grocers in Hamilton are well pleased with the advance in the sugar duties, and say the Government could not have selected better articles to increase the duties on than it did, as the changes will not be felt by the consumers. Nearly all the wholesale grocers had received a hint that the duty on sugar would be raised, and all had a large stock on hand.

Now, I say, if that statement is true, it is a most scandalous thing for the Government of the day——

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to state before this House that a hint was given by the Government to wholesale dealers or grocers?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have given you the statement of your mouthpiece in this city.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to give it as his opinion, and I would like to know if it is his opinion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No. I state what your mouthpiece, the Ottawa "Citizen," said.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no mouthpiece in the Ottawa "Citizen." The hon. gentleman has no right to say so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is the organ of the Government, the recognized exponent of the views of the Government. If the hon. gentleman wishes to deny the relationship which is supposed to exist between the Ottawa "Citizen" and the Government, he is free to do so. He is not the first Minister to say that their own organs are unreliable and not to be believed. I am just giving the statement which I find in the Ottawa "Citizen" of May 6th: and what was the reply of the hon. Controller of Customs yesterday? That from the 27th of March to the 2nd of May, 1894, there was 20,528,000 pounds of sugar entered for consumption, whereas from the 27th of March to the 2nd May this year there was no less than 85,519,000 pounds entered for consumption, and the further quantity of fifteen or sixteen million pounds entered, as to which, I believe, the Customs Department has a dispute on hand whether it should be entered free or not. According to his own reply, there was 65,000,000 pounds more sugar entered at the customs this year than there was in the same period last year. What inference can we draw from that except that this statement that the wholesale grocers received a friendly hint is borne out by the fact that so large an amount was entered? It looks very suspicious, to say the least of it, that so much larger an amount should have been imported this year than last year, unless they received a friendly hint, as the Ottawa "Citizen" said they did. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer. I have only to say that I am fully in accord with the resolution which has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I think that resolution ought to commend itself to the favour of this House. In my opinion, it proposes the proper remedy. I think, Sir, that instead of increasing the burdens of the people, which are now so heavy, we should do away with the enormous amount of unnecessary expenditures which exist in all branches of the public service, and in that way make our income meet our expenditure. There is no doubt that we could do this in many ways. If the Government were to manage the affairs of this country as they ought to be managed, there is no doubt that a very large saving could be effected. The resolution proposes that equilibrium between the revenue and expenditure should be restored, and that the tariff should be so modified that it may be made a tariff for revenue only. Sir, I cannot conceive why any person should object to that. I think the Government of this country have no right to meddle with my affairs or with those of any other man in this country. All that the Government are justified in doing is to take as little money out of the pockets of the people of this country as will be necessary to carry on the affairs of the country efficiently and well: and when they have done that, it is their bounden duty to see that every single dollar of that money is laid out to the best possible advantage. How can they possibly know how to protect all the industries in this country? Unless they protect all men alike, they will do injustice to some, and it is utterly impossible to conceive of any Government having the necessary ability to enter into all the minor details of every man's business so as to adjust the tariff to give him equal protection to what another man has. It is an impossible task, and therefore the only right thing for the Government to do is to let every man alone, leaving him to run his business according to his own ideas. There is no doubt that such a policy would tend to the best interests of the people of this country. In no period in the history of Canada has it made such rapid progress as it did when we had a revenue tariff before. People are apt to forget that from 1867 to 1874 we had only a 15 per cent tariff, and there was no time in the history of Canada when our manufactures were on a more substantial basis. In 1871 the capital invested in manufactures was $77,964,000; hands employed, 187,942; raw material, $124,907,000; wages paid, $40,852,000; products, $221,617,000. In 1881 it it had increased: Capital invested, $165,200,000; hands employed, 255,000; raw material, $179,918,000; wages paid, $59,429,000; products, $309,171,000. After ten years of the National Policy with all the protection afforded by this policy, they stood in 1891: Capital invested, $354,620,000; hands employed, 370,000; raw materials, $236,000,000; wages paid, $100,000,000; products, $476,000,000. Population increased between 1871 and 1881 at the rate of nearly 18 per cent, while from 1881 to 1891 it only increased at the rate of a litte over 11 per cent. In my own part of western Ontario, we have not one solid institution to-day that was not started and put on a good basis when the tariff was only 15 per cent; and after it was altered from 15 per cent to 17½ per cent, they continued to prosper and grow strong, and lay the foundation of their future greatness. But since the tariff has gone up to 30 or 35, or even 45 per cent, they have not progressed as well as they did at that time. In fact, many of those institutions that were then prosperous and were developing the resources of the country, have since gone out of existence. We can recollect the great furniture establishment of Jacques & Hay, in the city of Toronto, which, under a 15 per cent tariff, was employing a large number of men, and distributing a large amount of money and wages throughout the country, but since then that institution has gone down until it

has ceased to exist. We can all remember the good old times when ship-building was in a flourishing condition in this country. Why, in the city of Chatham we had a large ship-building industry and built some of the largest ships ever floated on the lakes. One hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy-five skilled mechanics were then employed in our ship yards; but since the National Policy came into existence this industry has disappeared and the grass is growing where, in those days the sound of the hammer and the chisel was heard. Why should we build vessels, when by our policy we are making it impossible for them to earn dividends? Is it not the most outrageous policy ever perpetrated? Here in the railway committee, we had a long discussion as to whether we should grant a charter to a company to build a bridge crossing the Detroit river at the city of Detroit. Men were coming forward with their millions of dollars to invest in a bridge that would span that beautiful river at the city of Detroit. What for? Not to look at, but to facilitate the trade and commerce of the two countries—to remove the obstacles that stand in the way of transportaion from the west to the east. But while we have men thus coming forward to build bridges and tunnels and remove natural obstructions, our Government raises artificial barriers to prevent trade and commerce. Why, last year, we bought and sold from the United States no less than $88,000,000 worth. Our whole trade with England was no less than $107,000,000. The Controller of Customs boasted that our trade with Great Britain had increased while our trade with the United States was decreasing. What is there to boast about in that? Does he not know that every dollar we send into the United States, we have to throw over a wall thirty-five to forty feet high; and that every dollar they send into this country, they have to throw over a wall erected by this Government thirty-five to forty feet high. There is no duty charged on anything we send to England, and yet we send almost as much to the United States. When we look at the position of this country and the United States, when we look at the vast trade that could be developed if we only had access to the American markets—and it is a policy of the Liberal party to take every possible steps to secure reciprocity with the United States—we cannot understand how any one can approve of the suicidal policy of the Government. No doubt, if the Liberal party were in power, as I believe in a short time they will be, it would not be long before the barriers separating the two countries would be removed, and then an era of the greatest possible prosperity will open to this Canada of ours. We cannot conceive of any act which you could place upon the statute of this country that will confer anything like the advantages which will be conferred by a reciprocity treaty with the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

I see the Controller in his seat, and I know something about his county, and I know that the people of his county would be benefited very largely by such a treaty. Last year thousands of bushels of barley raised in his county were sold in Toronto at 42 cents a bushel, when right across the way at Buffalo the very same barley was selling at 60 to 65 cents. If a reciprocity treaty could be arranged, as I believe it could, there is nothing that could confer anything like the advantages upon the people which such a treaty would. It would throw open the great coasting trade of the continent to our people. Last year there were over 7,000,000 tons of iron ore which came down the Great Lakes, and it is a lamentable fact that only 5 per cent was carried by Canadian vessels. But once you open the coasting trade to the people of the Dominion, once again the sound of the chisel and hammer will be heard, and our sailors will not have to seek on foreign shores the employment denied them at home. I am heartily in favour of the resolution placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a resolution which ought to receive the commendation of this House, but whether it shall or not, one thing I must say and that is that when the appeal is made to the people, the Government will find out that the National Policy has run its course and can no longer be relied on.

Mr. LECLAIR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to: and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Langelier) asked, 1. Whether there is anything owing at the Cullers' Office, Quebec, for inspection dues? 2. How much is due and owing? 3. By

whom, and how long has the money been owing? 4. Is it the intention of the Government to enforce payment of the sums so due?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I must ask the hon. member to move an order of the House for the purpose of obtaining the information asked. Too much time would be occupied in preparing an answer to this question, and the former part forms part of the subject which the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Miller) has asked the Public Accounts Committee to inquire into, and that is as to the arrears due the department, a return in respect of which the officers of the department are now engaged in preparing. That return will, no doubt, be ready when the House meets again.

WATER LOTS ON ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. TISDALE (for Mr. Reid) asked, In what position is the controversy between the Dominion and the Ontario Governments as to the right of the respective Governments to issue patents of the water lots lying in front of the municipalities bordering on the River St. Lawrence, and is the Government aware of the fact that the Ontario Government are issuing patents with a reservation clause protecting them in the event of it being decided hereafter that the Dominion Government are vested with the right? Has a case been prepared, or if not, is it the intention of the Government to prepare a case for submission to the proper tribunal for a decision?

Mr. DALY. The question of the right to issue grants of water lots in the great lakes, the River St. Lawrence, &c., has been submitted to the Supreme Court for decision, and it is probable that the case will be argued at the next sitting of the court. The Government has no information on the subject of the issue of patents by the Government of Ontario in the matter.

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. Somerville) asked, How many private secretaries does the Controller of Customs employ in his department, and what are their names?

Mr. IVES. The Controller of Customs is not in his seat, but I have the answer here. The Controller has only one private secretary and his name is J. R. K. Bristol.

INDIAN RESERVES IN QU'APPELLE VALLEY.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether there is any intention to lease certain lands forming part of the Indian Reserves in the Qu'Appelle Valley, near Fort Qu'Appelle, to certain persons for the purpose of giving them the sole shooting privileges over such lands?

Mr. DALY. No.

FISH IMPORTED FROM FRANCE.

Mr. COATSWORTH (for Mr. Kaulbach) asked, What is the quantity of dry fish, also pickled fish, imported from France or any of her dependencies into the Dominion of Canada, in the years 1891-92-93 and 1894; the ports at which they were entered, and the amount of duty collected on each description?

Mr. IVES. The following is a statement of the quantity and value of salted and pickled fish imported into Canada from France and her dependencies during the undermentioned years:—

1891.	Countries whence Imported.	Imported.		Entered for Consumption.		Duty Collected.
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	
		Lbs.	$	Lbs.	$	$ cts.
Halifax—						
Cod, haddock, ling, &c., salted ...	St. Pierre. .	2,985,155	116,401			
1893.						
Halifax—						
Cod, haddock, &c., salted.....	do ..	1,386,090	52,107	182	8	0 91
Port Hood—						
Halibut, pickled.....	do ..	1,200	18	1,200	18	12 00
1894.						
Montreal—						
Cod, haddock, salted.....	do ..	200	8	200	8	4 00
Herring, pickled	do ..	4,000	60	4,000	60	20 00
Salmon, pickled.....	France.....	59	6	59	6	0 59
Halifax—						
Cod, haddock, salted.....	St. Pierre...	4,440,256	168,656			
Lunenburg—						
Cod, hadd ck, salted.....	do ..	498,192	18,509	3,724	132	18 62
Totals.....	... .	9,315,152	355,765	9,365	232	56 12

THE LOBSTER INDUSTRY.

Mr. COATSWORTH (for Mr. Kaulbach) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to further promote the lobster industry in the maritime provinces by establishing one or more hatcheries in the county of Lunenburg, N.S. ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The work is still in an experimental stage, and the suggestion that the hatching of lobsters might be economically carried on at or near the canneries, under the supervision of the fishery officers, is under consideration of the department.

FISHING LICENSES PAID TO NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. COATSWORTH (for Mr. Kaulbach) asked, When can the fishermen of the maritime provinces who have spent their money in license fees for bait to the Newfoundland Government, expect the refund of money, and to whom will the payment be made for disbursement ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook to recover back from the Newfoundland Government fees collected from the Canadian fishing vessels under the Bait Act. Legal proceedings were instituted through the Department of Justice, by a local law firm, and some of the fees have already been recovered from the Newfoundland Government. The distribution of the money collected is awaiting the decision of the Department of Justice on certain law points, touching the law costs incurred in the suits against the Newfoundland Government. The portion of the fees which have been collected has in the meantime been placed to the credit of the Receiver General for Canada. The payments will be made to respective claimants as soon as the claims are finally adjusted.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What is the gross amount of capital expenditure, for all purposes, on the Cape Breton Railway, up to 1st April, 1895 ? What are the gross receipts, under the following heads, for the several years the line has been operated, up to 1st April, 1895 : Cash receipts for freight carried ? Cash receipts for passengers carried ? Cash receipts for express carried ? Amount allowed for carrying the mails ? The gross amount of cash receipts, without the mail subsidy, from opening of the line to 1st April, 1895 ? The gross amount of expenditure, under the head of working expenses, from the opening of the line to the 1st April, 1895 ?

Mr. HAGGART. The gross amount of capital expenditure on Cape Breton Railway up to 1st April, 1895, is $3,860,184.54. It is not possible to give the receipts or expenses of the Cape Breton Railway, as they are not kept separately from the receipts and expenses of the rest of the Intercolonial Railway system.

THE EMMANUEL ST. LOUIS CASE.

Mr. CASEY asked, What is the effect of the decision of Judge Desnoyers in the charge against Emmanuel St. Louis for having obtained $144,874 by false pretenses with intent to defraud, and for having destroyed his books, papers, &c., whilst Her Majesty the Queen was his creditor, delivered on 13th May instant ? Is it open to the Government to take further criminal or civil proceedings against the said St. Louis ? Have any such proceedings been taken or is it the intention of the Government to take them ? If so, what and when, and what is the present state of such proceedings ?

Mr. HAGGART. The effect of the decision of Judge Desnoyers on the charge against Emmanuel St. Louis is a legal question. The question of further criminal proceedings against Mr. St. Louis is at present being considered by the Minister of Justice. The civil proceedings are being prosecuted.

Mr. CASEY. What is the present state of things ?

Mr. HAGGART. One case has gone in appeal to the Supreme Court, and the other is before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. CASEY. Cannot the Minister answer more fully ? I have asked, what proceedings have been taken, when they were taken, and what is the present state of such proceedings ?

Mr. HAGGART. The civil proceedings have been taken a couple of years ago, and the case is in appeal now, and is at present before the Supreme Court. That is, Mr. St. Louis' case. The proceedings in reference to recovery by the Government are at present being prosecuted, and were up for hearing before the Exchequer Court and will be again.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps, if I let that part of the question stand, the Minister can answer more fully again.

Mr. HAGGART. I will try and give you a more exact statement.

Mr. CURRAN. The case is ready for trial.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means ; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that in these concluding years of this century the nations of the world enjoy a greater measure of liberty than at any previous period of the world's history. To-day in all parliaments and amongst all peoples, the Budget debate is the one which excites the greatest interest in the nation. In discussing it we pass in review not only the expenditure and income of the past year, and the estimate of the expenditure and income of the year to come, but we have under consideration also the fiscal policy of the Government of the day as well as that prepounded by the Opposition. We have placed before us the policies which actuate the political parties in the country. The past two years have been years of remarkable and great depression unprecedented in the world's history, and in this Dominion of ours, we have felt it, as described by the Toronto "Globe," "in diminished force." During the course of this debate, hon. gentlemen opposite in criticising the remarks which have been made on this side of the House, have questioned the accuracy of the statement that the condition of the agricultural labourers and of the working classes in free-trade England was unsatisfactory. Sir, in proof of the agricultural depression which exists in England, I beg to call the attention of the House to the following sentence which appeared in the Queen's Speech at the opening of the Imperial Parliament:

I regret that agriculture continues to be in a seriously depressed condition. The subject is still under the consideration of the commission appointed in the autumn of 1892. In the meantime the proposal will be submitted to you for facilitating the construction of light railways, a measure which I trust will be beneficial to the rural districts.

We have here, Sir, in the most formal manner, placed before the Imperial Parliament, the statement that the condition of agriculture in Great Britain is so unsatisfactory that a Royal Commission has been sitting two years, has not yet made its report, and meanwhile the Imperial Government, in order to give some aid to agriculture, and to help the rural districts of England, has taken the unusual step of assisting in the construction of light railways. This is most convincing evidence that the condition of agriculture in England is unprecedently bad, and that free trade has not benefited the farmers of Great Britain. It is also within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen, that in England, since the present Parliament met, so great are the numbers of unemployed people that a select committee, presided over by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, one of the members of the Cabinet, has been appointed to take into consideration the condition of the unemployed in England. When the members of that commission had taken evidence and considered the question, they did not feel justified in making any suggestion to Parliament, but they simply presented the evidence and left to Parliament the responsibility of dealing with this serious question. This condition of the population of England is a matter of extreme regret to us, but it is natural that we should take it into consideration when comparisons are instituted between the policy of protection which prevails in Canada and the United States, and the policy of free trade which prevails in England. The depression of the last few years has had its influence upon Canada, although as described by the Toronto "Globe" it has been felt here with diminished force. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), have attempted to convey the impression to the House that the depression which existed between the years 1874 and 1878, was greater than the depression which prevails throughout the world to-day. I do not believe such to be the case, but whether that be so or not, at all events it is satisfactory to us who have supported the policy which has prevailed in Canada for the last fifteen years that the condition of the Canadian people in these past two years of depression has been infinitely better than it was in the years from 1874 to 1878. I know that the hon. member for South Oxford contends, and he has made the statement during the course of this debate, that the condition of the population of Canada, especially in the five older provinces, was better from 1874 to 1878 than it is to-day. He made the assertion; he gave us no proofs and I think that is not the generally accepted opinion of the people of Canada. In fact, I do not believe it is the opinion of the hon. members of this House, no matter on which side of the Speaker they may sit. But the result of the depression in Canada has been that our expenditure has exceeded our income, and there is a deficit. The hon. Minister of Finance, in the admirable speech which he made in introducing the Budget, informed the House that he intended to make immediate provision to meet that deficit; and the bold and courageous policy he then announced commends itself to the country. I had not the pleasure of hearing the speech, but it seemed to be a surprise to the financial critic of hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for South Oxford. Indeed it had such an effect upon that hon. gentleman that for the moment he seemed to have lost his power of speech, and he had to ask for an adjournment of the House, in order that he might have time to recover from the effect of that announcement. As a citizen of Canada as a member of this House, I congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon the policy he adopted in courageously meeting the deficit in the manner

he did. I do so for this reason, that, occupying the position which we Canadians do before the world, it is all-essential that we should maintain our foreign credit ; and to do that we must be careful to maintain the equilibrium between our expenditure and our income. The advantages of maintaining our high credit are manifest. It is a decided advantage not only to the Dominion, but to the various provinces of the Dominion who are borrowers abroad, to the various municipalities, to the banking institutions, and to the commercial credit of our people. Therefore it is that all credit is due to the hon. Minister of Finance for the manner in which he met the deficit. And, Sir, in dealing with this matter of deficits, and with the comparisons which have been instituted by the hon. member for South Oxford, between the condition of the country to-day and its condition during the years when he administered its financial affairs, we have to look at the history of deficits in Canada. I find that during the first seven years of Liberal-Conservative administration the surpluses amounted to $11,000,000. From 1874 to 1879, when the hon. member for South Oxford was the Finance Minister, we had a surplus in one year and deficits in four years out of the five, the result being that at the end of those five years, there was a net deficit of $5,491,313. Then followed fifteen years of Liberal-Conservative government, the result being a net surplus of $16,000,000. Therefore, during the twenty-two years of Liberal-Conservative administration, we have had surpluses amounting to $27,352,890, and during the five years administration of the hon. member for South Oxford we had deficits in four years out of the five, amounting to $5,491,313. It appears that the only record that the hon. member for South Oxford has left of his connection with the administration of the Government of Canada has been those deficits, affording a verification of the oft-quoted words, that the good a man does in this world is often buried with him, and the evil alone survives. During those years, from 1874 to 1878, which the hon. member for South Oxford asked us to review and criticise, we find that whilst he was not able to meet the deficits, yet he increased the customs taxation, and our national credit was very much weaker and lower than it is to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite, during the course of this debate, have contended that the existing deficit can in nowise be due to the fact that the customs tariff has been reduced during the past few years. Why, Sir, they must know, if they carefully examine this matter, that if the customs taxation of 1874-78 had been adhered to on such articles as tea, coffee and sugar, there would have been no deficit to-day. But, in refutation of the statement which is frequently made that there has been no reduction of taxation in the present tariff, as compared with that which existed two or three years ago, I desire to point out that our importations in the year 1891 amounted to $113,345,124, and the duty to $23,481,069, while in 1894 our importations were nearly exactly the same as in 1891, being $113,093,983, and the duty was only $19,375,822, showing a marked reduction of customs taxation. Hon. gentlemen opposite are also fond of simply quoting the amount of taxation which Canada pays in the way of customs revenue, without, at the same time, showing fairly what the amount of our importations is on which that taxation is imposed. In order to carry out the comparison between the two periods, I find that in 1879 we paid in customs revenue $12,939,540 on an importation of $80,341,608, while in 1894 we paid a very much larger amount in customs revenue, $19,379,822, but on an importation of $113,093,983. These figures show that the rate of customs taxation was actually less in 1894 that in 1879. Take the year 1875, and we find that the customs duties per head amounted to $3.95, whereas in 1894 they amounted to $3.85. It must be borne in mind that we are now manufacturing very much more largely than we were in 1875, that the goods now made in Canada compare most favourably with those we were importing in 1875, that they are really better value than the goods then imported, and that we are obtaining for our own people all the benefits which result from manufacturing the goods within our own territory. But the hon. member for South Oxford, in admitting his deficits and declaring that they amounted to $4,500,000, makes this remarkable statement. The whole amount, he said, was extracted from the pockets of our neighbours on the other side. Of all the wondrous statements which the hon. gentleman has made in this House, of all the ridiculous assertions he has made in this country, I think that statement surpasses them all. The hon. gentleman, when he thus spoke, was referring to the Halifax award. we know that the commission which sat in Halifax and resulted in that award, was the outcome of the Washington treaty, and we are aware that the Washington treaty was negotiated by the late Sir John Macdonald in Washington in 1871. We know, especially those of us who come from the maritime provinces, and are, therefore, more particularly interested in fishery questions, that when Sir John Macdonald submitted to the Canadian Parliament a Bill to ratify that treaty, that Bill was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite in Parliament and in the country, and if they had had their own way, Canada never would have received one dollar of the $4,500,000 awarded us by the Halifax Commission, nor would our fishermen have ever had the bounty which they enjoy to-day. I am surprised at the audacity

of the hon. member for South Oxford in referring to that matter, and in taking credit to himself and his party for the manner in which those negotiations were conducted, and the issue to which they were brought. Why, Sir, the late Mr. Mackenzie, speaking in Ontario, stated that he never expected to get a dollar as the result of the Halifax Commission. Such a statement by that hon. gentleman, who was then leading his party, was prejudicing the case in Canada before it was heard ; but, after he and his party had done everything they could to prevent the ratification of the treaty, we succeeded in obtaining an award of $4,500,000. The commission met in Halifax in 1877, and it is a remarkable circumstance, that while the hon. member for South Oxford was a member of the Government at that day, neither the hon. gentleman nor any of his colleagues in the Government took part in the commission. The leader of the Government, the late Mr. Mackenzie, was so busy here watching the treasury, as is recorded in his great historic letter, that he was not able to turn his back less the treasury might be depleted in his absence. He had not sufficient confidence in his colleagues to leave them and go down himself to Halifax and take part in the commission. Nor had he sufficient confidence in any member of his Cabinet to send one down in his place, and so he actually went outside of his own colleagues and selected Sir Alexander Galt, formerly a colleague of Sir John Macdonald, and who was afterwards appointed by Sir John Macdonald, High Commissioner in London, to represent Canada on the commission. If, therefore, any credit for the conduct of the negotiation is due to any one, it is certainly due to Sir Alexander Galt and not to any member of the Mackenzie Administration. The hon. gentleman cannot justly claim any credit for the result of that commission. The fact that Sir John Macdonald's management secured to Canada the Washington treaty is what obtained for us the Halifax award ; and if hon. gentlemen opposite had had their way, we would never have received a dollar and our fishermen would never have received the bounty. In discusing the question of the Budget, we have to consider the policies of the two parties. The policy of the Conservative party is well known to every Canadian. It was inaugurated in 1878, and confirmed by the people in 1882, 1887, and 1891. But, Mr. Speaker, we have had on former occasions, when hon. gentlemen opposite have propounded fiscal policies, very great difficulty in understanding what they really meant, and it is equally difficult to understand them to-day. We remember that after their defeat in 1887, when their policy of slander and abuse failed in its object, and when in 1888, they changed leaders, they found it necessary to form a new policy. It was then we heard, for the first time, of the policy of commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity or continental free trade. Call it what you will, it meant discrimination against the mother country ; it meant the adoption of the American tariff ; it meant placing the tariff of our country under the control of a foreign legislature. That doctrine was most persistently advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite, it was also advocated by their friends in the United States, with whom they were corresponding continuously and with whom they had agreed on a common platform. So much was this the case, that when we asked for a definition of the Liberal policy, we were referred by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), to the resolution introduced in the United States Congress by Mr. Hitt, then chairman of the committee on foreign affairs. That was a most extraordinary statement. In fact, this movement was so akin to annexation that it excited our suspicions and alarm and its American advocates said distinctly they meant annexation. When this fact was brought home to the Canadian people, they again rejected hon. gentlemen opposite and relegated them to another five years' term on the Opposition benches. Sir, the fact is that the people of Canada realized that that policy was a policy disloyal to Canada and disloyal to British connection. But there has been seemingly a wonderful change in the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. From the highest pinnacle of protection on which they stood when they urged the adoption of the tariff of the United States, they have descended to the lowest rung of the free trade ladder. One is amazed at such a change, and, in seeking for a reason, it seems to me that they desire to rehabilitate themselves in the good opinion and esteem of the people of Canada—which they have lost ; and that their quasi treasonable movements being discovered, they attempt to associate themselves with some form of policy, or some cry in which the word "Britain," or "British" appears. Hence, we have them to-day advocating a policy diametrically opposite to the policy they advocated in 1891, when they declared that they had nailed the flag of unrestricted reciprocity to the mast, and were determined to keep it there until they sailed into the harbour of political success. They hauled down the flag—these hon. gentlemen are great at hauling down flags—but I think that when the opportunity is afforded us, as it will be in the general election, of placing before the people of Canada what these hon. gentlemen mean by free trade as it is practised in Great Britain, the result will be the same as before, and they will find themselves after the next general elections in quite as small a minority as they are in this House at the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). They have abandoned that.

Mr. KENNY. They have not abandoned it yet.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Pretty near it.

Mr. KENNY. Referring, Sir, to the abruptness of the change in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, I find that in 1891 the hon. leader of the Opposition made a speech in the city of Boston, where he was quoted as follows :—

Touching briefly on the policy advocated by some in opposition to reciprocity—the Imperial Trade League—Mr. Laurier said simply that it was absurd. Trade could not be made to follow allegiance. He had no objection to British trade, he wanted Canada to get all possible of it ; but they wanted United States trade, too, and Canadians, he thought, were not disposed any more than other people to throw away the Yankee dollar for the British shilling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what great change has come over the condition of the country since these words were uttered. It seems to me that the conditions of Canada and the United States are very similar to what they were then. If the Yankee dollar was so desirable in 1891, is it not equally so to-day ? And yet the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten entirely the Yankee dollar, and now to love only the British shilling. If unrestricted reciprocity was so valuable as it has been represented to be, why do hon. gentlemen abandon their efforts to secure it ? My hon. friend from Central Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) aptly referred to the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford, that the result of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity advocated by a gentleman opposite would be to add $10 to the value of every acre of cultivated land in the province of Ontario, and $30 to the value of every horse. My hon. friend from Toronto showed that there are 22,000,000 acres of uncultivated land in Ontario, at $10, $220,000,000 ; and 1,250,000 horses, at $30, equal to $37,500,000. This would yield enough to pay off the national debt, and leave a surplus of $7,000,000. If this would be the result, simply counting the value added to property in Ontario, what would it be if we count the value added to property throughout the whole Dominion ? It surely would leave us a very handsome surplus after paying off our national debt. If the policy would do so much for Canada, why should it be abandoned now ? Having nailed the flag of unrestricted reciprocity to the mast, why have hon. gentlemen opposite hauled it down so unexpectedly ? As I said before, I think the reason is that we told the people of Canada exactly what was meant by this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and Mr. Blake, their chosen leader, said it was so disloyal that he could not any longer associate himself officially with the party. We have to deal to-day with the subject of free trade as it is in England. But while I have before me the "Globe" report of the speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition at Boston, I will take the opportunity to explain a statement made previously. In the last session of Parliament, when reference was made by me to the speech which the hon. leader of the Opposition made at this Boston dinner, on 17th November, 1891, quoting from an American paper, I said that the hon. leader of the Opposition was reported as having said that :

England and Canada must separate, and it was manifest to him that the interests of his country were identical with the interests of the United States.

At that time, I had not in my hand his revised copy, the Toronto "Globe's" report of his speech ; but the hon. gentleman stated in reply, he would be bound only by the report of his speech which appeared in the Toronto "Globe." He would not be responsible for even his ipsissima verba taken down at the time by a reporter, but he would be bound by the version of his speech which he had revised before it appeared in the Toronto "Globe." On looking over that revised report of his speech, I find that the following is the manner in which he himself admits he referred to the separation of Canada from England :—

Britain and Canada were, however, drifting further and further apart, and the time was coming when they must separate ; but he was a British subject, and, as such, he hoped that when the final separation came about, it would come in friendship, as a son leaves the house of his father to become the father of a family.

Here, Sir, we find the leader of a party in a British country, the leader of a party in this British dependency, saying that Britain and Canada were drifting further and further apart and must separate. Sir, I deny that, I deny it most emphatically. Such is not the opinion of the people of Canada. It may be that hon. gentleman's opinion, and it may be the opinion of half a dozen hon. gentlemen who sit around him, but I tell him it is not the opinion of the majority of the people of Canada. They do not believe, they do not desire, that England and Canada shall separate. I say that such compromising language as that is unwise, unjust and unfair, unwise to himself and unjust and unfair to the people of Canada. I refer to that incident for the reason that it was a matter of discussion last year. Frequent reference is made to the condition of trade in two periods of our history, and the contention is made that the condition of our people is not as prosperous as it was in 1878 ; and further, that while a few "bloated manufacturers," or "thieves and robbers," as they are called by hon. gentlemen opposite, have been making money, the masses of the people are actually poorer than they were in 1878. Sir, I believe the contrary to be the case. I believe that in no period of the history of Canada has wealth been more evenly distributed than it is to-day ; and I

believe, further, that in no previous period of our history has the material well-being of our people been as great as it is to-day. For evidences of that we have only to visit the people in their homes, where we find them better housed, where we find them better fed, and where we find also a general material improvement which is most marked and most satisfactory. The contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that the condition of the people to-day is worse than it was in 1878, is capable of proof. Now, frequent reference is also made by these hon. gentlemen, as a sort of bugbear to frighten the people, to the national debt. We all know that during the last ten or fifteen years Canada has expended very large sums of money on important and necessary public works, on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the Intercolonial Railway, on public buildings all over the country. In fact, there is only one trouble with Canada, and that is that our revenue is too small. If we had a couple of hundreds of millions per annum instead of thirty or forty millions, it would be very much easier to conduct the business of the country. As a matter of fact, the net debt has increased 19 cents per capita during the last fifteen years. But let us go back and examine the history of this debt. I find that in 1873, the net debt was $99,848,726; in 1879, it was $142,990,187; that period was under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. During those six years the debt had increased $43,141,726, or an annual increase of $7,190,289. Let us take the history of the debt under the Liberal-Conservative regime, and we find that whereas in 1879, the net debt was $142,990,187, in 1894 it was $246,183,089; or an increase in the fifteen years of $103,192,842, or an annual increase of $6,879,723. The actual debt increased more rapidly from 1873 to 1879 under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, than it has during the fifteen years since. The estimate which the people of Canada placed upon that fact can be understood when we remember that they evidently considered that the administration of public affairs by hon. gentlemen opposite was—I would not like to say incompetent and corrupt, though that is the kind of language with which the hon. member for South Oxford emblazons his financial statements; but I will simply say that it looks, at all events, as if the people of Canada thought it might have been incompetent and corrupt, because they took the very first opportunity of turning them out, and they have kept them out, and my opinion is that they will keep them out for many years to come. Sir, take the condition of the trade of the country. One would imagine, listening merely to the doleful utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, that our trade was decreasing. Let us refer to the condition of trade in 1879 when these hon. gentlemen retired. At that time the aggregate trade with Great Britain was $67,288,848; in June, 1894, it was $107,255,123. In 1879, our trade with the United States was $70,904,720; in June, 1894, it was $88,844,040. I shall simply select one or two other places with the trade of which we are most intimately concerned. In 1879, our trade with Newfoundland was $2,280,823.79; in 1894, it was $3,633,154. With the West Indies it had fallen, under their management, to $4,753,099; in 1894, it had increased to $7,131,172. I will not weary the House by giving other figures. Sir, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) during the course of his speech the other evening, said that he was delighted to hear that the banks of the country were in a solid and solvent condition, that it was a source of pleasure to him, that he rejoiced in it; but he said that it was due, not to the favourable condition of the country, but simply to the good management of the banks; that it was solely a matter of management. With all due deference to the hon. gentleman, I contend that while the administration of Canadian banks has been most capable and most wise, at the same time, I do not care how wise the management may have been, if the banks had not had good customers, and if the general condition of the country had not been prosperous, certainly the banks could not have been prosperous. If the banks were simply doing business with thieves and robbers, as the manufacturers and the manufacturers' employees are termed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not think their condition would be very satisfactory. But nothing reflects more perfectly the condition of a country than the condition of the banks, and that is such a political axiom it should not have to be argued, in any deliberative assembly. I was rather surprised when the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated that the conditions of the banks afforded no indication of the general condition of the country. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman was then referring to the chartered banks. I find that the habit of referring, in the course of a Budget debate, to the savings of the people is not confined to Canada, but that Sir Wm. Harcourt, in his recent Budget speech, delivered in England, referred to that fact, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when Finance Minister, stated that the savings of the people in the savings banks had increased within a certain date from $2,000,000 to $7,000,000, and he thought that was a subject for congratulation. The hon. member for Oxford, in making that statement, recorded his opinion that these savings banks deposits are an indication of the well-being and thrift of the people of the country. The amount of deposits in the savings banks in 1874 was $7,210,260, and in 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite resigned the seals of office, they had increased

to $8,497,013, or an increase during those five years of about $1,285,000. Let us see what follows. During the five years when hon. gentlemen opposite administered public affairs, the increase was, in round numbers, $1,200,000; in the five following years the deposits increased, not one million, but twelve millions. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to show how much poorer the country is becoming—by referring to the fact that the deposits in the savings banks are increasing. But I venture to say this, that not only have the deposits in the savings banks increased, the amount being now $43,600,000, as against $8,000,000 when hon. gentlemen opposite retired from office, but I also desire to point to the condition of the chartered banks of the Dominion, to which the hon. member for Brant referred. And here it is noticeable that the deposits in the chartered banks in 1874, when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) took charge of the financial affairs of the Dominion, and when he was en rapport with the banks of the country, actually shrank from 77 millions in 1874 to 70 millions in 1878. I do not know whether the deposits increased in the Bank of Ontario. The correspondence with Senator Simpson would seem to indicate that in that particular bank the deposits rather increased, for reasons which the hon. member for South Oxford knows better than I do, and which I do not propose now to stop and inquire into, because that matter might come up appropriately on some other occasion when the hon. gentleman is indulging in one of his corruption tirades. Let me point this out, that whilst the circulation in the banks of Canada in 1878 was only 20 millions, and in 1893 had increased to 33 millions, the deposits in the former period were 93 millions, and in the latter 174 millions, the discounts in 1878 were 190 millions, and now 205 millions, and the general assets of the banks in 1878 were only 175 millions, and now they are 302 millions. This is the way in which we are obliged to show how very much worse off the people are than they were under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, by instituting a comparison of the conditions of trade and of our banking institutions at the two periods. Of course, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) could not make a speech without abusing the manufacturers of the country, and it does seem unfortunate that some of us who invested a part of our means in starting manufacturing enterprises in the different communities in which we live, and did so as much with the object of helping those communities as from a desire for personal gain, when we come here, should be called thieves and robbers. Of course, the term is intended to be offensive, it is intended to be insulting, and so it is accepted. But, I say, to brand the manufacturers of this country and the men who have gone into those joint stock companies, by which manufactures were started in this country and are now conducted, as thieves and robbers, is most insolent, most offensive and most unjust. Only recently, I am told—I read it in a newspaper, for I have not had time to look at the "Hansard"—that a gentleman who occupies a prominent position in the province of New Brunswick, Mr. Alexander Gibson, of Marysville, who is the best known and most prominent business man in the maritime provinces, was grossly assailed and abused in this House because he happens to be connected with some manufacturing industries. Let me pause to point out, that these epithets can be applied as well to the farmers of the country who are protected, to the miners, who are protected, and to the fishermen, who are protected, as well as to men engaged in manufacturing, refining or any other industry. I have always been in favour of a protective policy, and when I advocated it I asked its extension to all classes of our community, to farmers, fishermen, miners, as well as manufacturers: I am not ashamed of it, and I am not ashamed to declare, here or elsewhere, my connection with a manufacturing enterprise. Such industries have not been a source of profit to me individually, but I am very glad to say that they have been of decided advantage to the community or communities in which they have been started. As to the condition of those manufactures, I find that the increase in the number of manufactories between 1881 and 1891 was something like 25,800; that the capital invested in 1881 was $165,000,000; that to-day it is $353,000,000; that the number of employees was 254,000, and that it is now 367,000; that the wages paid in 1881 amounted to $59,000,000, and that in 1891 they were $99,000,000; that the value of the products in 1881 were $300,000,000, and in 1891, $475,000,000. Sir, that is an increase that is gratifying to Canadians. I know that the hon. gentleman who guides the financial policy of the Opposition has no faith in Canadian manufactures, for he has told us distinctly that he does not believe that Canada is a suitable country for manufacturing. I am quite sure that he is just as antagonistic to our manufactures as he was in 1874 or 1878, when by his management of the affairs of the country the sugar refiners were obliged to close their industry. That reminds me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a remarkable statement which is being repeated throughout the country, and something similar was started by the leader of the Opposition at a meeting which took place at St. Constance. I cannot quote the words of the hon. gentlemen precisely, but they were to the effect: That the duty which prevailed in Canada during the past year on sugars, refined, was a tariff which put $2,000,000 a

year into the pockets of the refiners of the country. I am connected with a refining industry in this country. It is a joint stock company, it is a public company, and its affairs are public, its annual statement is published, and therefore there is no secret connected with it. I regret to say that no portion of that $2,000,000 ever came near us, for last year we could not actually earn a dividend, and we were simply able to pay the interest on our mortgage. In the whole year's work of 1894, there was not sufficient money earned to pay even one-half per cent. I therefore say, in the presence of hon. gentlemen here who are business men, that for any man to rise in his place in this House and on his responsibility as a member, and in order to create prejudice against a manufacturing industry in this country; for any man to say that the tariff had put $2,000,000 into the pockets of the people engaged in that industry, when it did not earn a dividend, is saying what is grossly inaccurate, and which if repeated can only be termed a deliberate falsehood. I have served seven or eight years on the board of directors of one of those sugar refining companies with the Hon. Mr. Boak, who is one of the most prominent Liberals in the city of Halifax, who is today the President of the Legislative Council of the province of Nova Scotia, selected for that position by the Grit Government there, and yet that gentleman, because he happens to have some investment in a sugar refinery and to have become identified with it, for exactly the same reasons as I did, because he thought it would help the community; that gentleman, forsooth, must be dubbed a robber and a thief by gentlemen of the Liberal party in this House, because he happens to be connected with that industry. I reside in a community where there is no great individual wealth, and it is only by uniting together that we can succeed in starting these enterprises. Therefore, Sir, the utter fallacy of the statement, that any such money was to be made out of that business in Canada is shown by the fact that the companies which were engaged in that industry have experienced the extreme depression during the last year, as has been the case in other branches of commerce. I am told that the two refineries in Montreal paid small dividends. I know nothing of their private business, but I know that rumour has it that the dividends were paid, not from the earnings of that year, but from reserve funds. I am not surprised at the attack of the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the sugar refineries of Canada. He closed them once before, and he is prepared, I have no doubt, to close them again. But, if there is so much money in the business, why does he not come down and buy some stock? The stock of that refinery was selling at from 50 to 60 cents on the dollar, and you could buy a share of the preferred stock upon which $100 was paid, and with it a share of the common stock, for $60. If there was any such profit to be earned as is contended by hon. gentlemen opposite—I say contended by them, because I do not think they believe it in their hearts—I have no doubt they would inundate us trying to get the stock. But more than that; if they think the industry is so remuneraive, they can actually buy a refinery, for there is one idle in the neighbourhood of Halifax. I am sorry it is idle, but if they think there is so much money to be made, I invite them to come down and invest their capital and set that refinery going. The hon. gentleman also read an extract from the newspaper which referred to the large profits made by the Acadian Sugar Company in reference to sugar on hand. but subsequent returns laid on the Table of the House prove how inaccurate that newspaper report was. I desire also, Mr. Speaker, to point out, that in instituting a comparison, as we are forced to do from the line of argument which the hon. gentleman has adopted, we must look at the condition of the life insurance business in Canada. I find that, like the deposits in the banks, the amount at risk on life insurances decreased from the year 1874 to the year 1878. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) succeeded in decreasing the deposits in the bank, and he also succeeded in decreasing the amount of life insurance at risk. In fact he was making the people poor so fast that they could not pay their life insurance premiums and had to abandon their policies. The amount at risk in 1874 was, in round numbers, $85,000,000, and in 1878 it had decreased to $84,000,000, whereas in 1893, the amount at risk was $295,622,732, showing an enormous increase. Well, Sir, as business men and having to gauge the business condition of the country, we rely to some extent at least upon the report of the mercantile agencies. These reports give us some idea and some indication of the stability of the commercial community, and they are accepted on this side of the Atlantic, and I presume in Great Britain too, as a guide in those matters. I find that in the Dominion of Canada from 1875 to 1879, there were 9,187 failures, and the amount of the liabilities of these bankrupt firms was $132,371,240. On the other hand from 1890 to 1894, there were 8,503 failures, and the amount of liabilities, $78,357,641, or a decrease of $54,000,000, in the liabilities of the failures which took place from 1890 to 1894, as compared with the failures that took place between 1875 and 1879. Mr. Speaker, in my own province from 1875 to 1879, the liabilities of the firms that failed amounted to $9,651,760, and from 1890 to 1894, they only amounted to $4,175,262, or a decrease of $5,476,498. Thus it is conclusively shown that the condition of the mercantile community of this Dominion has been indefinitely better during the past

five years than it was from 1875 to 1879: and yet the hon. gentleman says that he does not believe the people of the five older provinces are as well off as they were in 1878. In fact, he does not believe that anything can be prosperous unless he is administering the finances of the country. Sir, referring to the condition of affairs in my own province, my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), in the speech he made the other evening, stated that the manner in which this Government was running the Dominion into debt and its extravagant expenditure invited an adverse vote from the people of Canada, and he also endeavoured to convey the impression that Nova Scotia was not in a prosperous condition. Well, Sir, I do not wish to exaggerate facts. Nova Scotia, like the whole Dominion, must share somewhat in the general depression; but I do not know a province in the Dominion which is better off to-day than the province of Nova Scotia. In proof of that statement, I find that the leader of the Liberal local government of that province, of which the hon. member for Antigonish was a member, placed in the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor on the occasion of the opening of the last session of the legislature, the following words:—

> While the past year cannot be described as one of general prosperity throughout the Dominion, it must be a gratification for us to know that a fair degree of success rewarded the industry of our people in their diversified fields of labour. A good harvest, an average fishery, marked progress in mining operations, and considerable activity in other departments, combined to enable the people of Nova Scotia to avoid to some extent the depression of trade which prevailed so widely on this continent.

That is a very good answer, I think, to any hon. gentleman from the province of Nova Scotia who endeavours to convey the impression that that province is not fairly prosperous. As regards the finances of Nova Scotia, I find that in 1882, when the Grit provincial government went into power, the province had no funded debt. By 1893, during their eleven years of office, they had piled up a debt of $3,142,922. I also find that whereas the expenditure of the province in 1883 was $541,099, by 1893 they had increased it to $822,462, an increase of 52 per cent, as against an increase of only 21 per cent in the Dominion expenditure by the Liberal-Conservative Federal Government in the same period. The exports of Nova Scotia to-day will compare favourably with what they were in past years. I could also show—but I do not wish to detain the House—that the shipping tonnage at the port of Halifax has very much increased. The hon. gentleman made reference to the reduction of our shipping, which we all know—we have threshed it out before—is due to circumstances with which neither this Government nor the Government of Nova Scotia have anything whatever to do. I am sorry that the efforts made by the Government of Canada to obtain a fast Atlantic service have not been successful. I still hope that the day will come when Canada will have on the North Atlantic a service as good as that which any other country enjoys. I have also to express my regret that the negotiations looking to a union of the colony of Newfoundland with this Dominion have been unsuccessful. I think that was an occasion on which Canada might deal generously with the sister colony, who are the only remaining British subjects on North America who are not a part of our confederation. I do not intend to express any opinion upon the terms which Canada offered or the terms which Newfoundland asked, for I have not had time to study them, and in fact one could hardly offer an intelligent opinion without hearing them very fully discussed. But I think that any distress which may prevail in Newfoundland, and which we know unfortunately does prevail, is not of the character which hon. gentlemen have attempted to convey to this House by reading exaggerated reports of the condition of things there. I believe the distress is largely due to the fact that in Newfoundland they have only one industry. What they want is a diversity of employment for their people, such as we have in Canada. If they had only some of those cotton factories, woollen factories and sugar refineries which we have in Canada, affording diversity of employment to their people, it would be infinitely better for the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the condition of our people in Canada to-day will compare favourably with that of any other people in the world. I do not know five millions of people on this globe amongst whom there is a general condition of well-being as there is amongst the five millions of people residing in the Dominion of Canada. I believe that is largely due to the fact that under our National Policy we have succeeded in securing for our people diversity of employment, and I believe that policy is an acceptable one to the people of Canada. I believe that it will be accepted by them at the general elections, and that its continuance will make of this Dominion the fairest land on earth.

Mr. RIDER. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in rising to support the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It seems to me that there never was a time in our history when a resolution of this kind was more called for. The resolution reads thus:

> That the Estimates for the fiscal year 1894-95 amount to the sum of $38,517,152, independently of any further Supplementary Estimates which may be brought down.
>
> That the said sum of $38,517,152 is in excess of the amount expended in 1893-94 by the sum of $922,127.

That the deficit for the year 1893-94 amounted to $1,210,322.

That the deficit for the present year is estimated by the Minister of Finance at $4,500,000.

That from statements made by Ministers of the Crown, in this House, it appears that our existing obligations for railway subsidies and for public works now in progress will involve a further outlay of $20,000,000, computed as follows :—

For railway subsidies now voted.....	$8,729,000
For the St. Lawrence Canals.....	6,000,000
For the Trent Valley Canal.....	5,000,000
For the Intercolonial Railway and minor works.....	1,000,000
	$20,729,000

The interest on which sum, together with the subsidy provided by statute to be paid on account of a fast Atlantic service, will entail an addition to our already very heavy annual fixed charges of $1,400,000.

That, inasmuch as enormous sums of money are now exacted from the people of Canada which are not paid into the treasury, and inasmuch as the burthens of the people are thereby greatly and unnecessarily increased, and it is of the utmost importance to the well-being of the community that not only should the present extravagant expenditure be diminished, but that the said burthens should be reduced as largely and speedily as possible,—it is expedient that in making provision to restore "the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure," as recommended in the Speech from the Throne, the existing tariff be so modified that it may be made a tariff for revenue only.

Yesterday we had laid before us supplementary Estimates, which were somewhat of a surprise, as the Finance Minister, when he presented the main Estimates, said there would be no other call on the revenue of the country. The supplementary Estimates will make an addition of about $1,500,000, or $2,422,000 in excess of the amount expended in the last fiscal year. In 1878, the then Opposition promised that if returned to power they would inaugurate a system of economy and retrenchment which would enable them to run the Government with the revenues of the country; or, rather they promised that they would manage the affairs of the country at an expenditure of about $22,500,000. The last year of the Mackenzie Administration, our expenditure amounted to $23,500,000. This was claimed, at the time, to be excessive. It was said that the business of the country could be run on at least a million dollars less each year, and that there would be no necessity to increase the public debt. At this time, much was said about the National Policy. It was a policy which was to give the people a home market; it was a policy which was to protect them by imposing high taxes. I propose to review the course of trade and show how that policy has been carried out. We were told at that time that real estate would be a safe investment. Farmers were told that they might be called upon to endure an increased burden for the time, but that the value of their farms would be maintained—that not only would real estate at the values existing then be a safe investment, but that any improvement they might make would be money as safely invested as though deposited in the soundest financial institution of the land. What are the results to-day? I have been looking over the difference between promise and performance, and I find that the net increase of the debt of Canada to-day is $110,000,000, or $23 per head. I find that the Government have expended, since 1878-79, about $366,000,000, in round numbers. If they had kept their promise, and expended no more than what was necessary to carry on the business of the country, they need only have exacted from the people, by way of taxation, the sum of $368,000,000. They have, therefore, expended $198,000,000 more than they said was necessary, or an excess of $41 per head. In order to ascertain how much the people of the county I have the honour to represent, have to pay of this increased expenditure, I have made the calculation upon a per capita basis, the population being 18,067, and I find that the share of the people of Stanstead would be no less a sum than $740,747, and that their share in the increase in the net debt of Canada, is $415,541, making an extra burden which has been placed upon the county of Stanstead, and which, sooner or later, must be met, some way or other, amounting to $1,156,288. And I have no doubt the decrease in the value of real estate will amount to as much more. If the hon. gentlemen now on the treasury benches had carried out their promises, a resolution such as the one I have the honour of supporting would not be required. I believe the Finance Minister looks upon the farmers as manufacturers. I understand that he accepts them as such, and it seems to me that this is a great deal in keeping with the other representations put before the people. If there is a class of the community who deserve protection or encouragement in any way, it surely is the farmer. How are we told that they get it? We are told that they get it by means of the duty on pork. The hon. Minister of Militia claimed great credit for having placed a duty upon pork. He gave this House to understand that that duty virtually enabled the farmer to export pork. I do not believe that the fiction known as the National Policy has ever produced one pound of pork, butter or cheese, but whatever progress has been made by the farmers has been made in spite of, and not because of the National Policy. If the farmers are to be considered as manufacturers, why should they not receive the same encouragement in the way of getting their raw material on as advantageous terms as do the manufacturers—the woollen, the cotton, and the iron men? Later on, I propose to deal with this subject, but at present I propose to draw attention, for a few

moments, to the very grave state of the finances of the country. The Finance Minister has been compelled, through force of circumstances, to admit an immense deficit. We were given to understand, at the opening of the session, that this deficit would be met by a reduction in the expenditure, and the adoption of a vigorous system of economy. That certainly was an idea which should meet the approval of the whole community, and I was rather in hopes that the Finance Minister would be able to make good that contention: but I find that, instead of adopting any such measure for meeting this bad state of affairs, he resorts to the same old method of putting on more protection in the shape of higher duty. So far as the increased duty upon sugar is concerned, it is quite evident that very little benefit has accrued to the treasury up to the present time. It has been reported—I will not vouch for the accuracy of the statement—that the refiners had a tip as to what was to be done. The results would seem to justify such a statement, because we find that large quantities of raw sugar were brought in just a few days prior to the time when the duties were to take effect. The saving to the refiners upon recent shipments would be no less a sum than $350,000. The hon. member for South Oxford says that it would amount to a good deal more, and I should think it quite likely. How will the tax upon sugar affect the consumers of this country? Say that the people of Canada consume, in round numbers, 350,000,000 pounds a year. The duty now levied is at the rate of 1·14 cents per pound. The tax, at this rate, would amount, in round numbers, to $4,000,000. That means this amount will be taken out of the consumers in Canada. And how will this great sum be divided? About $1,750,000 will find its way into the treasury through the customs officials, and about $2,250,000 will go into the pockets of the refiners. This is the way the hon. gentleman proposes to meet the growing expenses of the country. There is no doubt that retrenchment can be effected in nearly every department. There is no very important work at present in view necessitating a large outlay beyond the ordinary revenues of the country, and it seems that by inaugurating a system of economy and carrying it out vigorously—not a vigorous system of economy allowed to lie in a pigeon-hole, but the application of business methods to the management of the business affairs of the country—the necessary equilibrium between revenue and expenditure could be restored without resorting to any system of taxation, and without adding new burdens to those already borne by the people of the country. This system of protection by means of high taxation is said to be intended to develop the resources of the country—the natural resources, I presume. I will trouble you with a table, showing the amount of taxes collected on a few articles that are not produced in this country, and which are necessary articles, articles in use in every-day life. I have taken these figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th June, 1894:

Baking powder	$ 31,941
Yeast	13,088
Mustard	16,931
Spices	23,052
Currants, dried	64,582
Prunes, dried	23,934
Figs and dates	19,865
Raisins	141,882
Tea and coffee	27,528
Rice	76,942
Sugar and molasses	100,175
Dairy salt	11,385
Packages for salt	2,025
Cocoa, cocoa nuts, and other nuts	156,768
Peaches	18,899
Grapes	29,375
Oranges and lemons	95,409
White and decorated stone table-ware	210,924
Table cutlery	61,149
Total	$1,125,815

This is evidence, Mr. Speaker, that this policy of protection by high taxation is not entirely for the purpose of developing the natural resources of the country, but is for the purpose of extracting money from the pockets of the people that will enable the occupants of the treasury benches to keep themselves in power. Now, to hear the hon. gentlemen opposite in their election tours, you would be led to believe that they were very solicitous for the welfare of the farming community of the country. But their treatment of this class indicates that it is their votes they care for more than their welfare; and I am surprised at the success hon. gentlemen opposite have been able to achieve while maintaining such a wide divergence between promise and performance. In looking over the tariff passed at the last session, a few items specially attract my attention. I will refer to one—fence wire, plain, annealed-oiled and annealed, and galvanized. That is an article upon which the manufacturers have a very high protection. Now, I am not one of those who believe that the manufacturers are robbers and thieves; and I do not think that I have ever heard any hon. gentleman on this side of the House denounce them as such. I have often had the pleasure of listening to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has incorporated in his speech the allegations that gentlemen on this side of the House speak of the manufacturers as thieves and robbers, for I have heard him say that every session since I first had the honour of a seat in this House. I might congratulate the hon. member upon his improved delivery of that part of his speech, but that is as far as I could go.

I will give the hon. member a little idea of the working of this tariff. Fence wire, for instance, is one of those articles that constitute the farmer's raw material. The manufacturers of fence wire in this country are given protection to the extent of 25 per cent, and they get the rod from which the wire is drawn duty free. Why should not the farmer get the wire he requires for building his fences duty free? The protection on wire is such that it enables the manufacturer in this country to farm out the country, to divide it up into commercial districts, and make different prices to different sections. According to this arrangement, the farmers of the province of Quebec are obliged to pay from 10 to 13 per cent more for their fence wire than is charged the farmers in the province of Ontario. The manufacturers, as a rule, base their price, not upon what they can afford to sell it, but upon the prices prevailing in foreign countries, with the Canadian duty added. This is effected in certain localities by a system of discrimination. It seems this is an article wherein they can make discrimination, and they discriminate between provinces within our own country, a country that is doing so much for them. In respect to this article they discriminate against the farmers and the dealers in the province of Quebec to the extent of 10 to 13 per cent on the three kinds of wire I have named. Now, barbed wire is another article which to the farmer is raw material, and how is this treated? This is delivered in 500-pound lots to any point in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, freight prepaid; they are on an equal footing so far. But the prices in Ontario are from 12½ to 20 cents per cwt. less than are charged to the dealers and farmers in the province of Quebec, and this very article is manufactured in the city of Montreal. The merchants and the farmers of the province of Quebec pay 20 cents per cwt. more than is paid in the border towns of the province of Ontario. In places like Kingston, which is near to the American border, where the article can be procured at a low rate of freight, the farmers can buy it in the United States market and pay the duty, and have something of a margin left; therefore, the manufacturers put the price down in places like Kingston, Toronto and other points in Ontario. Now, Sir, that system is an outrage upon the farmers of this country, especially upon those who suffer most from it. It is something that the manufacturers never should allow to exist; it is to their discredit, and it surely discredits the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, a policy which they stand up and affirm to-day as strongly as they did when it was first adopted. Take iron or steel piping or tubing. This is an article that is largely used by the farmers in laying waterworks, and heating purposes. Let us see how the duty is arranged. The duty upon iron or steel tubing or piping in the manufacture of boilers is 7½ per cent; for use in petroleum refineries, imported specially for such use, in sizes from ¼ to 2 inches in diameter, the duty is 20 per cent. But for the sizes that are needed by the farmers and builders, the rate of duty is half a cent per pound and 30 per cent. It seems to me that the farmers in this country have only to know these facts in order to be able to judge this Government, not by their pretensions, but by their deeds. For instance, the farmers of this country produce pork, butter and cheese in excess of the requirements of the market; and the Minister of Militia undertook to point out that the duty upon pork had protected the farmers in consequence of which they were able to export to the extent, I think he said, of $2,000,000 in the past three years. Now, this is an acknowledgment of a most ignominous failure in the operation of this National Policy, because, as propounded in 1878, the National Policy was to give the farmers the home market, a market which would be better for them than any foreign market. They realize full well that when they have to go into a market like that of Great Britain, they have to meet the world in open competition, and if our farmers here are placed under any disadvantage in production, they surely cannot compete successfully in the markets of the world. If their agricultural machinery, fence wire, and so forth, cost more here, it is very evident that they cannot raise their farm products as cheaply, and that a duty upon articles that they produce largely in excess of the requirements of the home market, is simply no protection at all for them. It is no advantage to the farmer, it is laid rather to mislead him, it is done to throw dust in his eyes, to make him believe, if possible, by some such flimsy excuse, that the Government are really solicitous for his welfare. That is the reason that they have put on the duty, but it is of no advantage to the farmer, because I find that the very articles the farmer needs in the prosecution of his business are the articles that pay a very heavy duty. What I consider is raw material to the farmer, and what I believe that the farmers should get free, if any free goods are allowed to come into this country, are farm implements, which are now taxed 20 to 35 per cent; plain fence wire, which is now taxed 25 per cent; barbed wire, which is taxed ¾ of a cent per pound; buckthorn wire, which is taxed ½ cent per pound; iron piping, 2 inches in diameter and under, which is taxed ½ cent per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; wire nails, which are taxed 1 cent per pound; cut nails, which are taxed ¾ cent per pound; fertilizers, which are taxed 10 per cent; Indian corn, which is taxed 7½ cents per bushel; and kerosene oil, which is taxed at 110 per cent. In re-

gard to artificial fertilizers, that is an article which is imported to a considerable extent from the United States, and the duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, although it may not seem large, amounts to a tax of $1 to $3 per acre for the farmer. It seems there is no good reason why a tax should be placed upon fertilizers. If the manufacturers of this country are willing to meet fair competition, if all they want is a fair field and no favour, surely in an article of this kind they should not exact from the Government any protection. They have the United States market free, and should be willing to reciprocate. The United States Government allows the importation of all kinds of artificial fertilizers duty free. Anything that will assist the farmers in fertilizing their soil and increasing the amount of their crops the United States consider a national benefit, and therefore fertilizers are admitted free of duty. Why, therefore, should not the farmers of this country also be able to get fertilizers free? Now, kerosene is an article of great importance to the farmer; it is more largely used by farmers and by workingmen in cities than by any other portion of the people: and yet it has to pay a duty of 110 per cent. We imported last year 6,545,850 gallons, on which there was a duty collected of $466,163. It is evident from the amount of our exports that this is an article which enables the oil refiners to control the home market on account of the high duty. I desire to give the House another evidence of the deception practiced—if that word is parliamentary—by hon. gentlemen opposite in their dealings with the farmers. The farmers consider that a duty on corn is to them no protection, but rather a burden. We import quite a large quantity of corn, and export little or none. In order to give proof that cannot be gainsaid or denied in regard to the honesty of the Government in dealing fairly with the farmers in this respect, I refer to an Order in Council, passed a number of years ago, giving the distillers a rebate of duty paid on corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export. This was not a measure passed before Parliament in broad day light, it was a measure passed in secret session of the Ministry, the advisers of the Crown, and it gave to one class of the community an unfair and undue advantage. It was sometime before this was found out, and when it was discovered it was brought before Parliament in this way. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) moved the following resolution during the session of 1889:—

That whereas distillers are allowed a rebate of duty upon corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export, it is, in the opinion of this House, but just and right that farmers and stock-raisers who import corn to feed cattle or other stock for export, should also receive a similar rebate.

To my surprise I find among hon. members supporting the Order in Council, allowing the distillers a rebate on duty paid on corn when such rebate had been refused to the farmers, no less than ten members who are now on the treasury benches. When we consider this fact, we are satisfied that those hon. gentlemen have made no progress. Have we heard one word of penitence or atonement for such action as that? If we had, we might expect something better from them, and we might be disposed to say that under other circumstances they would meet the farmers fairly. We know this, that our farmers have to meet in the markets of the world the competition of other countries. In the British markets, they compete very largely with United States farmers, who have the advantage as regards cheap freight, besides being able to produce more cheaply, because they get the raw material at a lower rate, and thus our farmers are placed at a disadvantage. This subject came up again in 1890, when the leader of the Opposition moved as follows:—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that, in the opinion of this House, no rebate should be allowed on corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits.

In the division list, I find the names of eleven of the present Ministers of the Crown voting against the motion. So it is very evident, when you consider that they were the same men as those who had previously withheld from the farmers their just rights and privileges, that we could not expect anything better from them, and I am very sorry, indeed, to find among those who voted against the farmers on both motions, the name of the hon. member who formerly represented the county which I now have the honour to represent. We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that by adopting this line of policy, we should be more likely to obtain reciprocity with the United States. It is very evident, from the trend of trade between the two countries, that reciprocity with the United States would be a great blessing to Canada, and in evidence of this, I present a table showing the trade between Canada and the United States, in which farmers are interested:

	Value of Exports.	Value of imports.
Apples, green	$221,187	$ 44,277
Vegetables	107,233	132,896
Potatoes	193,917	50,329
Hay	753,575	18,404
Oats	20,817	59,239
Barley	216,493	1,395
Buckwheat	139,700	31
Beans	261,662	17,006
Pease	329,568	7,753
Indian corn	10	683,873
Maple sugar	28,093	.....

	Value of Exports.	Value of Imports.
Eggs	199,636	11,698
Wool	15,486	566,401
Horses	480,525	62,321
Sheep	642,231	45,708
Poultry	52,023	8,978
Hides, raw	283,430	1,664,857

Now, Mr. Speaker, wool is an article produced by the farmer and it is an article which is not produced in excess of the demands of our home market. If there is one single article which would be enhanced in value in the Canadian market by the imposition of a duty, surely it is wool; but yet in this instance the farmer is obliged to compete with the markets of the world. The woollen manufacturer requires that not only his wool, but his dye stuffs and raw materials shall be duty free, and if he has any important machinery to be brought in, a special Order in Council is passed to enable him to do so without paying duty. It seems manifestly unfair, and to my mind misleading, for the Government to pretend, that by putting a duty upon articles which our farmers produce largely in excess of the requirements of the home market: that they are giving them protection, while they refrain from putting protection on such a commodity as wool which is not produced in excess of the country's needs. The same might be said with regard to raw hides. That is a product of the farm, which we exported only to the value of $283,430, while from the United States alone we imported to the value of $1,664,857. The farmers of Canada might derive some little benefit from having a duty imposed upon hides and wool, taxes are imposed upon articles which they are obliged to use, and yet the Government allow hides to go on the free list. Let us take the list of some of the raw materials imported free of duty for the benefit of the manufacturers:

RAW MATERIAL FOR MANUFACTURERS, IMPORTED DUTY FREE.

	Value.
Diamonds, unset	$ 169,619
Grease for manufacturers	266,306
Hides, raw	1,866,333
Raw silk	203,040
Wool	1,085,254
Raw sugar	8,382,150
Tobacco unmanufactured	1,753,992
Cotton for manufacturers	2,997,071
Nets, seines and hooks, for use in the fisheries	434,530
Gutta percha and india-rubber, crude	976,948
Wire rods for wire-makers	510,783
Steel rails for railways	1,748,669
Tin in blocks, and tin plates	1,274,512

It will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that necessaries for the use of the fishermen were imported free to the value of $434,530. Now, I have no objection whatever to the fishermen being allowed the privilege of importing their nets, twines, seines, and so forth, duty free, but I do not know why the farmer should not be considered on the same footing. There is no industry in this country which requires a greater amount of labour for the amount of revenue received from it, than that of farming. Speaking for the farmers of the eastern townships, they each one of them will require to work his whole family in order to make 5 per cent upon his investment, and if the farmers were to figure a fair ordinary wages on the work of their families on the farm, they would have to throw in the use of the whole capital invested and get nothing in return. So long as that state of affairs exists, it seems to me that it is the bounded duty of this Government, instead of inflicting further burdens on the people in the way of taxation, to inaugurate a system of economy. Surely there is plenty of room for economy in the administration of affairs by this Government. I cannot see why the Government machinery should cost more to run to-day than in 1878, and if it does cost more, hon. gentlemen opposite are to blame for it. The increase in the population at all events, does not justify any increase in expenditure, and it is quite plain that there is great opportunity for retrenchment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have given you the free list of the raw materials of the manufacturer, and I will now on the other hand give a table showing some of the manufactured goods imported, and the amount of duty paid thereon:

DUTIABLE GOODS TO CONSUMERS.

	Duty paid.
Cotton goods	$1,139,068 41
Drugs, dyes, medicines	364,419 24
Rubber goods	157,800 11
Leather goods	200,552 88
Musical instruments	83,488 19
Oilcloth	74,344 12
Woollen goods	2,876,873 17
Silk goods	539,257 56
Ribbons, silk	197,905 42
Thread, cotton	84,864 82
do linen	31,240 25
do silk	6,239 38
Sewing machines	26,886 40
Needles, sewing and knitting	10,392 92
Farm implements	79,112 73
Carriages, carts	44,059 68
Window and plate glass	139,590 65
Glassware, lamps, chimneys	187,256 55
Bicycles	100,040 41
Coal, bituminous	843,841 89
Tools—carpenters' and mechanics'	139,670 46

It will be seen that on woollen goods imported, and used by the farmer to a large extent, the people of this country were called upon to pay $2,876,873 duty, and that while the manufacturer has his raw material free, the farmer has no protection on the wool he produces. This table will give you a little idea of the extent of the duties collected on many of the manufactured articles, the foundations of which are duty free to the manufacturer. Now, with regard to our trade with the British Empire, I find that it is as follows. Our exports to the British Empire were as follows:—

The Mine	$ 471,115
The Fisheries	6,078,895
The Forest	12,053,566
The Farm	43,284,900
Miscellaneous	20,469
Manufactures	4,229,664
Total	$66,138,609

To the United States we exported as follows :—

The Mine	$ 5,130,186
The Fisheries	3,260,677
The Forest	13,308,196
The Farm	5,095,624
Miscellaneous	54,308
Manufactures	2,448,607
Total	$29,297,598

Our total exports of home produce to the whole world were :

The Mine	$ 5,801,009
The Fisheries	11,102,692
The Forest	26,355,448
The Farm	49,559,622
Manufactures	7,692,755
Miscellaneous	75,327
Total	$100,586,853

Our imports from the British Empire for the year ending 30th June, 1894, were :

Dutiable goods	$ 28,225,204
Free goods	13,296,580
Total	$ 41,521,784

On these, the total duty collected was $8,431,987.22. From the United States, our imports were :

Dutiable goods	$25,823,636
Free goods	27,210,464
Total	$53,034,100

On which the total duty collected was $6,960,950.68. Now, let us compare the total imports :

Total from United States	$53,034,100
do British Empire	41,521,784
Difference	$11,512,316

The difference of duty collected was :

On imports from British Empire	$8,431,987 22
do do United States	6,960,950 68
Difference	$1,471,036 54

This statement shows that we imported from the United States $11,512,316 worth of goods more than from the British Empire, and levied upon them a lesser duty to the extent of $1,471,036.34 than upon the goods we imported from the British Empire. In the face of these facts, where is the foundation for all this cry of loyalty ? It surely cannot be found by examining the tables of trade between the two countries. If the hon. gentlemen were sincere in their protestations of loyalty to the mother country, surely they would treat the British manufacturer with as much consideration as they do the American manufacturer. Now, the figures of our total trade, exports and imports, are :

Total trade with United States	$ 82,331,698
do British Empire	107,660,393

Our trade with the United States, it seems, is nearly as large as that with the British Empire. This shows most conclusively the great need of having a system of freer trade between Canada and the United States. Our present trade with that country has been carried on under great disadvantages. There is a high tariff wall between the two countries, both ways, protected by an immense army of customs officials. This shows that the articles, a list of which I have given, that have passed between the two countries, are necessary articles. They are articles which we have exported simply because the United States market is the most convenient and the most practicable market for them. In comparing the position of the Canadian farmer with that of the United States farmer, I find that the Canadian farmer is labouring under a disadvantage to the extent of the greater cost of the articles which are his raw material. For instance, the markets of the British Empire are as free to the United States farmer as to the Canadian farmer for the sale of all his products ; and if the United States farmer has an advantage over the Canadian farmer in getting, at a cheaper rate, his kerosene oil, fence wire, nails, agricultural machinery, artificial fertilizers, &c., he has that much advantage over the Canadian farmer in those markets. If, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) stated in the House the other evening, prices are as low in Canada as in the United States, why the need of this high tariff ?

Mr. TAYLOR. To preserve the home market against slaughter goods.

Mr. RIDER. What the manufacturers of Canada or any other country require is a market ; and I have confidence in the business capacity of our manufacturers to believe that if they have a fair and equal opportunity, they are able to compete with the manufacturers of any nation under the sun. To restrict them to the Canadian market alone is, I believe, a disadvantage to them ; but just so long as they can control this market, the consumer is obliged to pay the amount of the duty over the price at which the same article can be got in the United States or elsewhere.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman tell us why the Americans keep a higher protection against Canadian and English manufactures than Canada does against the outside world ?

Mr. RIDER. That is a question which is seriously discussed by the American people.

Mr. TAYLOR. How did they vote at the last election ?

Mr. RIDER. There are, perhaps, half the people of the United States, if not more, who believe that they have suffered in the development of their natural resources by the system of protection, which is in existence there. Of course, in many respects, the protection is greater there than it is here ; but we have copied their system, and have taken all its bad features, without any of its good ones. For instance, the United States farmer gets his artificial fertilizers free, while the Canadian farmer has to pay tribute to the manufacturer ; and will the hon. member for Leeds pretend, for one moment, that that is in the interest of the Canadian farmer ? Yet the farmers of the two countries are producing for the same market abroad, and whichever can produce to the best advantage is the one who will have a corresponding advantage over the other in the market. Now, we have in England a High Commissioner who is supposed to be looking after the welfare of Canada as a whole, and he has an opportunity of being well posted, and he ought to be able to give reliable information. What report did he make to the Finance Minister in regard to canned goods ? He wished to make it appear that there was a grand opportunity for Canada to go into the canning of meats, and this is what he said :

> There is an immense consumption of canned meats amongst the poorer classes of this country, chiefly beef. The article is put up in attractive tins of 1 pound, 2 pounds, 4 pounds, 6 pounds and 14 pounds, and the wholesale price is about 4d. per pound. It is considered by those with whom I have consulted that the advantages existing in Canada are very favourable to the development of a trade of this kind.

He says further :

> Canada should be able to compete on terms of considerable advantage with the United States, for not only is the price of meat lower than in the United States, but as tinplate is admitted free of duty, the canning also should be less expensive than in the neighbouring country.

No one on the opposite side will gainsay a word uttered by the High Commissioner, and we have the High Commissioner declaring that meats are cheaper here than in the United States. If that be the case, I would like to know how hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches can for a moment pretend that the duty on meat is of any advantage to the Canadian farmers. It is simply levied with a view of misleading the farmer, with a view of making him believe that this is a paternal Government, that it is watching after his interests. All this is done to keep him quiet and peaceful while the Government are extracting the contents of his pockets to be used in ways best known to them. The country is told that the Government are so solicitous about the welfare of the farmer that they have established an experimental farm in order to disseminate useful information. If we look at the expenditure on that farm, we should imagine that great benefits ought to be derived from it. There has been nearly a million dollars already expended on it, but I should like to know what benefit the farmers have ever got from it. Of course it is all very fine for hon. gentlemen opposite to exclaim : See what we are doing for the farmer, and no doubt some of our farmers are misled by these exclamations. They do not stop to consider who is the Minister of Agriculture. It seems to me that Ministers should be selected who are fitted to manage the departments over which they are called to preside. But we have, in the Minister called upon to preside over the Department of Agriculture, a gentleman who is a lawyer by profession. Why should a lawyer be given this position? What can he know about agriculture ? What interest can he take in it ? Why, Sir, I question whether he could give a practical idea to the poorest of our farmers. What we want is a practical man to deal with questions affecting agriculture. Then look over the Auditor General's Report, and you will easily find illustrations of my remarks. It appears that there was a contract entered into by this Government in 1891, with a company known as the Haras National, of Montreal, for the hire of six stallions a year for five years, at the rate of $1,000 apiece, which means that the country will be called upon to pay $30,000 for the use of six stallions for the five years. And this is done for the benefit of the farmers. I do not believe there is a man in this House who would give $1,000 for the six stallions. Surely no hon. gentleman will venture to defend any such squandering of the people's money as this. In conclusion, I have to condemn the method adopted by the Government in dealing with the grave state of the finances of this country. Instead of meeting that unwelcome visitor, a deficit—the result of a system of extravagance unknown in the records of any previous Government—by retrenchment and economy, they propose to meet it by adding to the burdens of the people. Look over the Auditor General's Report for the past year. The least observant reader would be able to ascertain many ways in which savings might be effected without crippling the service of the country. There is not a department which is not spending large sums in excess of requirements ; and if the Government thought seriously of reducing expenses, they would have no difficulty in finding the means out of the Auditor General's Report. It is a good old saying that charity begins at home, and when the Government find that expenditures are going on a scale far outstripping the possible revenues of the country, they are bound to inaugurate a system of economy and retrenchment. But instead of this, what

do we find? We find that although the population of Canada has not increased materially, the Government have found it necessary to increase the number of Her Majesty's advisers, until we now have fifteen Ministers and three Controllers to do business for less than 5,000,000 of people. It seems to me, if we take into consideration the number of Ministers of the Crown and compare it with the number of Ministers in England or the United States, the number we have is a serious reflection upon the capacity of those who now fill the treasury benches. The impression is abroad, and I believe it is growing, that the present occupants of the treasury benches are incapable and not qualified to deal with the business requirements of the country. With your permission, Sir, I will give you an idea of the expenses which are being incurred in the different departments, and the extracts from the Auditor General's Report, which I propose to give, are only samples of what can be found in nearly every department, so far as I have been able to ascertain. Here, for instance, is a bill of the travelling expenses of a public servant in the receipt of a yearly salary of $3,200 per year. The account which he sends in for travelling expenses is as follows :—

Deputy Minister ($809.99)—		
To Ottawa Station, cabs, $8 ; street cars, 10c.....	$ 7 10	$ 1 00
Cabs : from Ottawa station, $8.50 ; stations to hotels, $10.20 ; hotels to stations, $9.55 ; sundry, $46.60.....	45 75	29 10
Single fares, $172.65 ; pullmans, $44.10 ; car-porters, $4.75....	202 85	18 65
Return fares, 2 to Montreal, $11.70 ; to St. Vincent, 90c...	12 60	
Steamers, $26.70 ; hotel-porters, $4.35 ; baggage, $2.....	12 85	20 00
Board, $168.75 ; hands on "Pratt," $3.50.....	142.30	29 85
Telegrams, $4.34 ; postage, 10c.; street-cars, $1.40.....	5 84	
Messenger, $2 ; papers, 55c.; ferries, $1.15	0 55	3 15
World's Fair: fares to and from, $1.40; entrances to fair, $3.50; elevator, 50c. ; intra-mural railway, 80c. ; elevated railway, 20c.....	6 40	
Advances before June 30, 1894, not accounted for to Dec. 11, 1894		442 00
Total		809 99

Here is another bill of a similar character from a second-class clerk in the receipt of a salary of $1,400 per year :

Côté, I., paymaster, 33 trips ($1,821.28)—		
Cabs : office to house, $13.50 ; to Ottawa station, $34.25 ; stations to hotels, $72.05 ; hotels to stations, $66.75 ; sundry, $87.75 ; from Ottawa station, $30.25		$ 304 55
Single fares : Ottawa and Montreal, 38 at $3.50 ; sundry, $534.....		667 00
Pullmans, $90 ; car porters, $31.50....		$ 121 50
Steamers, $37.30 ; boat-hire, $5.75 ; ferries, $2.55		45 60
Horse-hire, $57 ; team, Ste. Anne's to Murray Bay, &c., twice at $25....		107 00
Board, $468.16 ; telegrams, $10.87 ; 'phone, 30c.....		479 33
Porters, waiters, shining boots, &c. (items not given), $80.55 ; street-car, Kingston, 20c.....		89 75
Fur-coat, 26 d. at 50c., $13 ; umbrella, $2.55		15 55
		1,821 28

That is pretty generous tipping, Mr. Speaker—I suppose that is what it is for.

Now, Sir, I believe we have a right to hold hon. Ministers who are paid each $8,000 a year for looking after this business, responsible for this state of affairs. It seems to me extravagant, extravagant in the extreme, that such bills as this should be allowed. This is simply an illustration of many bills that are brought in under similar circumstances and embracing like charges, and this state of affairs exists in nearly every department. Surely such a state of affairs cannot be upheld ; surely we have a right to expect the Ministers to whom are confided the affairs of the people as advisers of Her Majesty, and as heads of these departments, to keep a more watchful eye upon the expenses of the country. These things are evidence that ample opportunities exist for curtailing the expenditures without lessening the efficiency of the service.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to finish by six o'clock.

Mr. RIDER. I have still a good deal of matter here.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. RIDER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company. —(Mr. Amyot.)

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

IMPORTATIONS OF RICE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, How many pounds of rice were imported between the 1st day of July, 1894, and the 1st day of May, 1895, both inclusive? How many pounds of rice uncleaned, unhulled or paddy were imported between the 1st day of July, 1894, and the 1st day of May, 1895, both inclusive?

Mr. WALLACE. The statistical records of this department at this date only admit of information on this subject for the nine months of the current fiscal year ended on the 31st day of March last, upon the close of the first quarter of this calendar year. If the hon. member requires the information down to the 1st day of May, as asked, it will take time to obtain the facts, as the request would necessitate a special circular to all collectors of customs throughout the Dominion directing them to forward the information. 1. I may say that the total quantity of rice imported into Canada from the 1st day of July, 1894, to 31st day of March, 1895, inclusive, was 6,068,729 pounds. 2. The quantity of rice uncleaned, unhulled or paddy imported into Canada from the 1st day of July, 1894, to the 31st day of March, 1895, inclusive, was 4,834,783 pounds.

WAKEFIELD AND RUPERT MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, What changes, if any, have been made during the past year in the matter of the mail service between Wakefield and Rupert, in the county of Ottawa? If none, do the Government intend making any change?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No changes have been made in the mail service between Wakefield and Rupert during the past year. Application has been made for a daily mail, which is still under consideration.

PAYMENTS TO TEMPORARY CLERKS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What was the gross amount paid in each department of the Government, inside and outside service, during the last year for temporary clerks, giving each department separately, and the gross sum total paid?

Mr. FOSTER. As the question concerns all the departments and cannot be answered by any one in particular, it would be better for my hon. friend to move for an Order of the House.

MR. THOS. MALONE.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Langelier) asked, Why did the Government refuse to issue the usual Civil Service insurance policy to Thomas Malone, ex-Deputy Supervisor of Cullers at Three Rivers? Was the application for insurance not duly made by Mr. Malone some time before the superannuation? Is Mr. Malone not in receipt of a pension since his superannuation, and is it not customary for the Government to continue life insurance policies on superannuated officers and deduct the amount of premium from their pensions?

Mr. FOSTER. Shortly after Thomas Malone's application for a civil service insurance policy was received, a recommendation for his retirement was sent to Council by the department to which he was attached, and the application was held over pending the result of said recommendation. Mr. Malone was subsequently placed on the retired list, and a policy was not issued to him. The Government having been advised that, having regard to the true intent and meaning of the Civil Service Insurance Act, the primary object of which is to make provision for the families of persons dying in the service, a policy could not properly or legally be granted to the applicant. Mr. Malone is in receipt of a retiring allowance. The form of policy at present in use provides that in the event of a member of the civil service to whom a policy has been issued being placed on the retired list, the premiums shall be deducted from the retiring allowance of the insured, but no case has arisen in which the policy-holder has been placed on the retired list.

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, How much was paid by the Government in the way of subsidy to the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway during the past year? For what portions of road constructed, and when were such portions constructed?

Mr. HAGGART. There was paid in the calendar year ended December, 1894, $18,750, as follows:—On the 60th and 70th mile, completed August, 1894, $16,192; balance of subsidy from Aylmer to 60th mile, completed September, 1894, $2,558; total, $18,750.

LETTER CARRIERS FOR HULL.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint letter carriers for the city of Hull?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to appoint letter carriers for the city of Hull at present.

GOVERNMENT SURVEYORS—OUTSIDE WORK.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Do the Government permit permanent employees, such as sur-

veyors or civil engineers to compete with outside surveyors and engineers and to engage in contracts which are not Government works ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

DUTY ON CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains) asked, 1. What is the amount collected in 1894, for duty on Canadian tobacco ? 2. How many pounds of tobacco were so subjected to duty in 1894 ? 3. On what quantity was such duty levied in the years, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892 and 1893, respectively ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). 1. The amount collected in duty upon Canadian tobacco in 1894 was $19,547.32. 2. The quantity of Canadian tobacco so subjected to duty in 1894 was 390,946 pounds. 3. Such duty was levied on the following quantities of Canadian tobacco in the years mentioned :

	Pounds.
1885	499,132
1886	346,471
1887	568,355
1888	708,873
1889	786,456
1890	632,035
1891	442,403
1892	468,962
1893	515,013

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN CAPE BRETON.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The cash receipts for freight and passengers at the several stations and ticket offices in Cape Breton for freight and passenger service over Cape Breton and other Government railways, for each year since the commencement of the operation of the line to the close of last fiscal year ? The number of miles of Government railways in Cape Breton, and the cost, per mile, for the operation of Government railways during the last fiscal year ?

Mr. HAGGART. It will take considerable time to prepare such a statement, as the cash received at each station has to be separated to ascertain the part belonging to the Government railways and the part belonging to other railways ; but the earnings at each station of the Cape Breton Railway for freight and passenger service over the Cape Breton and other Government railways, for each year, can be given in three or four days when I get the information from Moncton.

Question allowed to stand.

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked, (a.) Has any contract been let in 1895 for carrying the mails between Athlone and Tottenham ? (b.) If so, were tenders first invited ? (c.) Who tendered ? (d.) At what prices ? (e.) To whom was the contract let ? (f.) Was the lowest tender accepted ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes. Tenders were invited, but the notices were withdrawn, and the existing contract has been renewed for a further term. Tenders were not opened. The contract was awarded to S. E. Turner.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to give representation to the graduates of the Royal Military College on the Board of Visitors of the College ? If so, when, and to what extent ?

Mr. DICKEY. The advisability of giving representation to graduates of the Royal Military College on the Board of Visitors has been under consideration in the department for some time. No decision has been arrived at yet.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST EMMANUEL ST. LOUIS.

Mr. CASEY asked, What civil proceedings have been instituted against Emmanuel St. Louis ? When were they instituted ? What amounts were involved in each ? What result has been reached in any cases which have been decided ? What is the present state of such as are still pending ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. An information was laid in the Exchequer Court on the 18th October, 1894, claiming the sum of $143,881. This suit is now ready for trial. An application was made on the 7th January, 1895, returnable on the 10th January, asking the judge to fix the 29th January as the day for trial. This motion was enlarged by consent until the 12th January, and was again enlarged by order of the judge of the Exchequer Court until the 18th February upon the ground that the criminal proceedings against St. Louis were then going on and that by that date the criminal case would probably be over. On that date the criminal case not being concluded, and as it was impossible to say when it would be, the application to fix the date of the trial was dropped. On the 13th May Judge Desnoyers gave his decision on the criminal case, and instructions were at once given to the counsel for the Crown to apply to the court for the fixing of the day of trial. This application comes up for hearing on the 30th inst. The Crown has asked that the 20th June be the date fixed for the trial. I may add that the short delay which occurred before applying anew to the judge to fix the date of the trial was due to the necessity

of communicating with Mr. Osler, counsel for the Crown, who lives in Toronto.

IMPERIAL TITLES.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to make an inquiry of the Government in reference to a matter that has been somewhat discussed in the country, that is, the conferring of Imperial titles on Canadian subjects. Are the titles conferred on the recommendation of the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of His Excellency, or by what authority? I would like to know for my own information, and I know there are many people throughout the country who would also like to have some information on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. Government orders.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to have a reply to my question. I think it is a question which may be asked, and on which we should have information. If it is done by the will of the Imperial Government, we would like to know it; if it is done by representations from the Government here, we would like to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the hon. gentleman put his question on the paper. It is a very unusual one; I think there is no precedent for having it asked in the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, we will create a precedent.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committtee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. RIDER. Mr. Speaker, when I had the privilege and honour of moving the adjournment of the debate on Wednesday last, I was proceeding to give you evidence to show that there was no necessity for levying fresh burdens on the people of this country with the object of meeting the difficulties now before us. In order to satisfy myself upon this point, I have been looking over the Auditor General's accounts to see wherein economies might be made to relieve the people from such burdens, and I have prepared a list of the departmental employees and the salaries paid in 1878 as compared with 1894. You well know, Sir, that the Mackenzie Administration was accused of being very extravagant in the employment of civil service employees and in other ways, and that there was no necessity for so great an expenditure to be kept up. The statement I have prepared which shows an unnecessary and extravagant increase in the annual departmental expenditure is as follows:—

Salary paid.	Number in 1878.	Number in 1894.	Increase in Number	Increase in Salaries.
$				$
1,000	15	144	129	129,000
1,100	9	35	26	28,600
1,200	21	45	24	27,600
1,300	28	35	7	9,100
1,400	28	130	102	142,800
1,500	8	34	26	34,000
1,700	4	18	14	23,800
1,800	8	55	47	84,600
1,900	3	8	5	9,500
2,000	6	28	22	44,000
2,300	1	5	4	13,800
2,400	10	27	17	40,800
2,500	.....	4	4	10,000
2,600	.....	6	6	15,600
2,800	.....	5	5	14,000
3,000	2	4	2	6,000
3,200	11	19	8	25,600
3,400	.....	3	3	10,200
4,200	.....	1	1	4,200
5,000	.....	3	3	15,000
6,000	.....	1	1	6,000
Totals ..	154	610	456	694,200

Making the number employed in 1878, receiving $1,000 and over, 154, being an increase in the number of 466, and an annual increase in salary of $694,200. It would seem, in view of this fact, and other expenses, when we compare the two Administrations, that there would be no necessity for resorting to increased or new taxation for the purpose of meeting the financial difficulties which we have to face at present. I find, also, in comparing the travelling expenses of Ministers and officials, under the two regimes that the difference is even greater. One of the faults charged by hon. gentlemen opposite against the Mackenzie Administration was the amount of these travelling expenses; and, therefore, it is but proper that the people who have not the opportunity of looking over the Auditor General's accounts, should have put before them the facts in as clear and precise a manner as possible. I find that the travelling expenses of Ministers and officials, including cab-hire, in 1878-79 amounted to $6,241.50. The travelling expenses of Ministers and officials, including street car fare and cab-hire, in 1893-94, amounted to $23,629.41; or there was over five times as much expended in 1894 as in 1878. Surely no one can pretend that this is not a controllable expenditure, entirely under the control of the Government. I find, also, that, notwithstanding the fact that there are at least ten lawyers in the present Govern-

ment, no less a sum than $242,502 has been paid during the past two years for legal expenses, and that one individual in the city of Ottawa, Mr. D. O'Connor, received of this amount, $39,098.90 for legal expenses. This state of affairs should not be allowed to exist, and no doubt a great deal of the extravagance practised by the employees is due to the example set them by the Ministers. I was proceeding during the debate on Wednesday last to give you an idea of the travelling expenses incurred by some of the officials, as they go junketting about the country at the people's expense. I will give you another item in this connection. It is in the case of the private secretary of a Minister, in the receipt of salary as private secretary of $600 per year. That gentleman is also filling another position, that of second-class clerk, for which he receives a salary of $1,150, which, this year, will be increased to $1,200. Let us see the account of travelling expenses sent in by this official:

Private Secretary, 27 trips ($778.03)—	
Cabs: to Ottawa station, $26.75; stations to hotels, $21.50; hotels to stations, $18.85; sundry, $54; from Ottawa station, $20.75	$141 85
Single fares: Ottawa and Montreal, 46 at $3.50, $161; sundry, $68.70	229 70
Fares to New York, Mar. 28, and return, $22; to Calumet and return, 2 at $3.10	28 20
Pullmans, $49; porters, $13.25; steamers, $5	67 25
Telegrams, $15.28; phones, $1.05; stationery, $1	17 33
Ry. to Chicago Fair grounds, $1.50; entrance-tickets to World's Fair, $3	4 50
Board, $255.20; American postage, $2	257 20
Sundries not divided (waiters, bell-boys, papers, &c., in early accounts)	14 40
Waiters, porters, bell-boys, car-boys, $9.15; newspapers, $3.05	12 20
Barber, $1.30; laundry, $1.50; cleaning boots, $1.60; 2 books, $1	5 40
	$778 03

Now, if this were a single case, it would not be worth while bringing it before this House, but it is simply an illustration of how the business of the departments at Ottawa is being conducted, and that at a time, too, when the country is passing through a financial crisis, when the Government finds itself face to face with an alarming deficit, and a continuously decreasing revenue. Instead of attacking the evil, instead of removing the root of the evil by reducing expenditure, as they are in duty bound to do, the Government resort to new taxation, and impose taxes on people without necessity. On that point, I think, I have stated sufficient to show that the Government have not adopted the right course in meeting our financial difficulties; and I shall now, with your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, proceed to say a few words in connection with what is known as the so-called National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to have as much confidence in the National Policy at present as a panacea for all our financial ills as they had when they first adopted it in 1878. Let us review our export trade, and find how much it owes to the National Policy. I find that our total exports from the mines, fisheries, forests, farms, and manufactures, are a little over $100,000,000. Of this amount the manufacturers sent out $7,692,000, but of this item there was nearly $1,000,000 set down as household effects—effects of people who are leaving the country. When we deduct this, we find that less than $7,000,000 is the extent of the exports sent out by our manufacturers. From this it is evident that those manufacturers who are making enormous wealth under the influence of the National Policy, are not making it by the creation of a new trade, or by trade with foreigners bringing foreign wealth into the country, but are simply making it out of our own people, without adding any new wealth to the country whatever. There was a time when in nearly every village, we had our carriage makers and other small manufacturers; but, under the operation of this policy, which facilitates the formation of combines, these have all disappeared, greatly to the disadvantage of the communities in which they were situated. I believe, Sir, that this policy known as the National Policy, so far from being what was pictured to the country in 1878, has proved a most ignominious failure; and I believe the most sanguine of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, must accept one of two conclusions—either that the National Policy is a bad policy, or that it has fallen into mighty bad keeping.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Both.

Mr. RIDER. I believe, Sir, that both are true, that this policy is bad, and that it has fallen into bad hands. I believe a good policy in bad hands will produce worse results than a bad policy in good hands. And in view of the results we have seen, it seems to me it is the duty of this Government to reform, and I believe they will have to reform matters or the people will take them in hand and reform them themselves. I wish to say but a few words in connection with some of the commercial ventures of this Government. The farmers of this country, a few months ago, were considerably stirred with the prospect of a home market. The Government was proposing to pay 20 cents per pound for butter with the idea, as they professed, of helping to build up a reputation for Canadian butter in foreign lands. If we look back we will find that it seemed to be very near election time, and, no doubt it was thought to be a very fine thing with the farmers to have a home market at last, the home market which has been so long promised and never realized. Now, when we find that the butter bearing the imprint

of this Canadian Government is being sold at a loss of from 5 to 7 cents per pound, it surely reflects badly upon the business standing of the Government in foreign lands ; and I believe that nothing has been done that will so much depreciate the value of this most important Canadian product, as the course adopted in this case by the Government. It would seem that the Government has been in truth doing those things that it ought not to have done and leaving undone those things that it ought to have done. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there never was a time when the public mind was in a more receptive mood. I believe that the people are studying the financial affairs and the fiscal policy of the Government as they never did before, and that when they have the opportunity of pronouncing judgment they will declare that there has been a great discrepancy between promise and performance on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, I beg to thank hon. members for the kind attention with which they have listened to me in this debate.

Mr. RYCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to be one of the representatives of the city of Hamilton, the birthplace, I may say, of the National Policy, and the chief manufacturing centre in this Dominion. I have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite during this discussion condemn the National Policy and condemn the manufacturers of this country, and I feel that I cannot let this opportunity pass without taking some part in the discussion, for I have seen the benefits which have followed the building up of manufactures in our own city, benefits accruing not only to our own citizens but to the farmers for twenty miles around the city. Every member in this House and thousands of people out of it will remember the bad times during the Mackenzie regime. All are aware that the workshops during that time were deserted and that hundreds and thousands of workingmen were walking the streets of our cities unable to find employment. But what took place when the protective policy was brought in by the Conservative party ? The workshops were opened, capital came in and labour was employed. I can give you instances in my own city of Hamilton. Near the Grand Trunk station we have a large rolling-mill, whose great chimney stood smokeless and idle during the years of the Mackenzie administration. But after the protective policy came into force, capitalists came in and operated these mills, engaged hundreds of willing workmen, and have since paid out hundreds of thousands of dollars in wages. Then there were the works known as Beckett's foundry, a large brick building. The friends of hon. gentlemen opposite used that building for political meetings in 1878, as the works were not running. But after the protective policy was inaugurated all was changed, the cotton factory was started, the shuttles commenced to fly, hundreds and hundreds of hands were employed—men and women, girls and boys—and since then wages to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars have been earned and paid there. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite say that times are not as good as they were. We admit that. There has been great depression all over the world, affecting even the greatest nations on earth. In Great Britain they have done everything they could to relieve the distress of their people, but they have not succeeded as they expected. Take again the United States, with the highest protective tariff in the world—they have had their troubles there also ; their people have been out of work, their trusts have been forced to the wall, national banks have broken down by the hundred. But in this young country only one bank went to the wall. We have stood the pressure and have carried on our business still. We have suffered from the shock, but to a less degree than other countries, and I believe that the policy of moderate protection will soon again bring us into a condition of prosperity. Hon. gentlemen say that shops and factories are not increasing. In the city of Hamilton, we have a large malleable iron works which has just finished an extensive addition intended for the manufacture of scales and other products of iron. We have under construction a smelting works in which will be invested probably $400,000. This industry will give employment not only to men in Hamilton, but also to men engaged in the mines, to men manufacturing dynamite, to men making tools, to railway men who transfer the goods—it is almost impossible to predict the benefits that will flow from the establishment of this industry to the working-people of the country. We find also, that as a result the natural resources of the country in the way of iron mines will be developed to a great extent. Only last week I was informed of a new industry to be started in the city of Guelph, in the form of a rolling-mill which will manufacture a line of goods not now produced in this country. This is a high grade of iron, known as Norway iron. One of the directors of the company told me that he had had a conversation with a member of the firm of Goldie & McCulloch who said they had to import this iron hitherto and was glad that hereafter they would be able to purchase it at home. These are but indications of what is being done, and I believe that new factories are being developed to a greater extent than many people have any idea of. Now, Sir, the manufacturers of this country, of course, anticipated the depression in other countries and they, as far as possible unloaded their goods, and have no accumulated stocks on hand. I feel satisfied for some years to come these manufactories will go on manufacturing the supplies this country requires and that

the demand will keep their men employed. I claim that the workingmen of this country are greatly assisted and protected by the National Policy. Just as soon as this protective policy is changed, just so soon will the manufacturers of this country find it necessary to close their works or reduce the pay of their men. On the contrary, the policy of this Liberal-Conservative Government has been to secure good wages for the working-people and in every way promote their interests. Let me give you an instance. I remember that in 1877, there was a cargo of furniture shipped from the United States to the city of Hamilton. The consignee rented a large flat, unloaded his goods, and called in an auctioneer. The auctioneer got up on his table and announced to the public that they had just brought over from the United States a large cargo of furniture, bedsteads, sofas, chairs, and all kinds of fancy ware, which they were offering for sale, and which must be sold under the hammer for what it would bring. The auctioneer spoke to the people in this way: "Gentlemen, now is your time, these goods are brought from the United States, and a forced sale has got to be made, so now is the time to invest your money." Such instances as that were frequent during the time the Mackenzie Government were in power. Now, I will show you, Mr. Speaker, how the Americans are trying to crush out our manufactures. Wherever they find only one firm manufacturing any particular line of goods, they take every possible means to run them out and close them up, and so control our market. I wrote to one of the manufacturers in the city of Hamilton in 1891, asking him for information on this subject, and this was the reply he made me:

S. S. Ryckman, Esq., M.P.

My dear Sir,—Yours of 17th inst. received and contents noted. I am always pleased to give you any information that I have in regard to the matter you ask. The facts of the case is this: During the Mackenzie reign, and when the country was suffering from the unequal competition of the American manufacturers, we, along with every Canadian manufacturer, felt the bad effects of the goods that were thrown into this market, and we resolved to get even with one American house that were trying to wipe us out, we being the only competitor that they had in their line—one line of goods in particular, which will show how they were slaughtering goods in our market. I refer to an article in the harness business known by the name of rein-snaps. These were sold in the American market at $5.50 per gross for ⅞—the same size sold in Canada, $2.50 per gross, F.O.B. at New Haven; of course, freight and duty to add, and which after delivery the goods were away below what they could be made for, and left us out in the cold. We thought, being a large wholesale house, would be the best house for us to order through, and concluded it was better to buy them than make them, and, as we wanted to teach our competitors a lesson, we wanted to buy through them a large lot of the lock snaps, and did buy $1,000 worth. Our arrangement with the firm in Hamilton was for them to buy for us $1,000 worth of the lock snaps, and we to take them out of bond, paying our own freight and duty, they to receive 5 per cent for their commission. Of course, they did not see what we wanted the goods for, or they would not have entered into the arrangement; they only saw 5 per cent. We made them give us a written agreement, in black and white, they agreeing to fill the contract. Well, when the first shipment came along, for about $500 worth, they commenced to think something was wrong, and refused to supply any more, but we threatened a suit for damages, and they had to deliver. When we got them all in Hamilton in bond, we paid the firm and then shipped all the goods through to Detroit in bond. So we had the goods in Detroit, less the freight, at $2.50 per gross. Then we sent our traveller, Charles Carpenter, whom you know to be a staunch Grit, to Detroit to get the goods, and he commenced to place them on the American market, commencing at New York and finishing at St. Louis, selling in small quantities; and their own goods at $3.00 per gross, or $2.50 per gross less than they could buy them at home.

I think this is a pretty strong case as showing the way in which the Americans try to crush out manufactures in this country. Now, Sir, I claim that business men generally, other than manufacturers, are benefited by the protection which the National Policy affords. I may mention that I myself have been in the grocery business in the city of Hamilton, and during one period of six years that I carried on a business aggregating about $300,000, we did not lose $25 in bad debts. For the last year or two I have been carrying on business to the extent of about $60,000 a year, and so able are the people to pay for what they purchase, that we have not lost $5 in bad debts; and I may say that our trade is mostly with farmers and mechanics. That is one fact showing that business men generally are benefited by this policy. The life insurance men also are protected, because many mechanics and workingmen in towns and cities are carrying a small life insurance for the protection of their families, and as long as they are able to get work, as they do now under the National Policy, they are able to pay their premiums. Now Sir, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) referred to the duty on sugar, and said there was a great difference in price between England and Montreal. Well, I have been largely dealing in sugar, and this spring I purchased 125 bags of German sugar, which I found an inferior article to what is sold in this country. It is made from beet root. For $1 we had to give three pounds more of that German granulated sugar than of the Redpath sugar, but the difference in price is owing to the inferior quality of the former. Now I will refer to the home market. This is a most important subject in discussing the trade policy of the country. Prior to the inauguration of the protective policy it was contended that the result would be to largely

increase home production and home consumption, and that contention has been borne out over and over again. Wherever manufacturing industries have been established, a greater number of men have been employed in those industries, and all these men are consumers of manufactured goods and of farm products. There is a vast quantity of vegetables and perishable articles which farmers are not able to ship out of the country, but for which they find a ready sale in the home market, wherever manufacturing business is carried on, because the people have the ready money to pay for those goods. I may say that the farming community for twenty miles about Hamilton find a ready market for their fruit and vegetables. If the farmers were obliged to export those goods, the goods would have to pass through the hands of one or two commission merchants, who would eat up the profits which the farmers now keep for themselves by selling direct to the consumers. I may say that the farmers surrounding Hamilton supply themselves with groceries and a great part of their clothing by the sale of their vegetables and other farm produce in the home market supplied them to-day by the protective policy. So, I claim that the farmers are greatly benefited in that way. All kinds of farm produce meets with ready sale in the city of Hamilton. I contend that the protective policy, instead of having benefited the manufacturers at the expense of the farmers, has benefited the latter class as well as the former. A careful estimate places the entire product of the Ontario farms at $500,000,000, of which about one-tenth is exported, the balance being used for home consumption. This proves that the home market is, by all odds, the best for our farmers. The question to be asked is, Would it be well to jeopardize the home market, which consumes so large a portion of our agricultural products, for the possible good that might arise from the free entry of the one-tenth we have to spare into the markets of the United States? Time and time again the people have said, no. It is claimed that Canada has not prospered under the National Policy, but statistics prove the very reverse. Take the case of our farming population, for instance, and see how it compares with the farming population in the United States. According to the reports of the Ontario Bureau of Industries—and hon. gentlemen opposite will not question the truth of statements issued from that quarter—the value of farm lands, buildings, implements, and live stock in Ontario in 1882 was $882,624,610, while in 1889 it was $982,210,664, an increase of nearly one hundred millions of dollars in seven years in the wealth of the farmers of the province of Ontario alone. Take the condition of the Canadian and American farmers to-day, and what do we find? The farms in the Dominion of Canada are mortgaged to the extent of about $80,000,000, and it is a well-known fact that the greater part of this indebtedness has been incurred in order to improve old farms or acquire new ones. The New York "Times," one of the most reliable journals in the United States, recently made the following statement:—

> The farms in our state (New York) are mortgaged for over $700,000,000. * * * The farmers of the United States are staggering under a burden of mortgage indebtedness approximating nine thousand millions of dollars. The greater portion of the money represented by the faces of these mortgages has not been expended in improving the farms, because the larger proportion were supplied with buildings before the mortgages were laid. The money has been spent to enable the farmers to live.

It is contended that our farmers would be benefited greatly by obtaining free admission for their products into the United States markets. Why? The United States export agricultural products every year to the value of $400,000,000, after supplying home consumption; so it is apparent that it would not be of very great advantage to our farmers to compete in a market already overstocked. Unrestricted reciprocity of trade with the United States would, moreover, seriously affect our trade with Great Britain, for the policy means, if it means anything, that we would have to meet the same duty there as the rest of the world, including the United States, has to meet. In 1878 our exports of animals and their products to Great Britain amounted to the value of $9,060,279, while to the United States it was of the value of $4,483,206; in 1890, the same class of exports to Great Britain amounted to the value of $18,578,722, while to the United States the value was only $5,906,474. So we see the home market was altogether more satisfactory to our farmers. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Rider) referred in the course of his speech to the expenditure on the experimental farm. I was under the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite were the great friends of the farmers; yet they claim that the Government should not have expended so large a sum in furnishing means to educate our farmers in the highest degree possible in regard to agriculture. I am sure the Government have taken all possible means to instruct our farmers, they have issued books of various kinds, and have engaged men of great experience as lecturers, and have adopted other methods to give our products high standing, not only in Canada, but throughout the world, and when the hon. gentleman found fault with the expenditure on the experimental farm, I thought he was certainly not very friendly to the farming community of this country. Diversity of industry is necessary to complete success. No nation that ever attained

to greatness depends on a single industry. Not many years have elapsed since Canada possessed few industries, but, within recent years, a great advance has been made in that respect. A reference to the Statistical Year-Book shows that in Canada in 1881 the capital invested in manufactures only amounted to $7,000,000, with a total yearly output of $209,000,000, and in the past ten years these amounts have been vastly increased, nearly, if not quite, 100 per cent; and I am proud to say that nowhere has that increase been more marked than in the city of Hamilton. When we think of the large amount of wages paid out, and the number of hands employed, the figures speak volumes for our industries, and they indicate the excellent prospects of our Dominion. The public generally are beginning to see—not only Conservatives, but Reformers—that the policy of protection is the best policy for this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of speaking to farmers who live away from manufacturing cities and they tell them that the manufacturers are destroying them and ruining them, and making them pay heavier taxes than they should pay. I will be able to show you, Mr. Speaker, that those who live in the neighbourhood of cities and in manufacturing centres appreciate the benefits conferred upon them by the protective policy and, to my knowledge, in many cases they have set their political feelings aside and have voted for the National Policy, because they know it is to their own interests to do so. There was a by-election in the city of Hamilton about two weeks previous to the last Dominion election, and the Hon. J. M. Gibson, a Liberal, was elected to the Ontario Assembly at that by-election by over 700 majority. But in spite of that, two weeks after, Mr. McKay and myself were elected supporters of the National Policy by over 600 majority. That proves that over 1,000 Reform votes wheeled into line in support of our protective system. Hamilton was generally known as a Reform city, but lately its people have begun to see that the National Policy is for the benefit of property holders and wage-earners, and all classes of the community, and they now support that policy. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the time of the Mackenzie Government you could walk street after street in Hamilton and see "To Lets" on dozens of vacant houses. That is altered now, and bankers, and merchants, and the people generally, know that the change is to be attributed to the policy of the present Government. Our American friends protect their manufactures, and they protect their people as well. If one of our sons goes over to work in the United States the first reception he gets is, that they tap him on the shoulder and say: Young man, go home; whereas we allow United States citizens to come into Canada and take their chances with the rest of us. Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that Canada has made more progress than any other country under the sun, considering her age and population. The high standard of our products prove this. Our cheese ranks as high as that of any other country in the world. Take our apples, our wheat, our barley, our beef and mutton, and they are prized in every market to which we send them. I may say, Sir, that during the latter part of this week I visited New York city, and I was taking dinner with a friend, who said to me: Mr. Ryckman, I suppose you will be glad to have a little Canadian lamb. I replied that I would be glad at any time to take anything Canadian. "Do you know," said my friend, "we pay 3 cents more a pound for Canadian than for American lamb here." I asked, "How is that?" and the answer was: "I do not know whether it is the breed or not, or whether it is fed better, but, at all events, we pay it because we like it better." That shows you, Mr. Speaker, that our products are valued in the American markets. Take our institutions, and we find that they are equal, if not superior, to those of any other country. Our banking system is good, and no one can find fault with it. Our postal system is good. In fact, an American gentleman wrote me last year asking me for some information with regard to our post office order system, and he said that they wanted to improve their system in the United States, and they thought that by adopting something such as we have in Canada they would be much better off. We all know, Sir, that our national credit stands high in the money markets of the world. Let me ask: What have hon. gentlemen opposite to offer to the people of this country in lieu of the policy of the present Government? What policy do they propose to the farmers and to the people of this country generally, at the next election? They have latterly announced that they are in favour of free trade. Well, Sir, if they go to the country on that cry, I have not the slightest doubt that they will be beaten worse than in any previous election since confederation. We are lying alongside a great nation to the south of us with a high protective system in force; and how, in view of that, can any political party honestly appeal to the electorate of this young country on such a policy as free trade? I remember that not very long ago, the Liberal party was not quite so pronounced on the question of free trade as they seem to be at present, and when they shifted their policy around from one scheme to the other. At the present time they are following a somewhat similar course. To the farmers they say: We will give you free trade; but when they are speaking in a manufacturing centre, their cry is: Gentlemen, manufacturers, we are not going to hurt you very much; your protection has got to come down sooner or later, but we will take it down by degrees.

The people of Canada have seventeen years' experience of the policy of the Conservative party, and I have no doubt that at the next election they will support it with greater enthusiasm than ever before. Let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker, some of the progress made by Canada under the National Policy, and I will do so by comparing the year 1881 with the year 1891. In the manufacture of textile fabrics and dress, including cotton and woollen goods, boots and shoes factories, tailors and clothiers, dressmakers, &c., in 1881, there were 10,163 establishments and 60,617 employees. In 1891, there were 17,650 establishments and 80,662 employees. In the industries connected with paper, including printing establishments, the increase in the ten years was 48 per cent in the establishments, and 53 per cent in the number of employees. In the manufacture of machines, tools and implements the increase in the ten years was nearly 30 per cent for employees and the same for establishments. The value of the machinery and tools in the industrial establishments of the Dominion in 1891 was $80,803,265. The total number of industrial establishments in Canada in 1881 was 49,923, with 254,935 employees. In 1891, there were 75,765 establishments and 367,496 employees. In the years between 1875 and 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite ruled the destinies of the country, thousands upon thousands of young men were unable to get employment at home, and were compelled to seek a livelihood upon a foreign soil and under a foreign flag. But, Sir, when the National Policy was adopted in 1878, manufactories and industrial establishments were started, and those young men, previously exiled from Canada were able to find remunerative occupation at home. Our country has great resources; as great as those of any country in the world. We have valuable timber lands, almost inexhaustible mineral resources, productive agricultural lands, and teeming fisheries. We have a fine class of people, good, honest, hard-working men, who love their country, and who are capable of developing it, and under our present protective system there cannot be a doubt that the energy of our people will cause Canada to progress. It must not be forgotten, however, that this Reform party has a record of its own—that its ability to govern this country has been tested fairly in the past, for it held the reins of power in the Dominion for a period of five years. They promised a millenium of prosperity when they obtained office in 1873, and you can all remember the result. Instead of prosperity, there was an era of disaster, distress and deficits such as was never known before or since in the history of Canada. It was no wonder that the people, when the opportunity arrived, swept them out of power, and it is no wonder they have kept them out ever since. Under the Conservative Government, the protection of Canada will continue, and our people will continue to enjoy prosperity as they do now; for I see no chance of the Liberals getting into power so long as our Liberal-Conservative Government adhere to the policy now in force, that is, the policy of regulating our tariff to suit a young country like Canada. So long as they do that, I think they will be satisfactory to the people of this country, and when the next general elections come round, our friends of the Opposition will find that the policy of protection will be endorsed by the ballots of the people. I do not know what the manufacturers of this country will think; but I know that the manufacturers of the city of Hamilton are rather modest people, and, when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gets up here and declares that the manufacturers are plunderers who are taking money out of the pockets of the people, they will, of course, regard his remarks as applying not only to the manufacturers, but to the men they employ, the workingmen; and I think the manufacturers and the workingmen of this country will show their appreciation of the hon. gentleman's remarks when they cast their ballots at the next general elections.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ryckman) took great credit to the National Policy for the starting of the Hamilton Rolling Mills, which he said had been standing idle up to 1878 on account of the trade policy of the Mackenzie Government. When half the truth is told, and only half the truth, it is very misleading; and the hon. gentleman ought to have told this House and the people of the city from which he comes, the real reason why the Hamilton Rolling Mills were lying idle. Those mills were owned by the Great Western Railway Company, and steel rails became so cheap that the company were obliged to abandon the rolling mills which they had used for years for re-rolling the old iron rails. When iron rails were set aside, and steel rails were introduced, the Great Western Company had no further use for the rolling mills. But the hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House that after the National Policy came into operation, in the first year of the existence of the Hamilton Rolling Mills Company under it, they paid a dividend of 75 per cent on their capital; and to-day the same company enjoy a protection of from 30 to 75 per cent—I will not imitate the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he talks of three thousand per cent, which is a kind of calculation which no member of this House understands except himself. My hon. friend from Hamilton also spoke of the foundries in that city running full blast. I would like to tell him and this House that the Hamilton foundries were standing idle for months during the winter; but, because they thought that a general election was

about to take place, the Conservative rooms in the city of Hamilton were opened, and the old placards and the old flag and the old brag and the old swag were unfurled to the breeze, the Tory owners of the Hamilton foundries at once set them to work. I dare say that if they had been in the secret of the Government, their men would have been idle still. My hon. friend spoke of the building trade of Hamilton being bad during the time of the Mackenzie Government. Let me tell him, after an experience of twenty-five years in this country, that the building trade of Canada was never in a worse condition than it is to-day. In the very city the hon. gentleman represents he will find hundreds of idle workingmen walking around looking for work. It is true, they are laying macadam on the streets; but an acquaintance of mine there yesterday told me that the workingmen were only getting an hour or two of work when the contractors saw fit to give it to them. My hon. friend might have told this House how the National Policy had driven R. M. Wanzer out of his factory in Hamilton, a man whose name was known throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and, in fact, in every part of the world where his machines were introduced; but, owing to the protective duties imposed on his raw material, his business was destroyed, and his factory closed. Then, my hon. friend spoke of the smelting works about to be started in the city of Hamilton. I trust that those works will be started, and that they will cost $400,000, as he says they will; but the cost, so far, has been borne by the citizens of Hamilton, who passed a by-law providing that if a certain sum of money was spent in the starting of smelting works, the city would grant a bonus of both land and money; and so far, whether the money has been spent or not, the company have been able to induce the people of Hamilton to give them the money and the land, and that is all that has come of the smelting works, so far as I can see. The building was of so permanent a character that the first gale of wind which swept across the district from which I come, blew to the ground one of those tall chimneys we have heard so much about. My hon. friend also talks of sugar. I do not know where he gets his information; but when we were fighting the sugar combine of Nova Scotia, some of his Conservative friends came to me and asked me to prevent, as far as lay in my power, the organization of the sugar combine that was going to be formed in Halifax. They said it would control the trade of the east, while the Montreal combine would control the trade of the west, and the whole sugar trade of the country would be at the mercy of these two combines. One of these gentlemen told me that when they imported sugar from abroad they were able to make money, but to-day when any one has the courage to import sugar, a doubt is expressed by the customs authorities as to the value of the sugar, it is detained for an examination, and scrutinized; and when, at last, it is passed through the custom-house, the price of sugar drops, the importer has to sacrifice his sugar, and then the combines raise the price to the old figure again. My hon. friend also spoke about the postal service of Canada. Perhaps he is not aware that the postal service of Canada is a branch of the general postal service of Great Britain, and that the United States have as much to do with the postal arrangement between the two countries as the Canadian authorities have, and I am glad to say that on both sides of the line the most amicable postal arrangements are carried on. The hon. gentleman said he would like to know what the Liberal party have to offer the farmers. Well, I can tell him that what we offer the farmers is taxes for revenue only, economy in administration, and no boodling. We were told last session by the late First Minister, who, I regret, has departed, that we would not be able, for some years to come, to get experimental farm reports, because the Government had to economize. The first economy they were to practice was upon the farmer; and if we have to wait until this amount of money is saved by this reckless and extravagant Government, the farmers will never receive a report of the experimental farm. My good friend spoke of young Canadians in the United States coming back to Canada. I regret that too few of them come back; but I have this to say, that our Canadian young men, when they go to the States, are able to take positions there which are alike a credit to themselves and an honour to the country from which they come. There is scarcely a factory or a Government work, or a work of any importance that is not directly or indirectly administered by Canadian young men, and they enjoy the most implicit confidence of their employers. The hon. gentleman says that the National Policy is a benefit to the country, to the farmer and to the merchant. It is not a benefit to all the manufacturers, but only to the favoured few who have the ear of the Government, and for whom the Finance Minister is the mouthpiece on certain occasions. Let me read you this extract from the report of the annual meeting, this year, of the shareholders of the Montreal Cotton Company:

> At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the Montreal Cotton Company, which was held to-day, very satisfactory reports of the year's operations were submitted. The profits for the year were $174,628.28, being about 15 per cent on the capital of $1,200,000. A dividend of 8 per cent, amounting to $84,000, was paid to the shareholders, being 8 per cent for the first nine months on $1,000,000, and on $1,200,000 for the last quarter of the year; $15,000 was taken off the building account, $25,000 put aside for wear and tear of machinery, and $19,000 taken off for new

flumes, making a total of $59,000. There was carried forward to the surplus account $75,652.49. This account now stands at $721,586.55, being over 60 per cent on the capital stock. During the year the company paid $211,616.58 in wages. The balance-sheet shows a total of $2,561,981.91. The only liability of the company is $300,000 7 per cent bonds, which fall due on May 1 next, for payment of which $200,000 new stock has been issued at par. The first call of 50 per cent was paid on January 15 last, and the last call is payable on March 15th next. This will increase the capital $1,400,000, the company being free of all incumbrances.

Now, the other night the Minister of Railways and Canals wanted to show that the province of Ontario had increased in ten years $95,000,000 in wealth. He said that in lands there was a decrease but that the increase was in the buildings, the implements and the live stock. But where are the buildings? Does the hon. Minister pretend to say that the buildings have been stolen? Are they not still on the land? And where are the implements? To whom do they belong? Not to the farmers, I am sorry to say, but to the manufacturers who hold a rod of iron over the backs of the farmers and exact heavy interest on the unpaid portion of these implements. I would like to state for the information of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Ryckman), a few facts in connection with the depreciation of land in Ontario. This is no problematical or hypothetical statement at all, but it is the actual facts furnished by a company, from the very city which the hon. gentleman has the honour to represent. Well, this company states that lands have depreciated as follows:—

Counties—	Per cent.
Essex, Kent and Lambton	30 to 40
Huron, Bruce and Grey	40
Elgin, Oxford and parts of Middlesex	20 to 30
Wellington and Simcoe	30 to 40
Ontario, Durham and Northumberland	35
Hastings and Prince Edward	35 to 50
Lennox and Frontenac	40 to 50
Dundas, Stormont and Russell	25 to 30

In the township of St. Vincent, county of Grey, 161 acres of land, which were valued in 1887 at $5,500, the company is prepared to sell to-day for $3,500, or a depreciation of $3,000.

In the township of Arran, county of Bruce, 100 acres of land, which were valued in 1887 at $2,500, were sold last year by the company for $1,200.

In the township of Kincardine, county of Bruce, 150 acres, valued in 1879 at $5,000, were sold in 1894 for $2,000.

In the township of Goderich, county of Huron, a farm of 180 acres, valued in 1886 at $6,000, is now offered by the company at $3,500.

In the township of Camden, county of Kent, a farm of 150 acres, valued in 1888 at $10,500, was sold in 1894 at $7,500.

In the township of Anderdon, county of Essex, a farm of 100 acres, valued in 1886 at $6,000, is now offered for sale by the company at $2,800.

In the township of Hallawell, Prince Edward county, 174 acres, valued in 1889 at $7,500, the company will now sell for $3,000.

In the township of Athol, Prince Edward county, 100 acres of land, valued in 1887 at $5,000, the company will now sell at $2,800.

In the township of Fredericksburg, Lennox county, a farm of 200 acres, which was valued at and sold in 1879 for $14,000, cash, the company is offering for sale now at $8,500, and the best offer they have got, so far, is $7,500.

The company add:

There are many cases yet similar to these that could be given, and, from the experience of the society, we consider the estimate given above as to the shrinkage in value quite moderate. As to the towns and villages in western Ontario—for instance, Harriston, Wallaceburg, Essex Centre, Chatham, Collingwood and nearly all towns of similar size and population—they have depreciated nearly 50 per cent in value.

The hon. gentleman has said that protection has done a great deal for the workingman and that it has raised his condition. I would like to read to this House what Macaulay says in this connection:

Our rulers will best promote the improvements of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment, maintaining peace by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the state. Let the Government do this; the people will assuredly do the rest.

How does this apply to our Government, with their Curran bridges, Tay canals, Langevin blocks, and Kingston graving docks? The ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Patterson), in one of his campaign speeches, is reported to have said that the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie was the man who built the Tay Canal. Was ever such a slander cast upon an honest man as this? But no doubt it is in keeping with the statement made by the same gentleman that if the Government failed in ballots they could use bullets to secure their election. Fancy the late Mr. Mackenzie consenting to a work that cost $470,000, the annual outlay in interest on which is $18,815, the annual expenditure of operating which is $2,500, and the cost of maintenance, $2,000 per mile, or $12,000 for the six miles, making in all an annual expenditure on a canal of six miles long of $33,315, and for the whole of this annual outlay of $33,315, the people of Canada had the satisfaction in 1891 of receiving $58.81, and in 1894, $130.62, total revenue. This is in keeping with the whole of the work, and this was done, Mr. Speaker, to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The people of this country spend $33,315 a year in order that the people of Perth may use this canal, to the increase of the revenue of the country by from $130 to $150 a year. Then we have our Curran bridge, and I am glad the Solicitor General is in his place, because he knows something about the work in connection with this famous enterprise. The total cost, as given by the Government's engineer's report, was $490,725. The total estimated cost was $170,000, or a

difference between the estimated cost and the actual cost of $320,725. This estimate of $170,000 as the cost of the bridge was made by the late Mr. Page, chief engineer of canals. We have never had before, and I doubt that we shall ever have again a man more capable of carrying on the duties of his department than Mr. Page. The name of Mr. Page was never touched by the breath of scandal. No contractor of experience would hesitate to undertake any piece of work under the estimate made by Mr. Page, and no estimate made by him and submitted to this House, either when Mr. Mackenzie was in power or under this Conservative Government, had to be increased. When Mr. Page reported this estimate of $170,000 for the bridge, Mr. Hannaford, of the Grand Trunk Railway, expressed his willingness to undertake the work for the amount. But that was not the policy of the Government. They allowed months to elapse, and then, at the eleventh hour they offered the work to the Grand Trunk, providing they would guarantee the opening of navigation on the 1st of May. But Mr. Hannaford, as the engineer of a great corporation like the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was not going to place his company at the mercy of the Government, and he very properly refused to undertake the work upon the terms offered. Then our friend St. Louis was called in to do the work. And how well he managed it! According to the report of the commissioners, it was reported by the engineer in charge that on 1st March, 1893, three-quarters of the stone on Wellington Street bridge had been cut, the work occupying 17,259 hours. But to finish the last quarter of this work required 32,804 hours. And on the Grand Trunk bridge, on the same date, 1st March, 1893, half of the stone was cut, 5,115 hours having been occupied in cutting it. But to cut the remainder of the stone required 52,075 hours, or a total of 57,190 hours. And for lock No. 1, Mr. Speaker, it actually cost the Government no less than $67 a yard to cut the stone. Why, as a practical man, I would cut the faces of all the members of the Cabinet and the two Controllers on every stone at that price per cubic yard, and I would throw in the Solicitor General in full length as being the best-looking member of the Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, they went out of their way to find means of spending the money. There was a railway running from the quarries at Terrebonne to the line of the Grand Trunk, from which the stone could have been unloaded upon the works. But it did not suit Mr. St. Louis to use that railway; he had no profits where the Grand Trunk were concerned. And so the stone was teamed twenty-two miles; and even after teaming it twenty-two miles it was found that they had a false charge for teaming that never was performed to the amount of $12,712. And the management of the rest of the canal was in keeping with this part. We find that the expenditures for repairs and general management on the Lachine Canal increased rapidly. The report said:

> Mr. Kennedy was appointed superintendent of the Lachine Canal in November, 1890. A comparison has been made of the expenditure for repairs previous to Mr. Kennedy's appointment, since 1879, and has been divided into periods of three years each, to correspond with the time during which he held office, nearly three years, until suspended.

The Government puts it this way:

Repairs cost—		Increase.
From 1879 to 1881.....	$ 42,512 73	.....
do 1882 to 1884.....	54,999 29	$12,486 56
do 1885 to 1887.....	61,966 77	6,967 48
do 1888 to 1890.....	65,956 73	3,989 96
do 1891 to 1893.....	155,409 39	89,452 66

Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures are entirely misleading, because each increase is counted on the basis of comparison with the expenditure of the period immediately preceding it. But in order to find the real increase, we must compare the expenditure of every period with that of the period from 1879 to 1891. On that basis we find the increases to be as follows:—

	Increase.
From 1879 to 1881.....	.....
do 1882 to 1884.....	$ 12,486 56
do 1885 to 1887.....	19,454 04
do 1888 to 1890.....	23,444 00
do 1891 to 1893.....	112,896 66

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the Government prosecuting the criminals. There was one criminal, however, whom I have not heard referred to in this House; I mean the man who appropriated in one night from the banks of the Lachine Canal some 450 sticks of timber from 25 to 30 feet in length, 12 inches by 12. The Government has never made any effort to secure the conviction of that person, because they knew that if convicted he would have to be sent to jail, and our Canadian jails are not exactly hospitals, not exactly places of retreat for the benefit of the health of those who occupy them. Up in Prince Albert, I see by the records, a boy who stole a half a cord of wood got eighteen months in jail. I suppose you would call that petty larceny, and, if so, the stealing of the 450 pieces of timber I have mentioned might well be called grand larceny. So, while petty larceny gets eighteen months in jail, grand larceny goes scot free. While I do not pose as one who is in favour of increasing the public expenditure, I still think that, in this particular instance, a change should be made in the Department of Railways and Canals. In the case of the Intercolonial Railway the Government take credit for reducing the expenses and bringing about a balance between revenue and expenditure. But, when it comes to expenditure of this kind we find that they try to shift the responsibility to others.

Now, I claim that no living man can occupy the positions of chief engineer of canals, Deputy Minister, and chief engineer of railways. The position of Chief Engineer of Canals was held by the late Mr. Page, who was an able man, and I may say, with all due respect to the present chief engineer, an abler man than the present incumbent of that office. I claim that every one of these positions ought to have a responsible head, instead of one man trying to manage all three. The reason that all this scheming took place on the Curran bridge was simply because Mr. Schreiber had too many other duties to perform, and he had not the time to look after all the details of these various jobs. Therefore, I claim that in each of these departments we ought to have a responsible head who would be able to give his whole time and attention to that particular branch of the public business. Now, we are told by our Conservative friends, as if it was something they were proud of, that Britain's greatness has departed. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance where he goes when he wants to borrow money. Where does he go when he wants to replace the money that has been stolen in the various ways that I have indicated? Why, of course, to Great Britain. Great Britain lends to the world. Let me read him this statement of a high authority:

All the world appears to be in debt to Great Britain. Mr. Burdett, a statistical writer of some note, in his "Official Intelligence," estimates that the amount of foreign stocks held in Great Britain aggregates the enormous total of $3,819,035,000, and the interest receivable upon them is $145,000,000 per annum. The Boston "Herald" commends these figures to the notice of American protectionists and silverites. As Great Britain has a gold standard and a low revenue tariff, according to the doctrine of American silverites and of Canadian and American protectionists she ought to be sunk in the depths of poverty, but she manages some way to get all the world in debt to her and to keep it in that position. More than that, her ocean marine is larger than that of the United States, Sweden and Norway, Germany and France combined. She does over 60 per cent of the ocean-carrying trade of the world, and her foreign commerce is equal to that of any two of the great powers of the world combined, with Canada's foreign trade thrown in. That is pretty fair, is it not, for an old, effete, free trade country, whose people refuse to take any stock in the beneficent (?) system of protection which Canada and the United States persist in keeping hanging around their necks to dwarf national development and retard national progress.

Sir, we find that in 1880 the gross exports of Great Britain were £286,000,000 or $1,430,000,000; in 1890, her gross exports were, £328,000,000 or $1,640,000,000, an increase in ten years of $210,000,000, or 15 per cent. The exports of Great Britain to the United States increased during that period from £38,000,000 to £42,500,000, or $22,500,000. During the decade from 1880 to 1890, Canada's exports increased from $88,000,000 to $97,000,000, only $9,000,000, or 8 per cent. During that decade Great Britain reduced her national debt by $450,000,000; while Canada increased hers by $100,000,000, or 50 per cent. Yet, Sir, the hon. Minister of Justice, whom I am glad to see back in the House again, said that Great Britain was being driven from the civilized markets of the world; that every year her output was decreasing; that she was spending millions on her army and navy to force her wares and her goods and other merchandise, into the uncivilized markets of the world. This is the testimony of the distinguished statesman who has been honoured by Her Majesty. This is his gratitude for the honours bestowed upon him. Well, Sir, let us see how our trade stands with the West Indies. In 1875, we had a trade with the West Indies of $3,945,000; in 1876, it dropped to $3,675,000; in 1892, it had dropped to $3,546,000; in 1893, it had dropped again to $3,145,000; or $800,000 less in 1893 than in 1875. This decrease in our trade with that country took place in spite of the fact that the Hon. John Macdonald, of Toronto, was sent there for the purpose of working up a trade; and in spite of the trip of the Minister of Finance himself for the same purpose. We remember also that our estimable friend, Mr. Adam Brown of Hamilton, went on several occasions to the West Indies for the purpose of increasing our foreign trade; but in spite of all these efforts it has steadily decreased. Now, the Minister of Railways, as well as the Minister of Finance, had something to say about our western trip; but he did not tell the House very much about his own western trip. He was coldly received in some places, especially in the skating rink in Winnipeg. It was a little warmer for him in Moosomin, and we remember reading that the Minister of Agriculture told the farmers up there to go into mixed farming—at least so it is said in the west. At all events, we heard that when he reached the British Columbia coast that the miners came before him to complain about the duties that were exacted from them upon their mining machinery, the Minister of Agriculture, who I understand, is not a practical farmer, told the miners of British Columbia to go into mixed farming. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways said that we went out there to make promises. We did not do anything of the kind. We found that the town of Revelstoke, where our good friend from Yale (Mr. Mara) resides, was nearly half destroyed by the river; and when the people told us that the Government had no money to expend upon necessary public works, we told them what we are prepared to repeat from our places in the House, that there had been enough money stolen in connection with Curran bridges, and misapplied on Tay canals, to do all the work at Revelstoke. But the people had another complaint to make; they wanted to hold their land more

securely than they were able to do. We found that the only gentleman who had any patent for his land was the hon. member for Yale, but no other man in that locality had any title deed for his property. Perhaps, however, that state of affairs may have been improved since then. Next, we find that in going up to Edmonton, they crossed the river in an old-fashioned ferry. I would like the Minister of Finance to visit that place, and more especially the Solicitor General. The people of that place want a bridge built. Well, there are no cousins of the Minister of Public Works living in Edmonton. It is a long way from Laval up to Edmonton, but I suppose the Minister of Public Works could send some of his constituents up there to secure votes for him. Still the Ministers were very liberal in their offers to the people of Edmonton ; they were willing to build a bridge for them provided the town supplied half the money. Fancy a Government that was generous enough to spend $18,000 at Laprairie, for a little post office where the income is less than $300, making such an offer as this to the people of Edmonton. The Government were willing to spend $18,000 for a useless piece of work in a little village, and the only excuse the Minister of Public Works was able to give was that it would adorn the banks of the St. Lawrence. But away out in the Saskatchewan district, where the people have to run the risk of their lives in crossing and re-crossing the river, the people can only get a bridge provided, because there are no relations there of the Minister of Public Works, if the town will supply half the money. At Prince Albert, the public buildings were so poorly built that the people had to put up timbers and shores to prevent them falling upon those who were obliged to use them. What does this mean ? It simply means that where money cannot be stolen the work is made to suffer. It is the same with every public work. No public work has been constructed by the present Government that did not cost from 25 to 100 per cent in excess of the estimate, and, in the case of the Curran bridge, the cost was two and three-quarter times more than the estimate. So far as this debate has gone, no speaker on the Government side of the House, and no member of the Government has made the promise that in future honesty would be observed. The Government simply called on their followers to vote down the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but they never indicated by word or deed that they would reform their administration by conducting the affairs of the country in an honest manner. We were told by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Ryckman) that the banks and insurance associations were in a flourishing condition. It is the first time in my life that I knew the Finance Minister had anything to do with the insurance companies. I had the idea that our large corporations were conducted by general managers and boards of directors ; but it now appears that every institution that is successful owes its success to the Government of the day. Nothing is said about the Candian Pacific Railway not paying a dividend, or the Grand Trunk Railway receipts falling short of expenditure ; but hon. gentlemen opposite claimed that the Canada Life was a glorious institution, and they pointed to the large number of people who have taken policies in that company. I am glad of the fact ; but that is no sign of prosperity : it is rather the reverse. It is true that many men of means insure their lives, but the general run of people insure largely for want of money to enable them, in some other way, to make provision for their families after their decease. We are told that the banks and savings banks have larger deposits than formerly. I should like the Minister of Finance to go to the bank with which I am connected, and tell the manager how to prevent a reduction of circulation, for the bank's circulation has diminished nearly 15 per cent. It is not a sign of good times, but of bad times ; it is a sign that the people have no confidence in business, and are putting their money into the banks instead of investing it in business enterprises. Yet the Government glory in the fact that there is more money in the banks to-day than there was many years ago. It may be so ; but there is less work being done in the country than there was some years ago. Instead of credit being taken by the Dominion Government for the condition of our banking and insurance institutions, it should be given where it belongs, to Mr. Ramsay of the Canada Life, to Mr. Walker, of the Bank of Commerce, to Mr. Clouston, of the Bank of Montreal, and many others. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Ryckman) spoke with great emphasis on the condition of workingmen in Canada, as compared with the condition of workingmen in Great Britain. It is true that, relatively speaking, the wages of the mechanic in Canada are higher than those of the mechanic in Great Britain, but the social condition of the British workman is better, his amusements are more varied, cheaper, and better, his rentals are less ; his clothes are cheaper and better, and last longer ; and the purchasing power of his dollar is greater than here. When it suits the Tories, they are loyal ; but when it suits Tory interests, hon. gentlemen opposite run down everything English. If the Liberals were to speak as violently against Great Britain as do hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House, every hon. member opposite would call the Liberals traitors on every platform in the country. I am sorry the Controller of Customs is not in his place, because I desire to refer to a statement made by him when he was going

over the works carried out in this country, in the course of his speech I mentioned that the hon. gentleman had forgotten to enumerate among the canals built, the Tay canal. The hon. Controller then claimed that the Tay canal was part of my stock in trade. I want to tell this House that I have always been able to live by my trade, and never had to place myself on the country to support me. As I understand it, the Controller's stock in trade, more particularly, is connected with following a fife and drum band on the 12th July. That hon. gentleman is a man who, although Controller of Customs, never imported a dollar's worth of goods in his life. He is a man whom no one would hire at $50 per month to conduct his business; and if he did so, it would involve a loss. Hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly wanting to know the opinions of our leader. Where was the Controller when the Haldimand election was going on? Where did he go? He visited Washington, in order to get posted on the way to conduct his departmental business—and the hon. gentleman needs instruction. Mr. Speaker, the last hon. member who addressed the House laid great stress on the opportunity that would be given the Liberal party at the next general elections. We are ready for the general elections. I think more ready than are hon. gentlemen opposite. We were ready last spring, we hoped that the Government would then bring on the general elections, and I am told that if the opinions of some members of the Government had been taken, the elections would have been brought on, but a difference of opinion prevailed in the Cabinet. I am satisfied, however, that when the time comes the people will rise in their might and remove the incapable men who are now controlling the affairs of our country, and place honest, efficient, able and loyal men at the head of the Government.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I do not propose to follow the bad example of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in referring to personalities during the present discussion. Instead of discussing the financial or fiscal policy of the Government, and the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, the hon. gentleman wandered over every subject connected with scandals, and matters of that kind. I do not propose to make a lengthy speech, but I will refer briefly to some of the statements made during the debate. The burden of the song of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the Opposition side of the House has been with respect to the iniquities of the National Policy. Now, I am not at all sure that these hon. gentlemen opposite know what the National Policy is. At all events, Sir, if we take into account their mode of discussing it, we would imagine that they did not understand it. It does not mean simply a tariff for high protection. That is not the whole of it. The National Policy is not simply for arranging the tariff in such a way as best to promote and encourage the industries of the country without placing unnecessary or undue burdens on the people. It means also the building up of great and important works, and the deepening and enlarging the canals of the country in order that the products of the farmers may be carried to the seaboard as cheaply as possible. It also means establishing experimental farms, and encouraging industries specially connected with the farming operations, such as cheese factories, and creameries, and establishments of that kind. Taking it as a whole, that is the National Policy. I want to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the tariff. I maintain that the tariff we have at present is not one whit higher than it was during the time of the Mackenzie Government (when the hon. member for South Oxford was Minister of Finance), so fas as the total duty upon each article imported is concerned. So far as the consumer has to pay upon the separate article, the duties under the Mackenzie Government were just as high as they are to-day. The rate was 17½ per cent then all round, and let us suppose that it is now 25 or 30 per cent according to the nature of the article. But hon. gentlemen must remember that the cost of the articles in those days was a great deal more than it is at the present time. For instance, cloth that was sold at $1 a yard then, can be bought to-day for 50 cents a yard, and 17½ per cent upon a dollar is quite as much as a duty of 25 or 30 per cent on cloth that cost 50 cents per yard. Therefore the actual expense to the consumer was as great, if not greater, during the time that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Minister of Finance than it is to-day. I wish the House to bear this in mind, because it will have some bearing on an extraordinary statement by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman as reported on page 553 of "Hansard," said:

> Before this debate is through I intend to prove—and if I were not to undertake it, there are fifty good men and true on this side of the House able and willing to do so—that the actual taxation taken out of the pockets of the people is $60,000,000 a year, as against $20,000,000 per year, which was all we ever exacted.

I do not suppose, Sir, that any person could believe in the actual correctness of that statement, and I question very much if the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself, if he had taken time to consider, would be prepared to guarantee the statement as being correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. We can prove it, too.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I question very much if the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) could prove that, notwithstanding

all his great abilities. I suppose he thinks himself quite as able a man as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I am perfectly sure that neither of the hon. gentlemen can prove the statement to be correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in another part of his speech, says :

So far as a tariff is protective, the measure of the taxation is the total consumption of imported goods, plus the goods manufactured under that tariff in the country. Where those goods are double the amount imported, the tax will take $3 out of the pockets of the people for every $1 which it puts into the treasury. Where the goods manufactured in the country under the tariff are four or five times the amount of the goods imported, then you may fairly conclude that it will take four or five times more out of the pockets of the people than it puts into the treasury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we can get at the absurdity of a statement of that kind if we compare the imports of the year 1878 with what they are to-day. I have not made any special calculations as to what these imports were, but I have taken as correct—and I suppose hon. members on the opposite side of the House will take it to be correct also—the statement made by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). At page 999 of "Hansard," he says :

In 1877 we imported from foreign countries only $1 worth of furniture for every $13 worth manufactured in Canada. We imported only $1 worth of carriages for $52 worth we manufactured in Canada. In clothing, we imported $1 worth for $57 worth manufactured here ; in spikes, nails, tacks, and other manufactures of that kind, $1 imported to $10 worth manufactured here ; in boots and shoes—which were particularly mentioned by public speakers and hon. members as an item in which American competition was particularly severe—we imported $1 worth for $69 worth manufactured here ; in saddlery and harness, $1 imported to $73 manufactured ; in other goods of all kinds, $1 to $26 ; in woollen goods, $1 to $17 ; in machinery of all kinds, $1 to $27 ; agricultural implements, $1 to $14.

Now, if you apply this statement of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) to the argument of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it will be seen wherein the absurdity of the argument consists. If we imported $1 worth of furniture for every 13 manufactured in Canada in 1887, and then remember what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said :

Where the goods manufactured in the country under the tariff are four or five times the amount of the goods imported, then you may fairly conclude that it will take four or five times more out of the pockets of the people than it puts into the treasury.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not four times.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Yes, if there were four times as much manufactured in the country as imported, then there were four times as much taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, according to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). But according to the member for East Huron, there were thirteen times as much manufactured in Canada as was imported in 1877, and, therefore, there were thirteen times as much taken out of the pockets of the people of this country during the Mackenzie Government as was put into the treasury. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) also stated that in 1878 we imported only $1 worth of carriages for $52 worth we manufactured in Canada, and, therefore, there were $52 taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada for every dollar put into the treasury during Mr. Mackenzie's Government. With reference to boots and shoes, $69 would be taken out of the pockets of the people for every dollar put into the treasury, and in the case of saddlery and harness, $53 was taken out of the pockets of the people for every dollar put into the treasury during the time of the Mackenzie regime. On woollen goods $17, on machinery of all kinds $27, on agricultural implements of all kinds $14, would be taken out of the pockets of the people for every dollar that went into the treasury, according to the arguments of these two hon. gentlemen. On the 8th of May, the hon. member for East Huron went on to say that of eighteen leading articles, representing a total of $73,263,000, manufactured in Canada, we only imported $3,624,000 worth, or in the relation of about $1 to $20. So that, taking all those articles together and averaging them, for every dollar that went into the treasury in the year 1878, $20 was taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, and, I suppose, according to the arguments of the Opposition, was pocketed by the manufacturers and others who were receiving some benefit from the tariff of those days. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a very fair and reasonable comparison, on the line the hon. member for South Oxford took in his speech in reply to the Budget speech of the Finance Minister. The hon. member for South Oxford said that a thousand millions of dollars had been taken out of the pockets of the people of this country during the last sixteen years. It is astonishing how the members of the Opposition can handle these millions in the reckless way they do. But, if so much money has been taken out of the pockets of the people of this country within that time, I would like to ask how is it possible that the people are so well off as they are? I think it is paying a very great tribute to the National Policy that, notwithstanding the fact that one thousand millions of dollars have been taken out of the pockets of the people, they

are still in the extraordinarily prosperous condition they are. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman's arguments or statements are correct; I am only pointing out the absurdity of them and of many of the contentions of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. The hon. member for South Oxford said, as reported, on page 657 of "Hansard": "I know that very large classes of the community are much poorer." I totally dissent from any such statement as that; I think it is wholly and utterly unfounded. Any person who knows anything of the condition of our people, of the farmers and labouring classes especially, must know that the people of this country are vastly more prosperous than they were in 1878. There is not a shadow of doubt on that point. I know it of my own personal knowledge: I know it by going among the farming community and among the labouring classes generally. One has only to visit the farmers in their homes to see the luxury in which they live to-day as compared with 1878, to be satisfied that the people of this country have very much improved in their condition and prospects since the National Policy came into force. In another place, on page 656 of "Hansard," the hon. member for South Oxford said: "The enormous taxation under which we laboured in 1894-95 as against the taxation which existed in 1878." Now, this is another very serious error. I think a comparison of the taxation will show that there is very little difference between the taxation of to-day and the taxation of 1874. In the six months ending December 31st, 1894, goods to the value of $54,572,395 were imported into Canada, upon which a tariff taxation of $8,701,037 was imposed, being at the rate of 15·9 per cent. How does that compare with former periods? In 1876, the rate of taxation upon imports was 13·14 per cent; in 1878, it was 14·03 per cent; in 1881, a period of great prosperity, it was 20·19 per cent: and in 1889, also a year of business activity and material progress, it was 21·65 per cent. That is to say, the tariff taxation now levied is 4·7 per cent less than it was five years ago, and only 1·9 per cent higher than in 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Government. If we take the per capita contribution to federal revenue through the customs tariff, the talk of excessive taxation is found to be equally groundless. In 1872, the amount of duties paid per head of population was $3.61, and that was under a low tariff; in 1873, the amount was $3.55 per head; in 1874, it was $3.77; in 1875, $3.95; and in 1878, $3.13. Since the revenue tariff period, as it is called, the rate has been a good deal higher, rising to $5.23 per head in 1883, and again to $5.02 in 1889; but since the latter year, in consequence of the abolition of the sugar duties and a general scaling down of rates, the per capita taxation has steadily declined, until, in the last half of 1894, it amounted to only $3.43 per head of population for the whole year, or just 30 cents a head more than in 1878, when the hon. member for South Oxford controlled our fiscal policy. Therefore, the statement of the hon. member about the enormous taxation under which we laboured in 1894-95, as against the taxation which existed in 1878, is wholly groundless. There was one remark made by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) to which I would like to refer. He complained very bitterly that in his vicinity factories of various kinds—I think he specially referred to cotton factories—had been closed, and he made a very mournful lament about the number of hands that had been thrown out of employment—men who had built homes for themselves and who had been obliged to go away to other parts of the country for work. Now, I have no doubt at all that there have been factories closed for various causes. That is not to be wondered at. The National Policy does not furnish brains or intelligence to every person who wishes to go into a manufacturing industry. It only gives assistance and encouragement, which is all that can possibly be done, by arranging the tariff in such a way that manufacturing industries can be built up. But factories will be obliged to close unless they keep up with the times in having machinery of the most improved kind and the best skill that can be got. That is the case not only in this country. We know very well that in England, the home of free trade, the policy which is so much held up for imitation by our friends on the Opposition side of the House, there are factories closed all over the country for precisely the same reason—because their machinery has become old and antiquated, and they are unable to compete with factories equipped on the latest and most improved principles. That would be so in every country, and I think it is entirely beside the question to blame the National Policy, because some factories or some establishments have been obliged to close down. That happens in every country's period. Now, Sir, I think there can be no question whatever in the minds of reasonable, intelligent men, that the country has made enormous progress since the National Policy came into force.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because of the policy?

Mr. ROSAMOND. Because of the encouragement which that policy has given. That is exactly what I meant to say. Every one knows that almost immediately after the National Policy came into force, business men generally embarked in new enterprises, spent their capital in building new mills, and buying the latest machinery, confident that they were going to be en-

couraged by the arrangement of the tariff, and that in place of the opposition, they would have the support of the Government, and business enterprises of all kinds took a start forward and improved very much. I think that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) knows that very well. He knows that in his own county the same improvement took place that was witnessed in every other county. The hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) complains that when agricultural implements were exported from this country, the manufacturers got a rebate of duty equal to 99 per cent of the duties on the raw material used in the manufacture of these implements. I think that is perfectly reasonable. It is certainly not a matter which can be charged against this Government any more than the Mackenzie Government. The same thing was done under the Mackenzie Government in precisely the same way, and I do not see, therefore, why any charge should lie against this Government on that account. The hon. gentleman forgot that the farming interest get the benefit of this rebate, because any manufacturer who makes a large quantity of implements can manufacture them more cheaply than if he made only a small quantity. The effect, therefore, of this rebate, by increasing the output of the Canadian manufacturer, enables him to give the farmers the benefit of the decreased cost.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman's version of a statement that I made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman rising to a point of order?

Mr. ROSAMOND. I would be glad if the hon. member were allowed to make his statement.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman says that I made the statement that under the Mackenzie Government agricultural implements were allowed to come into the country through local societies. That is not correct. Mr. Mackenzie did not do so.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made the statement he has, because it is not at all what I was referring to. I was not at all referring to anything my hon. friend has spoken of. It was not to his remarks, but to those of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that I was replying. That hon. gentleman said that the exporters of agricultural implements were allowed a rebate of 99 per cent of the duties which were charged on the raw material that went into the manufacture of these implements. I do not remember that my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) made any statement of that kind. At all events, I was not alluding to anything he said. The principle of giving a rebate of the duties upon articles exported out of the country was in existence under the Mackenzie Government precisely as it is now. It may not have been given on the same articles, or to the same extent, but the principle existed exactly as it does to-day. In referring to the comparison of taxation, I wish, also, to refer to the degree of prosperity which existed during the regime of Mr. Mackenzie, and that which now exists. I know very well that some of the statistics which have been produced by this side have been criticised, but I think that the statistics furnished by the banks will not be questioned. They are sworn to, or, at all events, certified to, by credible men connected with our banking institutions. If we refer to the period of the Mackenzie Government from 1874 to 1878, we find that the note circulation of the country was, in 1874, $27,904,000, and that in 1878 it had fallen to $20,475,000. In 1874 the total deposits amounted to $77,113,000, and in 1878 they had fallen to $70,856,000. The discounts to the people of the country in 1874 were $131,680,000, and in 1878, $113,485,000. The total assets in 1874 were $187,921,000, and in 1878, $175,450,000. Of course, it will be said, and said correctly, that that was a time of very great depression, but I think that no intelligent man will refuse to admit that the depression of the last five years has exceeded, in intensity, very largely, that of 1874-78. Now, it would be a fair comparison to take the last five years and compare them with the five years of the Mackenzie Administration. The note circulation in 1889 amounted to $32,207,000; and in 1893, notwithstanding the depression, it had increased to $33,811,000. The total deposits, which, in 1889, were $134,650,000, had risen, in 1894, to $174,776,000. The discounts to the people in 1889 amounted to $149,958,000; and in 1893 they had increased to $205,623,000. The total assets were, in 1889, $253,789,000; and in 1893 they had risen to $302,696,000. That, I think, is a fair measure of the difference between the two policies. During the Mackenzie regime, in all these instances, the amounts had steadily decreased. That was a time of depression, I grant you; but from 1889 to 1893, a time of still greater depression, they had steadily risen. This is an exceedingly fair comparison of the results of the two policies. One hon. gentleman—I am not sure whether it was the last speaker or not—referred to the general depression in farm lands in this country. I hold that that is not a fair representation of the matter at all. We know very well that farms all over the world have fallen in value; it is not a thing peculiar to Canada at all. If the value of farm lands have fallen in Ontario and the older provinces, they have fallen to a still greater extent in England, the home of free trade. I simply refer to this because we know that hon. gentlemen opposite are ask-

ing us to adopt a policy of free trade. Speaking of that policy, I suppose none of us quite know what is the policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has been repeated often enough.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. gentleman says that it has been repeated often enough. It has been repeated often enough, perhaps, but it has not been twice stated the same. For instance, we had the hon. leader of the Opposition in Winnipeg saying:

> We shall give you free trade, and, although it will be a hard fight, we shall not give in one inch or retrace one step until we have reached the goal, and that goal is the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day.

But he did not sing the same tune when he got to Montreal, for there he did not say "the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day," but he said:

> The step in England was all the way from protection to free trade; whereas we propose in Canada to go from protection to a revenue tariff.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Now we have it.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. gentleman says now we have it; but the leader of the Opposition did not say the same on these two occasions.

Mr. LAURIER. Just the same.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I submit that no person will say they are the same. Free trade as it is in England is entirely distinct from a revenue tariff. At Toronto the hon. gentleman spoke somewhat differently from his speech in Montreal. So I think that we on the Conservative side of the House are not to blame if we do not understand really what hon. gentlemen opposite are driving at. And I imagine that when the country comes to vote at the next election they will find just as great difficulty in understanding what the hon. gentlemen propose to do. The people are satisfied that they know what the present Government is doing. We know that the country has prospered, notwithstanding the depression and hard times throughout the world; and we know that Canada has stood the strain of that depression better than any other country in the world. That is a fact known to every business man in the country, known to every banker in the country, and I believe that it will be to the interest of the people of this country, to the interest of the farmers, of the workmen and of the great body of consumers that the policy which has been so successfully carried out for the last sixteen years should be maintained for the next sixteen years to come; and I have no doubt but that it will be. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the attention with which I have been heard.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) had just finished his speech. I am free to confess to a feeling of more than ordinary disappointment at that speech. The hon. gentleman rarely challenges the attention of the House, and when he does he generally speaks pointedly and with effect. On this occasion I had anticipated that, as he was specially interested in the subject-matter the House was discussing, being himself one of the protected manufacturers, the House would have had the advantage of hearing from his lips the case put as strongly, from their standpoint, as it could be put. And I suppose I must do the hon. gentleman the justice to hold that the case was put from his standpoint as strongly as he was able to put it. And yet, if that was the strength of the case, then we must all acknowledge that the case is an exceedingly weak one. The hon. gentleman commenced by stating that the existing tariff, the National Policy tariff is practically not one whit higher than was the tariff under Mr. Mackenzie; that though the present tariff is from 30 to 31 per cent and the tariff under Mr. Mackenzie only 17½ per cent, still, under the peculiar condition of things now existing as compared with the condition of things then, the tariff of to-day is no higher than the other. The hon. gentleman said that cloths which were then selling for $1 are now to be purchased for 50 cents, or only one-half the price at the time of the old tariff, and, that being the case, they were not more highly taxed at 31 per cent now than they were at 17½ per cent then. Sir, there is a good deal of ground for the hon. gentleman's contention. I call his attention, however, to a factor which he omitted to notice in his remarks—the item of specific duties which ignores the value of the goods altogether and which were present in the existing tariff, but were not present to any considerable extent in the tariff with which he compared it. I call attention also to the remarkable admission made in the hon. gentleman's speech, an admission that I hope every tax-payer in the country will recognize and appreciate—that, notwithstanding that goods have fallen in value at least one-half, we have adopted a policy so onerous that the consumer is obliged to pay as much as formerly; in other words, the consumer gets no benefit whatever from the cheapening of goods which is going on from year to year throughout the world. If this is true, it is an acceptance of one of the strong points which we have urged from time to time against the National Policy. Surely every hon. gentleman will concede that it is right and that it is desirable that, as goods become cheapened in the markets of the world, the consumer here should share in the benefits. But the protectionist policy as set forth by the hon.

member for North Lanark says: No; as goods decrease in value so we will increase the taxes you pay, so that at no time and under no circumstances can you hope to have cheaper goods than you had in former years.

The hon. gentleman went on to deny certain statements made by my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) with regard to the volume of taxation paid by the people of this country. I hoped that an hon. gentleman of the care and prudence of the hon. member for North Lanark, would have gone further than a mere denial of my hon. friend's statements. I thought, from the vigour with which the hon. gentleman denied the truth of the statement, that he would be at least prepared to advance some fact or argument in support of his denial. But the hon. gentleman seemed satisfied to place his denial against the statement of my hon. friend beside me, oblivious of the fact that when my hon. friend here made his statement as to the volume of taxation borne by the people of this country, he enforced it by illustration and argument, and by facts from the public records, so manly, so vigorous and so clear, that, unless these are controverted, the conclusions he drew must be accepted by every fair-minded man. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman denied that any taxation is paid by the people beyond that which goes into the treasury. But the hon. gentleman must see that the statement made by my hon. friend from South Oxford went to this length, that where a tariff acts as a protective tariff, where it has that object and effects that object, excluding all foreign manufactured goods from the country, it does so with the object of compelling people to purchase goods made at home; and the competition which would result from the influx of foreign goods being excluded, the consumer is compelled to pay to the home manufacturer for the goods he buys as much or almost as much as if they had been imported from abroad and the tariff tax paid the Government on them. In other words, the protective tariff is framed to compel the purchaser of goods to buy the article made at home, and to pay for that article as much as the foreign article when imported and the duty paid on it can be sold for. So that the purchaser in each case pays the duty. In the one case to the treasury. In the other to the home manufacturer. So that one of the main grounds of complaint which the tariff reformers have against the existing tariff is this, that in addition to a very large amount more than is necessary which is paid into the treasury of the country on foreign goods imported there is the enormous sum of money which we pay, and which we are compelled to pay, to the manufacturer of the home-made goods, which never goes into the treasury at all. That is one of the chief grounds of our complaint against this protective tariff.

The hon. gentleman went on further to say that he saw no reason to complain of the Government's policy in offering a rebate of 99 per cent to the manufacturers on those articles which enter into the manufacture of their goods. Well, from the standpoint of an extreme protectionist, I dare say there may be some grounds for the hon. gentleman's contention. It may be right, it may be fair; but let me point out to the hon. gentleman one or two things involved in that contention. It was contended some years ago by those who advocated a protective system, that the consumer did not pay the duty at all; the duty was paid by the foreign manufacturer or merchant from whom the goods were bought. If these taxes on the raw materials on which the rebate is given are not paid by the manufacturer here, but if they are paid by the man from whom he bought them, then a gross and grievous wrong is perpetrated when he is repaid money that he did not pay out. That will be conceded. If, on the contrary, he does pay that out of his own pocket, then the argument that the consumer, or the person who imports, does not pay, goes to the winds. I think that will be conceded by the hon. gentleman. But one ground upon which they claim that they have any right whatever to a rebate of this duty, is the ground that the man who imports pays the taxes himself; and if he is going to export the goods again to sell them abroad, he has a right to have the tax he has paid on this raw material, rebated to him. Then so much is conceded, the ground is clear thus far—the consumer does pay the duty. At any rate hereafter we will not have the cry proclaimed throughout the country that the consumer does not pay at all, but that somebody in a foreign country does.

Now, I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to another curious anomaly which exists, the injustice of which he does not see, or professes not to see. We have a firm manufacturing, we will say, agricultural implements. They pay $10, $15 or $20 duty upon the raw material which enters into the manufactured article. They ship off an agricultural implement to the North-west Territories, and they ship off a similar one to the Argentine Republic. They are permitted by the Government to sell, they are encouraged by the policy of the Government to sell that machine $10, or $20, or $30 less to the Argentine farmer than they are permitted to sell it to the North-west farmer. The Argentine farmer and the North-west farmer are producing the same things and compete with each other in the markets of the world; therefore our Government pursues a policy which permits and encourages the manufacturer of goods in this country to

sell machinery at a lesser cost to the foreign farmer who competes with the North-west farmer, the result of which is that it costs the latter relatively a great deal more to produce his grain than it does his competitor, and both sell in the same market. What is the result? Evidently this policy is not one which is conducive to the best interests of that class of men whose interests the Government ought to consult.

Now, I thought that we had placed before the country two clear and distinct policies, and we were in hopes, many of us, that we were going to the country in a short time to challenge the verdict of the people upon the question as to which was the better policy in the interests of Canada. But it appears, Sir, that there are a large number of gentlemen in this House who say that they do not know what the Liberal policy is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I notice that that statement is received with cheers by some hon. gentlemen on the back benches opposite, thereby showing their own ignorance. I shall be very happy to present to any one of those hon. gentlemen a copy of the political platform agreed upon by the Liberal party of Canada when they met in convention two or three years ago. The policy of the Liberal party was laid down at that time in terms very clear and distinct, and if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble not to read each other's speeches, not to read what Mr. A or Mr. B, who sits alongside of them says about the policy, but to read the policy itself, they will find it formulated in language so clear that nobody but one whose mind is wilfully perverted, can misunderstand it. Sir, during the progress of this debate, several hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Railways, the Controller of Customs and others, did me the honour to cite certain remarks I had made at different times in the maritime provinces, for the purpose of showing that I held a somewhat different view as to the policy of the Liberal party, from the views held by my leader and others. Sir, I am absolutely satisfied to spare the House the annoyance of reading any of my speeches, because the speech of mine which the Controller read, puts it as plainly and as lucidly, and more so, than I could put it to-night. I stand by every word of the speech he quoted in the House. The Minister of Railways in referring to what I said, stated :

> Now, however, a new policy, a tariff for revenue purposes only. * * This policy of a tariff for revenue purposes only was explained by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who said, in a speech delivered in the maritime provinces, that there were three kinds of tariff, a free trade tariff, a tariff for revenue purposes, and a revenue tariff.

He meant a protective tariff, a mistake, I suppose, of the printer.

> He spoke of what a revenue tariff was, compared it with a protective tariff, and he instanced as a revenue tariff a tariff such as that in force in England, and it is such a tariff and such a policy that we are dealing to-night. I venture to tell hon. gentlemen, that when the country comes to understand what a revenue tariff is, as explained by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and as it will be explained to the country from one end to the other before the general elections arrive, a tariff for revenue will occupy the graveyard with other departed ones.

But when the hon. gentleman was challenged by me directly in his speech as to whether I had said anything indicating that we were going to adopt the tariff which the English people have in force, "Oh, no," he said, "you did not say so, but I deduce that from your remarks." Notwithstanding my disclaimer, half a dozen of the lesser lights of the party, when they get up to speak, still, parrot-like, repeat the old story that the policy of the Liberal party is a policy which favours the adoption of a system of taxation similar to that which prevails in England. It seems to me it has been a put-up job, if I may use a vulgar expression, to repeat, in one way or another, this statement, with a view to induce the country to believe that our policy is not what we have declared it to be in solemn conclave, not what the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford declares it to be, not what he and my leader have, time and again, stated it to be, but some policy which hon. gentlemen opposite wish it to be. It is perfectly plain to my mind that hon. gentlemen opposite know that our policy is so true, is so thoroughly defensible, so commends itself to the good sense of the people that they dare not challenge the verdict of the people upon it. They are bound to twist it, to make it something else, to say it is not what we declare it to be, it is not what we have formulated, it is some other thing which they desire it to be. We decline to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to force a false issue on the people. We are going to the people on the policy formulated at our great convention, and enunciated by our financial representative and by our leader.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). And as often repudiated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not only are we prepared to go to the people upon this policy, but if we get fair-play, we will win upon it, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it.

Mr. FOSTER. You will get all the fair-play you want.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I admire your pluck, but not your prudence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Although our policy is not to adopt the tariff and system of taxation which exists in England——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—not because the principle on which that system is based is unsound, because we are thoroughly in accord with the principle, but because the circumstances of this country do not permit its application in the same way as they do there, still, as an academic question, it may be worth while to consider, for a moment or two, whether or not the policy as it is in England, which hon. gentlemen opposite denounce so viciously and so strongly, is as they represent it to be.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did you not say that the next fight was to be a free trade fight?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell the hon. gentleman what I did say. Why, the Controller of Customs, who, above all others, is a man who might be supposed to know something on this question, and whose duty it is to keep himself posted, has been guilty of making statements so opposed to the facts that I can only attribute them to his ignorance; I will not presume to say that he intended to mislead the House, for I give him too much credit for that, but I put them down to his ignorance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman quoted them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He quoted an article which he had picked up out of some magazine, the author of which he did not know, and which I challenged him to name, and he was not man enough to do it. He said the English people were taxed on their linen sheets. I asked him his authority, and I offered him the English tariff, which I hold in my hand, and challenged him to show such a tax. He said he had seen it in an anonymous article in an English magazine. And this statement came from whom? Not from a back bench member, but from the Controller of Her Majesty's Customs in Canada, a man whose duty it was to post himself on these matters, and know what he was talking about when he was speaking and making comparisons between the tariff of this country and the tariff of the motherland. The hon. gentleman warned the people of the Dominion what tremendous taxes they would have to pay if the system of taxation as it exists in England was introduced here. The hon. gentleman told the House that there were a large number of taxes imposed, and he read them over with great gusto. He said there were license fees of all kinds to which the people had to submit—fees for liquor dealers, refreshment houses, dog licenses, game licenses, gun licenses, for male servants, for carriages, for armorial bearings, and he went over the list and ran over the items one after another, and then turning triumphantly to his followers, said: This is the Liberal policy, and this is what you would have to submit to. One would suppose the hon. gentleman had examined into this matter. Are hon. members aware that, although these taxes are collected by Imperial officers they are collected by Imperial officers not for the Imperial revenue, but to be divided among the local authorities of the country? I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that of the £4,000,000 sterling taxation which the Controller referred to as collected by those license fees, and others, the whole sum so collected by Imperial officers was divided among the local authorities in the different counties of Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. HUGHES. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And when the hon. Controller tried to frighten us with the probate duties, hon. gentlemen should recollect that half of those duties, collected by the Imperial officers under Imperial supervision are also distributed among the local authorities of the country.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). By Imperial authority?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are collected by Imperial officers and distributed by local officers for local purposes. The whole sum, about seven million pounds sterling, or $35,000,000, is so collected and distributed. So it is only a mode of collection. In this country we allow certain taxes to be collected by the several provinces, and by the municipalities, and in England they are collected by Imperial officers and distributed in the way mentioned. And so the hon. Controller went on to talk about the income tax, and one would suppose that every man having an income of $100, $200, $300, $400, $500, $600, $700, or $800 is taxed in England. It is not so. There is not an income in England under $800 taxed a penny. The English system is one which aims at compelling rich men to pay a fair share of their riches towards national taxation, and so far as England is concerned, no man who receives up to $800 per annum pays a penny of taxation as income tax. Further, on all incomes from $800 to $2,000 a rebate of $800 be allowed.

Then we were told about inhabited house duty. The Controller said that every house is taxed. Is that true? I am not arguing that such a system is ever going to be introduced here, I am simply showing how utterly ignorant are some hon. gentlemen who have spoken without looking into the question and studying it. What are the facts? The total annual value of houses in Great Britain is £142,000,000 sterling, and the total number is 6,833,000. How many are charged house duty? Only $1,200,000 out of the 6,800,000 and out of the £142,000,000 of value, only sixty-five millions of value are taxed at all. The number not charged house duty is about 5,500,000, the annual value of which is 76 million pounds sterling. All houses occupied by artisans in

England are exempt from house duty, also all houses under $100 in annual value, and there are over five million of these. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that the English system—if we were discussing the desirability of introducing it here—is not the system which hon. gentlemen opposite have placed before the House. But we never have said that we are going to introduce the English system into this country.

Let us see, if we can, what the two policies are, as defined by those who have authority to define them. I find the hon. Finance Minister laid down his policy. I do not think we have ever tried to pervert that presentation : I do not think we have ever tried to misrepresent it : I do not think we have ever tried to put into his mouth a definition he did not give, and I will read to the hon. gentleman and the House the statement he made when he introduced and laid down his policy. I want to show the House the broad lines of demarcation or distinction between the policy which he says should be pursued and that which we say should be pursued. The hon. gentleman's policy is a policy of taxation for the development of the industries of the country. Our policy is a policy for revenue only—to use the words of our platform, and of the resolution before the House. The hon. Finance Minister said :

The arrangement of a tariff and the principle which is to be adopted has two aspects, it looks to the revenue which is required in a country and it looks, as well, to the general trade and development of a country.

I wish, at this early stage of my remarks upon this subject, to say that, so far as the revenue aspect is concerned, it is of infinitely less importance than the effect of the principle and the details of the tariff upon the trade and development of a country.

It was not, therefore, for revenue he was going to tax the people ; nor was it for revenue that he was going to restrict the trade and commerce of the country. The object of raising a revenue—which common people have heretofore supposed was the main one in levying taxation—was infinitely less important in his mind, than that by levying heavy taxation he could build up certain industries in the country. He went on to say :

I wish to say here that the Government of the day, and the party which supports the Government of to-day, take their stand squarely and firmly upon the embodiment and upon the preservation of the principle of protection in the tariff, the degree of that protection to be according to the circumstances of the industry and the conditions of business and of trade at the present time.

Now, Sir, that is the hon. gentleman's policy, and we will start with the understanding, clear as he has expressed it, that he does not ask the authority of the House to levy taxation in order to raise a revenue, and that that is a matter of infinitely less importance than the main purpose which he has in view when he lays on the taxes upon the people. Now, Sir, what is the Liberal platform ? I quote from the convention resolution, agreed to by 2,500 delegates, whom the hon. gentleman sneered at, who assembled here at their own private cost and charge, and who have, after deliberation, solemnly agreed upon this as the platform upon which they were prepared to contest the coming election. I say, Sir, it is neither manly nor honourable for hon. gentlemen opposite to seek to evade the issue which we have placed squarely before the people, and upon which we are prepared to challenge their verdict. Here is what the Liberal platform says :

That the customs tariff of the Dominion of Canada should be based, not as it is now, upon a protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

We do not say there should not be a customs tariff ; a tariff sufficiently high to raise whatever is necessary to carry on the government of the country. We say, on the contrary, it must be so, and we say, further, in our platform that "this tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest economical and efficient government." That is the platform of the Liberal party in convention, and that is the very idea embodied in the resolution which my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has submitted to the House, and upon which we are going to vote. It is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Laurier) has made use of some language which shows that we did not mean what we said. Well, the leader of the Liberal party moved the resolution I have quoted in the convention, and I beg the attention of the House while I read a paragraph from the speech he made upon that occasion, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is fair to divorce a phrase from the sentence, and to ask the country to believe that the phrase contains the whole of what the leader of the Liberal party intended to say, when every qualifying word and condition are eliminated ? I remember the old story about the atheist who said he could prove from the Good Book that there was no God, and he proceeded to prove it by quoting from the Psalms, "There is no God," but omitted to quote the preceding words, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." So, these hon. gentlemen opposite, after divorcing from the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) one or two words, try by repeating over these divorced words to make him say the very opposite of what he did say. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) did say was this :

I say the policy should be a policy of free trade, such as they have in England, but I am sorry to say that the circumstances of the country cannot admit at present of that policy in its entirety, but I propose to you that from this day hence-

forward it should be the goal to which we aspire. I propose to you from this day, although we cannot adopt the policy itself, to adopt the principle which regulates it, that is to say, that, though it should be our misfortune for many years to come to have to raise a revenue by customs duties, these duties should be levied only so far as is necessary to carry on the business of the Government. (Cheers.) I submit to you that not a cent should be extracted from the pockets of the people except every cent goes into the treasury of the people, and not into the pockets of anybody else. (Cheers.) I submit to you that no duty should be levied for protection's sake, but levied altogether and for the purpose of filling the treasury to the limits required. I submit to you that every cent that is levied should be levied, first and foremost upon the luxuries of the people.

That is a plain and a distinct statement; so plain and so distinct that an honest man cannot misunderstand it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) states here that the interests of this country require that what is necessary to carry on the government of this country shall be raised by customs taxation, and that, unfortunately, it must be so raised, for many years to come. But, he said: The principle underlying the British tariff is a sound principle, and we should keep it as the goal we have in view, and which we hope some day to reach. But those hon. gentlemen opposite will have none of this policy, because it comes from the motherland. When they want a precedent for the liberty of free speech, or a free press, or religious liberty, where do they seek it? They go to the motherland for it, where civil and religious liberty has had its origin. They are glad to take everything of freedom from the mother country, but they shut down on the principle of free trade.

Mr. FOSTER. So do you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, Mr. Speaker, we do not. We say that the principle of free trade is a sound principle, but we say that it must be applied with discretion in this country, and that the circumstances of the country do not permit us adopting it at present. I, for one, say: If the circumstances of the country did permit of it, it would be a good thing for Canada. We cannot hope to have it for years to come; but, Sir, we will eliminate, at any rate from the tariff, all that system of protection which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has inserted there, not to raise a revenue, but, as he says himself, to develop certain favoured industries in this country. I submit, for the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, a declaration made by that distinguished statesman, President Cleveland, in his inaugural address in 1893. I, for one, at any rate, endorse it. It is not necessary for me to go further than the Liberal platform and the definition given of it by my leader; I give to both my unqualified adhesion, but I say, Sir, that President Cleveland has, in his inaugural address, laid down the principles and the manner in which they should be applied, in a way which, at any rate commands my assent. He says:

> They could not defy with impunity the inexorable laws of finance and trade. * * * While there should be no surrender of principle, our task must be undertaken wisely, without vindictiveness. Our mission is not punishment, but the rectification of wrongs. If, in lifting the burdens from the daily life of the people, we reduce inordinate and unequal advantages too long enjoyed, this is but a necessary incident of our return to right and justice. When we proclaim that necessity for revenue furnishes the only justification for taxing the people, we announce a truth so plain that its denial would seem to indicate the extent to which judgment may be influenced by familiarity with perversions of taxing power; and when we seek to reinstate the self-confidence and business enterprise of our citizens, by discrediting abject dependence upon governmental favour, we strive to stimulate those elements of American character which support the hope of American achievements.

Substitute the word "Canadian" for "American" there, and you have an admirable exegesis and explanation of the trade policy of the Liberal party in this country. We are not going to rush like a bull in a china shop to destroy vested interests and that kind of thing. We will proceed with prudence, with caution, and, I hope, Sir, with what is markedly absent from the Government's policy—with statesmanship.

Now, Sir, if we can get down to a calm and cool discussion; if these are the two issues which divide the two parties in this country, let us see what the arguments are, pro and con. The protectionists say that a revenue tariff is condemned by the results shown between the years 1873 and 1878. I think I am right in saying that because it has been quoted time and again, not by one, but by twenty of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me ask is that so? Does our experience of the years between 1873 and 1878 justify that statement? If it does, then you condemn equally our experience of confederation from 1867 to 1873. During that time, when a Conservative Government was in power, you had a revenue tariff, just as you had afterwards when a Liberal Government was in power; and you had a measure of progress, which I think the Conservative party itself would acknowledge as gratifying. Therefore, it appears to me that, if the same tariff was continued from 1873 to 1878 which was in force from 1867 to 1873 and if there was depression and commercial trouble under it, during the latter four or five years you have no right, by any rule of logic to charge it to that system under which the country had progressed so happily in the previous years when the same tariff was in force. It must be remembered that the depression which existed between 1873 and 1878 was not confined in any sense or way

to the Dominion of Canada: nor was it in any sense or way consequent on the adoption by the Liberal party of any new fiscal policy. The Liberal party, when they came into power in 1873, merely lopped off, not the mouldering branches, but the growing branches of extravagance, which had grown to an enormous extent in the previous fiscal years, and continued the same fiscal policy, superadding to it a policy of economy and prudence in the public expenditure. That depression under which this country laboured from 1873 to 1878, was a depression world-wide in extent; and I wish to draw the attention of the House to a statement in regard to it made in a book lately published in England, entitled: "England's Foreign Trade in the Nineteenth Century," which received the Cambridge prize, written by a gentleman of the name of Bowley. On page 79, he says:

The most marked features of the diagram of imports and exports since 1870 are the two great falls in value: the first, the most noticeable, in exports, beginning in 1873, and reaching its lowest point in 1878, after which the values increased again till 1882; the second beginning, both in imports and exports, in 1883, while the recovery commences in 1886. * * * These changes may be due either to diminution of the actual amount of goods exported and imported, or to a reduction of prices of these goods, or to both causes. We shall see subsequently that, on the whole, the amount rapidly increased, and, therefore, the depression is mainly due to a fall of prices.

Here we have the statement made in this book, which received such commendation as to win the prize at the great University of Cambridge, that the depression began with the year 1873, and culminated in the year 1878, when it reached its lowest point, and that it was caused largely by the fall in prices. The author quotes from the "Statist" the following paragraph in regard to the cause of the depression:—

Having its origin in the excessive lock up of capital in the construction of railways, especially in America and Germany, many of which when built had neither population to use them nor traffic to carry; in the wild speculation that followed the German assertion of supremacy on the continent; in the exaggerated armaments, which withdrew an inordinate amount of labour from productive industry and overweighted the taxpayers of the great European nations, and in over-production in the principal trades in all commercial countries; it was aggravated by a succession of bad harvests in both hemispheres; by famines in the East and in South America; by repudiations by governments and other public debtors; and by the political anxieties which the reopening of the eastern question gave birth to.

And on page 101, he further says:

The effects of the depression which began in 1873 must not be exaggerated. In the figures of total imports and exports, as published, it is very striking; but, when we allow for the general and continuous fall in prices, which took place concurrently with the decreased value of imports, we find that the amount (measured in goods, not in money) of foreign trade transacted has continually increased. The depression affected capitalists and their profits, shook credit, checked for many years the outflow of capital abroad, and made employment uncertain for the small proportion of employees and workmen who are dependent on those trades which fluctuate in sympathy with foreign disturbance.

We have here, Sir, a description of facts as occurring in England almost similar to those which occurred in Canada during that great depression—almost similar to those which occurred in Germany, France and the United States. It did not matter what the fiscal policy of any country was, it seemed doomed to share in the extraordinary and general depression of the period. But, Sir, if hon. gentlemen point to the depression which existed from 1873 to 1878, as a warning against our reverting to the revenue tariff policy of the day, does not the same warning apply to countries which had a protective system and in which that depression was intensified? What would have been the condition of things in those years, when the ordinary depression was intensified by a succession of three or four bad harvests, if my hon. friend at my left (Sir Richard Cartwright), instead of lightening or keeping light the taxation of the people, had chosen to double that taxation upon them? Did the giving to them of cheap goods harm them? Did it intensify the depression, or did it relieve it? The question has only to be stated to be answered; it answers itself. Is it possible to conceive that if the price of every article which entered into the consumption of every family in Canada had been increased 30 per cent, that would have benefited the people? The thing is absurd. If while our products brought a low price we had to pay a high price for everything we purchased, bad as the condition of the country was, it would have been intensified tenfold; and I say that to the firmness with which my hon. friend stood by his guns and refused time and again to increase the taxes of the people, notwithstanding the pressure that was brought upon him—to that firmness the people of Canada owe a great deal more this day than they are prepared to give him credit for.

Now, Sir, I listened the other day to the able speech delivered by my hon friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), wherein he gave examples of the progress made by Canada, even in manufacturing industries, between 1873 and 1878. I listened also to the statements made by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who followed in the same line, in a remarkably able speech which was listened to by a thin House, but which I hope hon. gentlemen who had not the pleasure of hearing it will do themselves the pleasure of reading. I say those gentlemen proved beyond a doubt that in this period of universal depression the manufactures of this country steadily and healthfully increased. The increase was one which all fair men who are disposed to do justice to the question could congratulate the country upon, and

it showed conclusively that under a revenue tariff the manufactures which we would all like to see grow and increase and fructify in this country, did grow and increase and fructify in the period from 1873 to 1878, in a manner pleasing to every patriotic man. I say further that that fiscal system, although it did not keep all the people in the country, succeeded in stopping a large portion of the exodus that was going on. Our population maintained itself wonderfully during that period, not only in the cities, but in the rural districts; while real estate advanced steadily in value, and in 1878 maintained a price as great if not greater than it did in 1873. More than that, our shipping went on increasing to such an extent that during that period we added to the registered shipping of this country $5,000,000 worth of tonnage. All these things show not only that a revenue tariff is not only good in itself, but is suitable to the condition of affairs existing in this country; we know that, not only from theory, but from a practical application of the principle, not from 1873 to 1878 alone, but also from 1867 to 1878.

Now, Sir, from 1878 until the present, what have we to congratulate ourselves upon? We are told by the Finance Minister that we ought to congratulate ourselves upon our increased foreign trade. But is not his policy one the main object of which is to restrict our foreign trade? That main object of a protective tariff is to exclude foreign goods; yet still the hon. gentleman turns round very coolly and congratulates himself on the fact that the main object he had in view has not been achieved and that the commerce of the country has expanded in spite of his policy. He coolly takes credit to himself as the result of the National Policy of the very expansion in our foreign trade which the National Policy was destined to destroy. He tells us about the increase in our exports. I am not going to dwell upon that point, because it has already been very fully and ably treated by a number of gentlemen behind me during this debate, further than to remark that it is childish to attribute to the National Policy the increase on the quantities exported of the products of the farm, the forest and the sea. The National Policy neither causes the rain to fall, the sun to shine, the grain to grow, our hardy toilers to increase the quantity of their productions nor any of the causes to exist which enable us to augment the quantity and value of Canada's exports. Nor on the other hand, does it affect or contral the prices of these exports. The whole difference of opinion as to Canada's rate of progress between the two parties, it seems to me, consists in the aspirations and hopes which animate each of them. These gentlemen opposite are satisfied with the lamentable increase in our prosperity which we have had for the past few years. They are satisfied that a million of our people should have fled from our country in the last decade. They are satisfied that the values of real estate should have fallen 25, 30 and 40 per cent. They are satisfied that ship-building as an industry has been wiped out of existence. They are satisfied that the registered tonnage of the country has fallen, as it has since 1878, $11,000,000 in value. But, we on this side, hope for better and higher things for this young country. We look to the great North-west, and hope to people it; and we hope to do that, not by means of the "vigorous immigration policy" which has characterized hon. gentlemen opposite, but by means of a policy which will give the lands of that country into the hands of actual settlers, by a policy which will not put a paltry 100,000 people there in twenty years, but will establish half a million people there in that period, I venture to say, and I think I am using language of quiet soberness and truth that if it had not been for the unnatural restrictions imposed on the trade and commerce of the country, if it had not been for the unnatural land laws enforced against the settlers, we would have had to-day half a million more people in that country than we have. We, on this side, hope for greater things, and will not be satisfied with the slow rate of progress at which Canada has been going. I listened with pain the other night to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), whose position entitles him to speak with some authority on mercantile matters, when he stated that the progress made on that part of the Dominion from which he and I come, was one with which he is satisfied. Satisfied—when his own metropolitan city of Halifax has lost in population over 7,000 people in the last ten years. Satisfied—when the great province of Nova Scotia has in ten years added but 10,000 people to its whole population. Satisfied—when New Brunswick stands to-day where she stood ten years ago, without 1 per cent added to the number of her population. Satisfied—when Prince Edward Island has added in ten years the enormous number of 97 people to her population. Satisfied—when the real property of all these provinces has gone down in value from 20 to 40 per cent. Satisfied—when our shipping which ploughed the seas a few years ago has disappeared, and $11,000,000 of its tonnage cannot be found. Satisfied—because a few mushroom manufactories have been built up, many of which are closed one-third to one-fourth of the year, and which give employment to a few thousand people at the cost of the great farming, fishing and mining interests of the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be some things in which we may take just pride. There has been an increase in our savings banks deposits and in our exports and imports. These things indicate that we are going ahead to some extent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But you did not go ahead in those very things from 1874 to 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The trade policy surely could not control the harvest or determine whether it would be good or bad, and as for imports, I shall show that any decrease was only in the values and not in the quantities. I shall prove that, beyond the shadow of a doubt, by a statistical table which I shall read directly. Judging by the one great factor which determines the prosperity and advancement of a country, there is not that prosperity to-day in Canada that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their hearts, would like to see. Take the population of this country, and what are the facts? Leaving out the question of immigration altogether, and you have a loss in this new country of Canada—a country for which we all, I care not what be our political proclivities, hope better things—of 400,000 people in ten years. Adding to that the 800,000 immigrants no longer in the country, and you have a loss in ten years of 1,200,000 people. How will you get over these facts? Are you going to avoid them by hiding your heads, ostrich-like, in the sand? If you are honest men, you have to look the facts in the face and see if there is anything in the existing system which has given rise to this awful exodus from this new country. Take the maritime provinces, with which I am more familiar. Those of you who know the natural resources of that country, know that they are unequalled in any part of the world. Take Nova Scotia, whose shores are washed with waters teeming with fish, and whose mineral resources cannot be excelled even by the far-famed Kootenay valley of British Columbia; take New Brunswick with its great forest wealth, and Prince Edward Island with its agricultural resources; and tell me why these provinces, peopled as they are by those sprung from the best stock in the world, have retrograded in the past ten years in their population. It is one of the most damning facts ever brought against any policy carried out by any Government. Between 1871 and 1881, our progress was not what it ought to be, but we increased, at any rate, 110,000 people in population during that decade. What have you done to-day? You have introduced your policy of restricting trade and taxing trade and taxing the people in order to build up factories, and you have driven out from these three provinces no less than 165,000 people in the ten years. We all remember the fluent tongue of the Finance Minister, as some years ago, he dwelt with much unction on the natural flow of the people from the rural districts to the cities. I challenge him upon his own ground. Take the cities in the maritime provinces, with populations of over 5,000—St. John, Halifax, Charlottetown, Moncton, Fredericton, Yarmouth and Truro; take their population in 1881 and compare it with the population of 1891, and what have you got? The paltry, pitiable increase of 7,000 in the aggregate. Why, the natural increase in the people should have been 13,000 odd in those cities alone. We have lost, therefore, in ten years, not from the rural districts because many of these have been partially decimated—but in the cities alone of over 5,000 people, where, if anywhere, the policy of the Government ought to show some proof, we have lost not less than 7,000 people, and a total of 165,000 in all the maritime provinces. I say that the factor of population is the one which determines, above all other, the prosperity and advancement of a people. Show me a city or county whose population has doubled or increased 30 or 40 per cent in ten years, and I will show you a county or city where the elements of prosperity exist, where real estate has increased in value, and where the people are thriving, happy and prosperous.

Then, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us, among other things, that if they have not kept the population at home they certainly have given employment to the few who did remain at home. Is that true? I say it is not. Before the census returns came down the hon. gentleman could generalize, but now we are able to bring them face to face with their own official figures which they cannot deny. But what do we find? We find that out of 1,659,000 people engaged in different occupations in Canada, nearly one-half, or 790,000 are employed in agriculture, fishing, lumbering or mining, while only 320,000 are engaged in mechanical pursuits. When you come to analyse the pursuits in which these 320,000 are engaged, how many are found to be engaged in pursuits which are assisted in any sense or way by the National Policy? Why, Sir, it will not be contended that the ordinary carpenters and joiners, or dressmakers, or blacksmiths, or painters, or machinists, or those engaged in other similar trades are in any way influenced or improved by the National Policy.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Certainly they are.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman interrupts me, without there being any point in his interruption, for a mere assertion such as he makes proves nothing. The hon. gentleman will see that these classes to which I have referred number 255,000 out of 320,000. I have analysed and gone over the census to see how many there are who are directly affected by the National Policy. I find them to be of the following classes: Cotton mill operatives, woollen mill

operatives, textile manufactory operatives, not specified, manufacturers and officials of manufacturing companies, mineral and soda water makers, glass blowers and workers, hat and cap makers, hosiery and knitting mill operatives; my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) had something to say as to the amount they made—linen mill operatives, oil works employees, organ makers, rope, twine and cordage factory operatives, sugar makers and refiners, umbrella and parasol makers, and silk mill operatives. And all totalled up they number some 30,000 people. And this is the sum total of the people who are directly influenced or affected beneficially by the National Policy. And that, Sir, out of a total of 1,659,000 who are engaged in different occupations and avocations in this Canada. Now, Sir, I say that this system is an unjust and unfair system because, while it is a system of protection so far as the goods market is concerned, the hon. gentleman has never had the pluck to carry out his system to its logical conclusion, and give protection to the labour market. The hon. gentleman will protect goods coming into the country because he gets a quid pro quo from those whose interests he protects, but never has the hon. gentleman protected the labourer. He could do that by carrying out the system of excluding foreign labour as he excludes foreign goods, and so allow the Canadian labourer to have an increased price for his day's work. The hon. gentleman from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) talks about this policy giving a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. But where is the fair day's wage? If the hon. gentleman looks at the returns he will see that the operatives in the cotton factories in Nova Scotia receive an average of 65 cents per day. Is that a fair day's wage for a fair day's work? Wages, Mr. Speaker, is a relative term. The amount of wages a man gets does not determine, fully and finally, whether a man is getting a fair day's wage or not. The determinating factor is how much he can purchase with his wage. If a man in England on $1 a day can purchase more of the necessaries of life than can be purchased in a protection country on $1.50, the wages in England, though nominally lower, are really and actually higher. If you will look again at the book from which I have already quoted, you will find this very question of the English workman dealt with, and you will find the position I take set forth in very clear and specific language:

> As regards real incomes, that is, wages or salaries reckoned by their purchasing power, their improvement has, according to Mr. Giffen, been continuous since 1775.
>
> From 1775 to 1815 prices rose, but incomes rose still more.
>
> From 1820 to 1851 prices fell 33 per cent, while incomes remained steady.
>
> From 1851——

When Mr. Gladstone put the cap stone upon the free trade system——

> ——to 1870 prices rose 26 per cent, but incomes rose 66 per cent.
>
> From 1870 to 1890 prices fell 30 per cent. while incomes rose 40 per cent.
>
> In other words, incomes and wages, reduced by index number to the value which gold had in 1871, were approximately in the proportion:

1820	51
1851	76
1871	100
1890	200

These figures must not be used indiscriminately, they merely state that the average workingman could obtain with his wages in 1890 four times as much as those things which are consumed, food, manufactured goods, &c., as a man in a similar position could in 1820. To my mind, these figures speak volumes. It is not enough for the hon. gentleman simply to point to an increase in the number of men or women in a certain industry receiving the wages they got before or even a nominally slightly higher wage, unless he can show that the wage they get enables them to purchase more of the necessaries of life than did the wages they formerly got. One word more from this work upon this point, as I think it important, and I will pass on:

> The benefit of this increase of purchasing power has not been equally distributed; it has come mainly to the working classes and to people with small incomes. Our imports consisting so largely of food, it is those who had to consider every penny expended in housekeeping, who are enriched by the reductions in the price of bread, meat, and rice. Since the era of foreign trade there are hardly any in regular employment so poor that they cannot obtain as much bread as they want of a finer quality than middle-class people at the beginning of the century; meat is no longer a rare luxury among any large class of workmen, as it was fifty years ago; it is only necessary to allude to the reduction in price of tea and sugar, which have done so much respectively to make life endurable for adults and for the healthy nourishment of children. At the same time, a variety of food is possible, which must conduce greatly to the health and pleasure of city life.

Now, Sir, let us consider for a moment why the Liberal party condemn the National Policy. I have spoken of the advantages hon. gentlemen opposite claim for it, now let us see why we condemn it. We condemn it, in the first place, because it is a system which wrings from the people millions of dollars for treasury purposes more than the old tariff did. What is the sense of trying

to throw dust in the eyes of the people as to the incidence or amount of taxation, when your public accounts show that, whereas during the period from 1873 to 1878 we only levied about seventeen and a half millions per year of taxation, you have been levying, during the past seven or eight years, between twenty-seven and thirty millions. Not, mind you, for the private purposes of the protected manufacturer, but simply for the purposes of revenue. And this has brought about an era of unbridled extravagance. I remember well when, in this House, in 1881, the Conservative party —Tory party I like to call them, because that is what they are——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see some of them like to be called that. It is not a term of reproach or ought not to be. A Tory is generally an honest man, not the hybrid who calls himself a Liberal-Conservative. We say that when they entered upon their carnival of extravagance in 1881, they began the system of fleecing the people, and taking millions of dollars per year more out of their pockets, to enable them to continue this system of extravagance, than ever was done under the Mackenzie tariff; and we condemn it on that ground. Protection always generates extravagance, I do not care where it is applied. Look at the result in the United States. They have taken so much revenue under their high tariff that at one time they did not know what to do with the money; and the whole country was engaged for years in trying to find out men whom they could pension to use the money up; and hundreds of millions of dollars are to this day being squandered in pensions to thousands of people who do not deserve it, and would not have got it, if that country had not this abominable system of protection in force. Again I say we condemn it because it taxes the people directly for the treasury ten million dollars per year more than they were taxed under the Mackenzie tariff. I have made a very careful calculation upon this point, and I say that between 1878 and 1895 you have taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada at least 80 millions of dollars more under your present tariff than you would have taken out if the Mackenzie tariff had been continued. Mark, I make no reference at all to the millions you have taken from the people which did not go into the treasury; I am speaking entirely of the sum which you took out of their pockets and put into the treasury.

Now, Sir, I have heard gentlemen argue at public meetings and in this House, that the difference between the two policies is not very great, that it is only the difference between 17½ per cent and 31 per cent; that it is not so very much after all. I say, Sir, that the difference represents more than the mere difference between a 17½ and a 31 per cent tariff, and if hon. gentlemen will apply it to the importation of any given quantity of dry goods, they will see what I mean. Take $100 worth of dry goods that came into this country under the Mackenzie tariff. The cost of importation, freight, insurance, &c., are given to me by a gentleman largely engaged in the trade, as amounting to 8 per cent. That makes $108: add the 17½ per cent and you have $125. Then the wholesaler has his profits to the original cost of importation, say 15 per cent, which added to the $125, makes $144. Then he sells to the retailer, who adds his profits of 25 per cent to the $144, making at least $180. So that under a 17½ per cent tariff the consumer pays $180 for goods which cost $100. Now, take it under a 31 per cent tariff. The importer brings in $100 worth of goods upon which he pays $8 as the cost of importing. Add the wholesaler's profit of 15 per cent, and the retailer's profit upon that of 25 per cent, and you have $200 which the consumer pays for $100 worth of goods under a 31 per cent tariff. So that the increased cost to the consumer on these goods is not the difference between 17½ and 31 per cent, but it is $20 on every $100; and any hon. gentleman can figure it out for himself and show me, if he can, wherein that statement is inaccurate. Therefore, I say there is a tremendous difference between the old Mackenzie tariff of 17½ per cent, which is generally known as a revenue tariff, and this protective system of 31 per cent. I say that is one of the evils, one of the minor evils, arising from this protective tariff. Then again, I say, this protective tariff prevents us from getting the benefit of the cheap goods which are produced abroad. The hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond), himself a strong supporter of the Government, told us to-day that goods costing a dollar a few years ago, can be bought abroad for 50 cents now; and that is true. I took the trouble a short time ago to examine the statistical returns of the exports from Great Britain as to the great leading textiles. It cost me some time and some labour and, although it may be a little tedious, I think it of sufficient importance to justify me in asking the House to listen while I read some of the figures. This statement was taken from the actual exports and the declared values of those exports, and shows how much goods have fallen in value where they are manufactured. The table I am about to read shows the exports and selling values of the great staple goods in 1874, 1884 and 1894:

EXPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN SHOWING REDUCTION IN PRICES OF GOODS.

COTTON YARNS.

—	Quantities.	Percentage of increase or decrease.	Value.	Percentage of increase or decrease.
1874	220,599,074 lbs.		£14,516,093	
1884	271,077,900 "	+23	13,811,767	- 4·8
1894	236,196,500 "	-12·8	9,289,078	-32·7

COTTON FABRICS.

1874	3,606,348,527 yds.		£59,730,000	
1884	4,417,481,000 "	+22·6	59,000,000	- 1·22
1894	5,312,753,000 "	+20·2	57,297,120	- 3·90

LINENS.

1874	194,682,712 yds.		£7,116,255	
1884	155,317,000 "	-20·22	5,180,038	-27·20
1894	156,293,600 "	+ 0·63	3,462,182	-33

IRON AND STEEL, AND THEIR MANUFACTURES (EXCEPT MACHINERY).

1874	2,487,162 tons.		£31,225,380	
1884	3,496,352 "	+40·6	24,496,669	-21·6
1894	2,656,125 "	-24	18,731,140	-23·5

SUGAR, REFINED.

1874	922,342 cwt.		£1,221,891	
1884	1,294,311 "	+40·33	1,111,261	-10
1894	1,037,990 "	-20	729,426	-34·44

Now, Sir, the lessons to be learned from these figures, which are very wearisome to read and still more wearisome to listen to, are these, that although the increase in the quantity of cotton yarns sold in 1884 over 1874 was 23 per cent, it sold for 4 per cent less in value. In 1894 the quantity produced was 12 per cent less, but it sold for 32 per cent less. The same story is told in cotton fabrics, so much so that, as Mulhall puts it, a mile in length of cotton cloth cost £31 in 1874, it cost £23 in 1884, and £18 in 1890. Hon. gentlemen will see from that short synopsis the tremendous fall there was in the price of these fabrics, bearing out entirely the statement of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) that they had fallen, many of these articles, 50 per cent in value. Notwithstanding that fall in value, the people of this country cannot get the benefit of it. I want to show in the next place that notwithstanding the tremendous fall in the prices of goods, we are prohibited by this system of protection from getting the advantage of these cheap goods.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many of these goods were produced in Canada during the same period?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to show that this policy which the hon. gentleman supports prevents the people from getting the benefit of the large reduction in the cost of these goods. While there was 23, 25, and in some cases 30 or 40 per cent reduction in the cost of these goods, the abominable policy which he supports prevents the people from getting the advantage of these reductions. In the twenty years there was an increase of over 40 per cent in the quantity of cotton fabrics produced and this increased quantity sold for 5 per cent less price. Take linens. Decrease in quantity, 1884 below 1874, 20 per cent. Decrease in price same period, 27 per cent. Increase in quantity, 1894 over 1884, nearly 1 per cent. Decrease in price same period, 13 per cent. Iron and steel. 1884 produced 40 per cent more in quantity than 1874, and sold it for 21 per cent less price. 1894 produced 24 per cent less quantiey than 1884, but sold it for 23 per cent less price. Sugar, refined. 1884 produced in quantity 40 per cent more than 1874, and sold it for 10 per cent less price. 1894 produced 20 per cent less quantity than 1884, but sold it for 35 per cent less. I have done with these

figures ; they took me some time to prepare and collate in order to insure their accuracy. They point a moral and adorn a tale, and if the people of the Dominion, while compelled to sell their goods at decreased prices, that is the goods which they export, their grain and other agricultural products which are sent into the markets of the world, are not allowed to benefit by buying cheap goods. then truly is their state most pitiable, they are being fleeced at both ends. If these figures which I have read prove the statements I have made, can any one wonder that people have been fleeing from Canada by hundreds of thousands during the last ten years ? Would not this justify them in leaving this country, great and glorious as this country is, and great and glorious as are its possibilities of development ? If this policy is to continue, if there is no help for the people except the slow rate of progress that has taken place during the past ten years, why should our young men remain here ? If young men on the farm find that the farm is being mortgaged, that it is becoming more heavily involved, are they justified in remaining here to drag along for another ten years instead of going away to better their fortunes abroad ? No, you cannot blame any one. It will be in the future as it has been in the past, unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to recast their policy, or to go to the people, when they will recast it very speedily for them.

I say more than that. The great charge we bring against the National Policy is not so much the increased money it takes out of the people and puts into the treasury, not so much the fact either that it prevents the people from enjoying the benefits which flow from the purchase of cheap goods, but it is this fact, standing prominently above all others, and which is patent wherever a protective system exists—that you are taxing the people not only for revenue but for your protected interests. I was greatly disappointed when the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) spoke to-night, and I was disappointed with his speech in this view. I said : here is a practical man ; he challenges the accuracy of the statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford ; he is one of the protected industries of the country, for he owns such an industry himself ; he says that the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford are not correct, he denies them—now he is in a position to disprove them by facts—yet that hon. gentleman did not give us one fact to disprove them. Why did the hon. gentleman not take up the question of cotton, or iron, or cordage, or sugar, or any one of the numerous illustrations which the hon. member for South Oxford gave to prove his statement that you are taxing the people enormously not for the benefit of the treasury but for the pockets of the protected industries, and show that my hon. friend's statement is wrong ? The hon. member for South Oxford did not deal in generalities ; he made a general statement first, and he illustrated it with a wealth of argument and profusion of illustration which was convincing to every open mind that listened to him. If his facts were incorrect, if his illustrations were wrong, who was in a better position to correct them than the hon. member for Lanark himself ? Did he, in the half hour's speech which he delivered to the House, challenge the accuracy, in any one detail, of the figures which the hon. member for South Oxford gave to prove the general statement he made as to the enormous sum of money that is being wrung out of the people in the shape of taxes, not one dollar of which goes into the treasury ?

Take the subject of cordage, to which I have referred, and in which the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) is largely interested, a question which specially affects the interests of that part of the Dominion from which I come ; and I ask the hon. member if that is not a case in point where under a protective policy the manufacturers fleece the people without paying a dollar into the treasury ? How much taxes do you levy ? The customs tax is one cent and a quarter per pound, and 10 per cent ad valorem, equal to 2⅛ cents per pound. How much does that give us in the treasury ? Almost nothing. In 1894, there was $18,000 collected on cordage of all kinds, the quantity being 776,000 pounds. There was not a dollar paid into the treasury on rope. The monopoly in rope is complete, so much so, that the protective system, so far as rope is concerned, has been carried to its logical conclusion and foreign rope is excluded absolutely from this market. With what result ? With the result that the cordage combine controls the market and the extent of the tariff represents the amount which the consumers of cordage will pay for their cordage in this country. In other words, he will pay 2⅛ cents per pound more than if the duty was not there. Every dollar of this tax goes into the pockets of the cordage combine. This combine goes down into Newfoundland, where it has to compete with English and American manufacturers, and there the combine sells cordage at 1¾ or 2 cents per pound less than to Canadian consumers. So the people are being fleeced and mulcted in this enormous sum, not for the benefit of this country or its treasury, but with the result that the fishermen of Newfoundland, who fish against our fishermen, are able to obtain their cordage under our protective policy 2 cents per pound cheaper than can our own fishermen. Why did not the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) say something about the cotton mills ? We have heard a great deal about the cotton mills and the capital invested in them. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) gave the House a statement so far as regards some of the mills in his section, and the effect of protective

policy on those who invested capital in those enterprises and the development to which this policy enabled those mills to attain. What has been the effect in the maritime provinces ? We have in New Brunswick the St. Croix, the Courtney Bay, the Parks, the Moncton and the Marysville mills ; in Nova Scotia there are the Halifax and Windsor mills. In all these enterprises, according to the census, $3,308,000 of capital have been invested in the construction of buildings, machinery, and equipment. They employ 2,215 hands, and pay a large amount yearly in wages. In Nova Scotia the average wages per head is $196, or 65 cents per day. I want to ask this House, with the single exception of the Gibson mill, which occupies a very exceptional position, where are the men and where is the capital that were originally engaged in the establishment of these mills ? I have shown the House that instead of encouraging the shipbuilding industry, the Government, by adopting this protective policy, have induced men to invest any capital they had in these mushroom enterprises, with the result I have indicated.

Take the Courtney Bay mill, near St. John ; what is its history ? It had a capital of some $320,000, it carried on operations for some years and then became involved ; the property was mortgaged to carry on the business ; the bondholders foreclosed ; the enterprise never paid one dollar of dividend and was ultimately sold out, and the shareholders who had put $320,000 into the enterprise, lost every cent. Such was also the case in the adjoining mill, the Parks mill, which under the old Mackenzie regime tariff went on prospering fairly well for a number of years. It followed in track of the Courtney Bay mill, and the capital was lost, the mill mortgaged, and the bondholders foreclosed. It was the same with the Moncton mill, except that the shareholders there got 15 or 20 cents on the dollar out of it, and one or two dividends. The same story runs through them all ; men are enticed to put their capital into these mills thinking they were going to make fortunes, and for a year or two, all goes merry as a marriage bell. They get increased prices, but fierce competition between the numerous mills, that grow up in a restricted market, ran the prices down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) "Hear, hear." I well remember that when the prices came down hon. gentlemen opposite told us : Now you see our prediction is correct. Protection has had the effect we said it would ; it developed a home competition which has resolved the question of prices as you want getting cotton as cheaply as you would if it to be resolved, and here you are to-day you were importing it from Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That sounded splendidly for a year or two, but what took place ? Follow the history of the mills. A year or two had not gone by, after the time you got this cheap cotton, before a fierce competition in a restricted market brought bankruptcy to the cotton mills, and the money lords of Montreal stepped in and bought out these factories for a song. The original investor lost his all. He lost his interest upon his money, and the capital he invested at first. The mills fell into the hands of men who did not even pay cash, but gave their bonds in payment of the few cents on the dollar they offered the original shareholders. The combine was formed, the competition ceased ; that took place which always takes place under protection and a restricted market. A monopoly is formed and the monopoly dictates the price. You do not get the cheap cotton now you once did. The competition exists no longer. The mills are owned by the combines. The quantity they shall make and the quantity they shall sell, and when and where they shall sell it, and the price at which it shall be sold, is all dictated by the combines. And so far does that combine go, that although the Marysville mill, owned by Mr. Gibson, is not in the combine directly, yet in order to secure that there should be no competition, they enter into a contract with Mr. Gibson whereby they are bound to take from him everything he manufactures or can manufacture, at a stated price, so that he shall not sell it on the market in competition with them. What is the result ? You have excluded the cheap cottons of England by your protective system. Your monopoly has prevented competition at home, and the monopoly dictates the price at which people shall pay for their cotton, and your protective policy enables the combine to add at least 30 odd per cent to the price for which you would be able to purchase the cotton in England if the policy did not prevail. That, Sir, in a nutshell, is the history of your cotton mills : and the history of your cotton mills is the history, very largely, of your other protected enterprises.

I say also, Sir, that in the matter of cotton as in others, the protective system forces the consumer to pay enormous sums every year, which do not go into the treasury at all. What are the facts about the importation of cotton ? We imported $4,000,000 worth of cotton last year, and we paid duty into the treasury of $1,140,000. We manufactured in Canada, according to the census of 1891, cotton to the value of $8,000,000, but we paid no duty into the treasury upon that. Did the cotton manufacturers take advantage of the protective duty, or did they make a present of it to the people ? Is there a man in this House who believes that they are fools enough, when the law permitted them, not

to add the 28 per cent duty to the price. But there is more than the 28 per cent. It costs 8 per cent to import, and the protective system therefore gives them 36 per cent of an advantage. On the $8,500,000 worth of cotton which they manufactured and sold to the people, this 36 per cent would amount to about $3,000,000 taxes upon cotton alone, which the consumers paid, not into the treasury, but into the pockets of the manufacturers.

An hon. MEMBER. Who has got that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend opposite says, "Where is it; the manufacturers have not got it." It does not follow by any means that because the people paid it the manufacturer makes it as profit.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because he manufactures at greater loss and with less advantage than they do at home in England. The thing is lost absolutely to the consumer and manufacturer.

Mr. CAMERON. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not see it. All I have to say is: I pity the dulness of his brain. Perhaps the whole three million dollars was not taken out of the people. They took a shade below it maybe, and you can knock off, if you like, such sum as they would have to sell their cotton for so as to undersell the imported cotton. They had a protection of $3,000,000, and it may be that they only took $2,500,000, leaving them a half million margin to undersell the cotton that competed with them. As the hon. member from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has pointed out, the Dominion Cotton Company control eleven mills. They had a capital of $1,500,000. They were making so much money that they were ashamed to pay a dividend on the one and a half millions, because the dividend was so enormously large that the people would have revolted against it. What did they do? They increased their capital by $1,500,000 more, and all but $150,000 of that $1,500,000 was water. They have $3,000,000, therefore, of nominal capital, and of the last one and a half millions only $150,000 was paid in cash. The report they published in 1893 of their earnings showed 10 per cent on the $3,000,000 of capital, but on the last $150,000 cash which they paid in, that would amount to 200 per cent. Therefore, the policy of the Conservative party, while extracting $3,000,000 from the people in the shape of taxes, enables these men to put 200 per cent in their own pockets. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) stood up here as the representative of the manufacturing industries, himself a manufacturer protected by the tariff, and he disputed the statements made by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). But why did he not rise in his place and show that, with regard to sugar, or cotton, or iron, or wool, or any one of those enterprises which my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to, there was some mistake in his calculation. No; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rosamond) was as dumb as an oyster, because he knew that these facts were unanswerable.

Just let me say a word about sugar, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) spoke at some length upon this question the other night, and he attempted to make the House believe that the people of Canada got their sugar as cheaply as do the people in the United States, and when he said that, he evidently thought that the question was ended. Well, Sir, was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) dealing with perfect frankness in that matter? I say he was not. The hon. gentleman understands that question as well as any gentleman in the House, and he knew that the conditions were entirely different, because up to this year, when the Minister of Finance put his half cent per pound upon the raw sugar, the Canadian manufacturer got his raw sugar duty free, and was protected to the extent of 8-10ths of a cent per pound at first, which latterly was lowered to 64-100ths upon the 100 pounds. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) says that the Canadians are able to sell sugar as cheaply as they can in the United States. Why? The hon. gentleman knows, in the first place, that the people of the United States have to pay a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem upon the raw sugar, and which 40 per cent goes into the treasury. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) knows further, that the refiners there are protected in addition ⅛ of a cent upon refined sugar, and he knows that ⅛ of a cent is 12½ mills a pound equal to 12½ cents per 100 pounds while ours are protected 64 cents per 100 pounds. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, by allowing for that difference, that while you have a protection of almost ⅔ of a cent per pound, they have only a protection of 12½ mills. How much advantage does that give the Canadian refiner over the American refiner upon 100 pounds of sugar? It gives 51½ cents.

Mr. DAVIN. Have not the Americans 40 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Forty per cent is the duty paid on raw sugar; but, in addition to that, the protection given to the refiners of the United States is in the proportion of ⅛c. per pound, as against ⅔c. per pound, or nearly so, in this country. So that the sugar refiner of this country gets $1.50 a barrel more protection on his sugar than the United States refiner. Therefore, if our refiners sell at the same price as the United States refiners, they are

pocketing $1.50 per barrel more than the American refiners are.

Mr. FOSTER. Is ⅛c. per pound the only protection ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One-eighth of one cent on refined and the 40 per cent on raw sugar. The protection they get is ⅛c. per pound. The charge I make against the National Policy is that we pay millions every year in the shape of taxes which do not go into the treasury, and that this applies to sugar as well as to other articles. During the year 1893-94, we imported 2,800,000 pounds of refined sugar, on which the duty paid was $22,230, that is at the rate of 8-10c per pound. That is what the treasury got. On the raw sugar imported, 300,000,000 pounds, which was imported free, the protection of 8-10c. per pound amounted to $2,400,000, or, at the rate of ⅔c. per pound, to which the protection was reduced a year ago, it amounted to $2,000,000. Where did that money go? Did the sugar refiners make a present of it to the people of Canada ? Is not the thing ridiculous and absurd ? Are they different from other men ? Will they not make anything they can out of the consumers ? They will ; every one will. It is no wrong to be charged against them. I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) attempt to make the public believe that some serious charge was made against the gentlemen engaged in the refining of sugar. We make no charge against them. They are doing what anybody else would do under similar circumstances. We make our charge against the policy which enables them to tax the people for their own benefit. The hon. gentleman talks of the Hon. Mr. Boak, of Halifax, being attacked in this House. I fear that that remark was made by the hon. gentleman for a political purpose, and a political purpose only. I have sat in this House for thirteen or fourteen sessions, and during that time I have never heard a word said against Mr. Boak or any one associated with him because of their connection with the sugar industry. If the protective policy enables him and others who have invested their capital in the sugar industry to charge two or three million dollars a year to the consumers more than they would otherwise be obliged to pay, they are not to blame ; but the men who are to blame are those who maintain that policy upon the country. It is the policy we protest against which enables us to impose upon the people every year millions of dollars of taxes, not one dollar of which goes into the treasury. The product of the refineries is shown by the census of 1891 to be equal to $17,000,000 in value. Suppose we had imported that quantity from Great Britain free of duty, you would have saved exactly one-eighth of that amount, because you would have got the sugar one-eighth cheaper, that is, $2,125,000. That is nearly exactly the sum you compelled the people of Canada to pay on refined sugar in 1893-94, and not a dollar of it went into the treasury. That is the charge we make. We do not complain of taxing cotton or wool or sugar or anything else such reasonable sums as they ought to bear to discharge the burdens of the state. That has to be done. We are not fools ; we know that a revenue has to be raised, and we are prepared to levy the necessary taxation to produce it. But we are not prepared, as my leader says, to impose one dollar of taxes on the people unless that dollar is paid into the public treasury.

Now, I want briefly to show the House how the public have been fleeced in the matter of coal oil. I will not speak of the amount the Trade and Navigation Returns show was paid by the people in direct taxes. I will show from certified invoices, which I hold in my hand, that the rate of taxation we pay in the maritime provinces is over 150 per cent. These invoices, which were made last October, were handed to me by the importer, and they are certified by the customs officer with the seal of the Customs Department upon them ; and what do they show ? Four tanks of refined oil were imported, valued at $791, on which the amount of duty paid was $1,130.28, a duty of 150 per cent. Another invoice, two or three days afterwards, was for six tanks of refined oil, valued at $1,077, on which the duty paid was $1,538.70, a duty of 150 per cent. If there are gentlemen in this House who can uphold or defend the continuance of such a wrong as that, I have nothing more to say. I say it is unjust, and they know it is unjust ; it is taxing the people unduly and unfairly on one of the most ordinary necessaries of life.

But hon. gentlemen say, "Oh, well, if you have to pay more for your goods, our policy protects the farmer" ; and I want rapidly to say one or two words on that. I do not think any more silly argument is used or could be used by hon. gentlemen in support of the proposition that the protective system should be continued than that it protects the farmer. How can it protect the farmer ? What are the facts ? Look at the Trade and Navigation Returns : Is Canada or is it not an exporter of a surplus of farm products ? I hold in my hand an extract made from the Trade and Navigation Returns, which shows that in butter, cheese, lard, bacon and hams, shoulders and sides, salted beef, mutton, salted pork, poultry and game, canned meats, and other meats, we export an enormous quantity, amounting in value to nearly $18,000,000. What do we import of these products ? We import $575,000 worth. Now, can any gentleman argue without laughing, that a country that exports that quantity and imports practically nothing can be protected by an import duty ? What do you do with your barley,

your beans, your oats, your buckwheat, your pease, your wheat? You send them abroad, because your market is there. Does the putting of a duty on increase the price of these things. What do you do with your mackerel? Suppose you put a duty of $10 a barrel of mackerel, would it increase the price. Not a cent, because all our mackerel is shipped abroad, and finds its market in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. How about pork?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it increases the price of pork at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why did you want a high duty on it?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will just come down to the very question of pork. We exported pork in the shape of bacon and ham, shoulders and sides, to the extent of about $2,000,000 in value, and we imported $96,000 worth.

Mr. IVES. We imported much less than we used to do before the duties were imposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman stick to the point? I am arguing that where you are an exporter of an article in the proportion in which you export this, the putting on of a duty cannot affect the price.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would you take it off?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Finance Minister has done me the honour of asking me a question, and his friends seem very anxious to prevent me replying. I was going to answer it. I tell the hon. gentleman that the price paid for pork to the farmers—that is the undressed hog—is regulated by the market price in Chicago. I took the pains to go to the leading packers in the town from which I come, and I asked them the question so that I might read their answer in Parliament or elsewhere—and I have read it to thousands of farmers at many meetings—and they answered that the price they paid to the farmers is regulated by the price paid in Chicago. It is true, as was well shown by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that, owing to the wonderful facilities they have in Chicago for packing pork, they are enabled to sell it, when packed in barrels, cheaper, perhaps, than we can, but the price paid to the farmers is the same in the pork-packing states as is paid in the pork-packing centres of Canada.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would you take the duty off?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If we were in power the duties would be regulated according to a revenue tariff. That would be treated in the same way as other articles, and there would be no discrimination made.

But I have wearied the House already too long on these points and shall pass on. This system is indefensible on the grounds I have stated. It is utterly extravagant. Hon. gentlemen opposite entered upon a career of extravagance in 1881, and I wish to do the Finance Minister the justice of saying that I believe he made strenuous efforts, a few years ago, to stop it, but found himself powerless. With all his desires for economy and retrenchment, he was absolutely powerless in the hands of those who live by extravagant public expenditure. The expenditure under the Conservative Government, as I said before, has increased by $14,000,000 yearly. If we should come into power, we shall be able to reduce that expenditure enormously.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell the hon. gentleman how much, but before doing so I will call his attention to a statement made by the Minister of Railways a couple of years ago. What did the hon. gentleman say then? He said, two years, ago, when the expenditure was $2,000,000 more than it is proposed to be next year, that it could not be cut down one dollar. Let me read from his speech on the Budget in 1894. He was then in a state of chronic defiance. He defied everybody. He defied the leader of proposed to be next year, that it could not down the expenditure one dollar. He defied the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) our future Finance Minister, to show where he could make any reductions. He spoke as follows:—

> I defy the hon. gentlemen opposite to show in what partiular they intend to reduce the amount of expenditure in this country. I defied them last session to do this, and I defy them again. Before the people of the country will consent to put these hon. gentlemen in power, they must be prepared to show in what respect the amount levied upon the people is in excess of the country's requirements. * * * What item is the hon. gentleman going to reduce; in what manner is he going to lighten the imposts upon the country? * * * What a farce it is for these hon. gentlemen to state that if they get into power, they will lessen the burdens of the people.

That was the song which the hon. gentleman sang in 1894. He said: I have looked over the public expenditure—civil service, public works, militia, North-west, and all the rest—and I defy you to cut down a dollar. He told us the same story five or six years ago, when the country was alarmed at the extravagant expenditure on the Intercolonial. I told the hon. gentleman from my place, year after year, that it was in the knowledge of every man in the maritime provinces that the Intercolonial was run on a scale of extravagance which was appalling, that if any man with a business head on his shoulders took charge, $600,000 or $700,000 a year could be knocked off without injury to the public service; that this money was being recklessly

squandered by an extravagant Administration for political purposes. I was challenged, and my statements were scouted ; yet, two years later, the hon. gentleman came down and reduced the expenditure $600,000. And, having reduced it $600,00, he congratulated the country that the administration of that department was better than it had ever been. Then he came down and defied us to cut down our general expenditure another dollar. Yet to-day he proposes to cut down the expenditure $1,600,000 for the coming year. He told us it was not possible to cut down the expenditure one dollar on the Intercolonial, and he cut it down $600,000. Then, he said that it was not possible to cut down the expenditure of the general service, and the Finance Minister proposes to cut it down $1,600,000. What reliance can we place on the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite when they make statements of that kind ?

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to trouble you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The trouble is the hon. gentleman has not gone far enough in the right direction, but I will tell the hon. gentleman that I am satisfied with the statements made by my hon. friend from Winnipeg as to the extent to which reductions can be made in the public expenditure without injury to the public service. What did that hon. gentleman show ? He showed that the expenditure of 1894 had increased $14,000,000 over that of 1878. He showed that the increase of population in that period was only 22 per cent, which might justify an increase of $5,000,000 in expenditure. That would make a justifiable increase of expenditure in 1894 over 1878, of $5,000,000. Suppose we throw in another five million for expenditure fastened on the country in the shape of interest and charges imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and which we cannot get rid of. Suppose we throw in five million dollars more, and allow an increase in proportion to the increase of the population. There is still a saving of $4,000,000 which a good economical, strong Government—strong in its support by the people—could and will effect. I do not think that is an extravagant sum. I believe that saving can be effected, and if we come into office we shall do it. How does the hon. gentleman stand to-day ? I remember his casting sneers across the House at the fact that, owing to the depreciation in the value of goods, there was not sufficient money raised by the Mackenzie Administration to meet expenditures, and there was, consequently a deficit for several years. That deficit was a terrible thing, but the burden of their plaint has now changed. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that a deficit is not a thing to condemn a financier for, unless it is caused by extravagant expenditure. In what position does the hon. Finance Minister stand to-day ? $1,250,000 deficit last year ; $4,500,000 this year, $3,000,000 next year ; following each other in rapid succession.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you get your $3,000,000 ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will show the hon. gentleman. He levies $1,800,000 increased taxation to meet an anticipated deficit of $3,000,000, and then he hopes that the balance will be made up by betterment of trade. Suppose his hopes are not realized. What then ? We will have a deficit of $1,250,000 next year, notwithstanding the additional taxation of $1,800,000 which he is going to impose upon the people. Sir, the chickens are coming home to roost ; the hon. gentleman has learned that when there is a depression, the Finance Minister ought not to be held responsible for the decreased revenue resulting from customs ad valorem duties. He never was the man, though, to say that, to my hon. friend regarding his period of administration. The facts then were as the facts are now, but to these is superadded the extravagant expenditure to which the hon. gentleman has succeeded and which will never be reduced until another party comes into power. For this I condemn the Government.

I say further that they have developed administrative negligence besides. I was going to say official corruption. Yes, I will say official corruption—corruption in the highest places. Why, Sir, we have had here but a few years since a scandal at the very mention of which every Canadian had to hang his head in shame. Is there a man here who walked through the streets of London during the time of the investigation into the Langevin-McGreevy-Connolly scandal who did not feel the shame of it as a Canadian ? Is there a man here who read in the English newspapers that out of four millions of dollars spent in contracts in Canada about one million dollars was stolen, who feels any pride in the fact that, though the case was probed to the bottom and those who were responsible shown up to the public gaze, to this day no man has been punished unless you except the farce of six weeks imprisonment which was awarded to two of the minor culprits ? Why, Sir, the thing is disgraceful in the extreme. And have they improved ? Where is the Langevin block scandal to-day ? Has that been investigated ; have those who were responsible for criminal expenditure of public money been punished ? No, not even the first step has been taken. Where is the Caron-Ross-Beemer scandal ? In this case $25,000 was personally paid to a member of the cabinet who, in his turn, advises the giving of railway subsidies to the corporation from which he derived the $25,000. Is that gentleman morally more guilty than the rest ? No ; for every man of them endorsed his action, every man of them voted to support his action as politically and morally right. He

told them he was prepared to do it again, and they applauded him to the echo. It is not the hon. Postmaster General I condemn; he is the victim of circumstances. He did it for his party and they applauded him and voted to declare his action perfectly correct. Then you had the Harris land job which stinks in the nostrils of the better disposed people of St. John. Then you have the Tay canal, the Sheik's Island dam, and the Galops Rapids. You had the culminating scandal when within a hundred miles of the capital city you had $200,000 stolen on a $200,000 contract. What about the Curran bridge scandal? Did hon. gentlemen read the remarks made by the judge who presided at the preliminary investigation? An hon. member behind me read a portion to the House the other day, but the House was thin? Will he allow me to read some of these remarks.

An hon. MEMBER. Fire away.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) "Fire away" says the hon. gentleman. Of course we can "fire away," but the question to which the country will demand an answer is, when the judge in his place has declared that $200,000 has been stolen from the country, who are the culprits and how have they been punished? And if the Government say: No: the departments are so mixed up in this scandal we dare not punish, the tax-payers will repudiate the reason. On every hustings in Canada these facts will be spoken and the tax-payers will require an answer. The Government prosecuted one of the men the other day, for what? For obtaining $170,000 under false pretenses. The judge dismissed the charge. I do not myself agree with the legal conclusion the judge drew. But I am not concerned with that. I am concerned with the facts which he stated and upon which there could be no difference of opinion. And what did the learned judge say? After reciting the charge he says:

Defendant sent in his accounts periodically, as the work was in progress, for the labour so furnished by him, and his accounts were certified by the officers of the Government, and the signatures of the latter to that effect affixed to the documents. The different accounts sent in by the defendant to the Government for labour furnished aggregate $275,655.34. On the strength of these accounts the Government paid him $220,550.20, and now complains that he has made overcharges in his accounts.

* * * * * * * * * *

The two experts took cognizance of the contract for labour above mentioned obtained by the defendant, and the pay-lists and accounts rendered by the latter to the Government (and filed in this case). They also had communication of the depositions of

a number of the witnesses——

Acting upon the said information, the two experts made their respective reports separately. One of them, Mr. Vanier, certifies that the defendant has already been overpaid $95,000 besides what he still claims, and the other, Professor McLeod, says he has been overpaid $100,000, also independent of what he still claims.

* * * * * * * * * *

The prosecution has produced about forty carters who had been employed on said works. They all claim to have been employed for a shorter period of time and to have been paid smaller amounts than those charged by the defendant.

* * * * * * * * * *

The prosecution, in support of their pretensions that the defendant has made overcharges for carters, have produced witness Henri Frigon, a brother-in-law of the defendant, who swears that he was employed from the 6th of March to the 21st of April, hiring men and checking the time of the carters who worked at the excavations for the Grand Trunk bridge. He says he kept two little books to that effect, which were given to him by Mr. Villeneuve, another brother-in-law of the defendant. It appears by these two little books, compared with defendant's pay-list, that the defendant overcharged the Government upwards of fifty thousand hours for carters during the said lapse of time (about 47 days).

* * * * * * * * * *

He also admits that he entered in his said books as carters about twenty-five fictitious names of persons, who, of course, never worked at all. He says he entered such fictitious names at the request of Villeneuve, who wanted to raise a sum of money to buy himself a horse and rig, and for other outside expenses.

* * * * * * * * * *

Frigon further says that defendant was aware of such fictitious names being put in. Frigon also admits that while being paid $4.50 per day to keep the carters' time, as aforesaid, he managed to obtain from Mr. Kennedy another similar pay of $4.50 per day, for services supposed to be rendered on the Wellington bridge, and he says he was to look after the tools and materials used for the construction of the Grand Trunk bridge, thus making for himself the snug pay of $9 per day from the 7th of March to the 21st of April.

* * * * * * * * * *

Frigon also asserts that he received from Villeneuve, besides his $9 a day, about $300 per month, money raised by fictitious names on the lists, and says he used this money towards a payment of expenses, wine, cab-hire, kitchen expenses, &c., for the benefit of St. Louis' job.

* * * * * * * * * *

Now, with regard to the overcharges alleged to have been made by the stonecutters, Mr. Leonard Shannon, accountant, proves that the amount charged to the Government by the defendant for stonecutters on the three different works, namely, Wellington bridge, Grand Trunk bridge and Lock No. 1, is $42,535.25, exclusive of the time for foremen stonecutters. Expert witness, Mr. McLeod, gives his estimate for the cost of stone-cutting, and fixes it at $10,953.98, making a difference or overcharge by defendant of $31,581.29. Michael Doheny says that he counted the stonecutters for the three different works every day from the 20th March until the 17th May, a period of 58 days, and entered them in a book, which he filed. His figures, compared with the pay-list of the defendant, shows an overcharge by the latter of 3,307 days, equal to upwards of $10,000 during the said period of time.

* * * * * * * * * *

Charles Latour, mason, says he worked four days in all. C. Latour, who appears to be the same person, is charged in the defendant's accounts for 49 days, plus 30 hours' overtime.

Aime Rateau worked for about six or seven days, including night time, had an accident then

and worked no more. He is charged in the defendant's account as having worked 38 nights at $4.60 per night; that is to say, he is charged as having been been paid for overtime whilst he was in the hospital disabled.

Zepherin Leveille worked 16 days, and is charged in the defendant's accounts as having worked 45 days, and so forth for the others, who all say that they have worked and were paid for a much shorter time than that charged by the defendant.

According to the accounts filed by Mr. St. Louis, the cost of cutting the stone for said Wellington bridge, Grand Trunk bridge and Lock No. 1 averages $30 per cubic yard, and we have the testimony of Mr. J. B. de Lorimier, contractor, to the effect that the same work would cost about $4 and a fraction per cubic yard, if made in ordinary circumstances, but that it would cost more, of course, if made by night work or Sunday work.

Mr. McLeod says it should cost an average of about $7 per cubic yard.

And here is where the department's malfeasance comes in:

In the tenders of Mr. St. Louis, above referred to, no mention is made of timekeepers, although, according to the evidence, they were just as necessary as the foremen, if not more so, for the proper execution of that large enterprise.

* * * * * * * * * *

As there was no provision for timekeepers, according to Mr. St. Louis' contract, those assistant timekeepers were entered in Mr. St. Louis' accounts as night and overtime foremen, day masons, overtime skilled labourers. On that ground the defendant is charged with having obtained $1,861.40 by false pretenses.

* * * * * * * * * *

There was no proper surveillance by the officers of the Government, on two of the jobs at least; namely, the Grand Trunk bridge and Lock No. 1 of the Lachine Canal. The timekeeping on the two latter jobs seems to have been left to take care of itself, as far as the Government officers were concerned.

* * * * * * * * * *

Mr. St. Louis procured all the workmen that were asked of him. He did not keep their time personally. He had several clerks to do it. Those clerks made the lists, and one of them stuffed the lists. There can be no doubt as to that, because it is sworn to by himself, to his own disgrace, and when those lists were so made and cooked, they were certified blindly, and as a mere matter of form, by the officers of the Government. On the strength of those lists, so certified, the money was obtained from the Government. Every man's pay was put in a separate envelope, with his name on it, and distributed to the men, fictitious or real. One can conceive how easy it may have been to distribute loaded envelopes to fictitious men, or rather to men personating men, when it is known that sometimes as many as 800 men were there together shoving and jostling for their wages; so much so that the paying clerks had to require the services on some occasions of as many as 20 policemen to prevent the shanty where they were sheltered, from being overturned.

Who can wonder at it when men who never worked a day, were paid for 30, 40 and 50 days work? He winds up:

As stated above, I believe, after studying this record, that there have been frauds committed to the detriment of the Federal Government, but I do not think that they were as large as alleged. Mr. St. Louis' contract was extremely favourable to him. He was allowed $4 a day for a foreman stonecutter, day time, and $6 a day for the same foreman for night or overtime; $8 for the same foreman on Sundays, and at the rate of $12 for the same foreman for Sunday overtime. He was allowed $5 a day for a double team, and $10 a day for the same double team on Sundays. He was allowed $2.50 a day for the use of a derrick, day time, $3.75 for the use of the same derrick night or overtime, and at the rate of $7.50 a day for the same derrick for Sunday overtime, and so forth on the same scale for stonemasons, stonesetters and skilled labourers.

It is no wonder that Mr. St. Louis' bills must have been tremendous, when it is remembered that the job lasted about four months, and that there were at times as many as two thousand men at work in the day time, and 1,500 men at work at night time. The men were paid alternately every week. Mr. Michaud tells us that some of the pays amounted to $34,000, some $10,000, some $15,000 and some to $20,000. In my opinion, the main causes of all the trouble in this matter are:

1st. The exorbitant prices stipulated for labour in Mr. St. Louis' contract; and

2nd. The almost unlimited number of men allowed on the said works, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

Now, Sir, I have at some length given those facts because they stand out in broad, black and damning disgrace of the department under which they were carried on. I say if these things can be done within a hundred miles of Ottawa, what must be done in contracts carried out 1,000 miles away. If such things can be done in the green tree what, I ask, may be done in the dry? Hon. gentlemen know that in this matter the Government have been guilty of criminal neglect. They know that in this matter there has been no business application, no business conduct. As in all other matters, everything seems to drift. There is a want of business knowledge, a want of business application. The country seems drifting slowly to the dogs. They let men get what prices they like, exorbitant prices, prices three, four, and five times more than they would pay if they were carrying out a private contract of their own. The public can judge why the Government pay these awful and exorbitant prices to men who, it was shown, give large contributions to their election funds. And we have to-day these gentlemen, not, mind you claiming exemption from the scandals of a year or two ago, but revelling in the scandals of the present. There is a want of business capacity which marks their dealings, not only in the Customs Department, but in Public Works, in the Railway Department, and throughout the whole Government. The heads of the Government seem to be gone. The men who guided them and to whom they looked up for inspiration and advice, have gone away, and we have the dregs left. The hon. gentleman moved a want of confidence, I almost wonder he took the trouble. Let them die, die as they are dying, through sheer inanition.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has not gone over a great deal of ground, although he has spoken at considerable length. He started out—because I will come right to business with him—by a statement that not only did the National Policy take out of the pockets of the people the amount of the duty, but it also took out of the pockets of the people fully as much again. Now, Sir, that statement was made by the hon. member for South Oxford; it was also made from the back benches: and with the permission of the House, I will reply to what the hon. member for South Oxford said:

> We have the most awful tariff exactions. We have had a taxation of sixty millions a year since 1879, and a billion of dollars have been taken out of the pockets of the people.

He is fond of that billion, because you remember that in summing up what our indebtedness is, he declares on his own ipse dixit that it is also a billion, without giving rhyme or reason for that statement. Said he: We tax ourselves to the extent of $60,000,000 a year; in 16 years, $450,000,000; the cost of collection equals half of the revenue; although we have statistics to prove that it does not equal the half of half. Yet the hon. member for South Oxford, in the most reckless manner, declares that it equals half. Then he goes on to add to that an amount that brings it up to a billion dollars:

> So far as our tariff is a protective measure, the taxation is the total consumption of imported goods, plus the goods manufactured under that tariff in the country.

Precisely the same statement, though not made so formally nor so definitely, has been made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. Again, I will quote the hon. member for South Oxford:

> The more manufactured, the more taken out of the pockets of the people. Where the goods manufactured are four times the amount of the goods imported, then you may fairly conclude that it will take four times, or five times more out of the pockets of the people than it puts into the treasury.

So the argument is irrefutable, the richer you make a country in manufactures, the more certainly do you rob the people generally, and the sure course to wealth would be to blight every manufacturing industry that could arise! That is the logic of these gentlemen, that is to say, if they ever give a thought to logic. But I think after the speech to which we have just listened and the previous speeches from the Reform side of the House, I do not think we shall come to the conclusion that there is much logic at all events in one part of the debate. Take cotton. We have had the version of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and I will give the House the versions of the hon. member for North Norfolk and of the hon. member for South Oxford. The latter hon. gentleman gave the total import as the value of $4,000,000; total value of manufactured articles, $10,000,000; tax, $5,600,000; amount paid into the treasury, $1,140,000, while the manufacturers receive $4,460,000. The hon. member for Norfolk said the manufacturers receive $2,250,000, and the hon. member for Queen's placed the amount at $3,000,000. Which of those hon. gentleman is right? Because surely when we are here in the great council of the nation discussing so important a question as the tariff of the country we are not to be told that a million dollars one way or another on a single item of the fiscal policy is of no account whatever. Why, Sir, it is trifling with the question. Here is an hon. gentleman sitting on the front Opposition benches, who if the Reform party came into power, as he anticipates—hope tells a flattering tale just now, and the hon. member for South Oxford anticipates the same outcome, and on the back benches one hears a curious squeak like an echo, that the party is coming into power, but we have heard that cry before, and it has died away and nothing came of it—the hon. member for Oxford would be Finance Minister and the fiscal policy of this country would be entrusted to his tender mercies and the member for Queen's would be in the ministry, as also would be the hon. member for North Norfolk. If those three hon. gentlemen on one item of the fiscal policy differ so much that one says $2,500,000 is taken by manufacturers, another $3,000,000, and another $4,000,000, I think the public are in a position to demand from them what they mean; under which king they serve; to which estimate they will adhere: and that when hon. gentlemen opposite call upon a Tory Government to explain a difference of $50,000 or even $10,000, the Reform party should not be permitted to say that one million or two millions of dollars amounts to nothing. And it matters nothing, because the speech of the hon. member for Oxford, like the speech to which we have just listened, and like the speeches of a member of the Reform party with whom I would not compare them for a minute, whom I would put above and apart from them, show the utmost recklessness, not merely in regard to one detail of that policy, but the utmost recklessness of statement as to what their general policy is. What have we heard in regard to the policy they have placed before the House during the present debate? We need not go over the debates from year to year. We need not take up what they said in 1879, and then go to 1888, when they began to set forth their commercial union policy, and to 1889 when they proposed unrestricted reciprocity, and to 1890 when they wobbled again. Then we had the leader of the Reform party down at Boston de-

claring for continental free trade, a declaration made in a speech in which I was amazed to see he went back to the war time and was somewhat unfaithful to Canada, and I thought unjust to England, to gain the applause of the Americans who were listening to him. When I read that speech I could not help remembering how a great Liberal and a great man, and splendid orator behaved in the teeth of the war sentiment, when men were aroused and almost mad, how Joe. Howe attended a great meeting held at Detroit in 1865, stood before the people and told them he would not take back one single action, that the people of Canada behaved as a free people should have done, and he asked them: Is there an Irishman, Englishman, Scotchman or American who would for one moment surrender the right of asylum to people coming from other countries? That was the way in which a great man and a great patriot acted on that occasion. Then we come back to 1892, when there was a wobble again. Again, in 1893, there was something different. Now, in 1894, we have their new policy defined. That policy is a curious one, because I find in the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and other hon. members on the Opposition side of the House that they are constantly harking back to the beauties of reciprocity with the United States and point out the value of the American market. They are belated reciprocitists; they are belated politicians; they are unable, however, to change with the facility of their leaders, whose views change with the regularity of pilots looking out on a shifting sky, and as they find the breeze veer, trim their sails and fix their rudders. Sir, the hon. gentlemen were discordant in their own speeches; they were discordant in their own cries and in their oratory—shall I call it oratory, or is it not the parrottory of discordant cries? Take the very point that hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to make, namely, that so much money has been taken out of the pockets of the people by the manufacturers that in sixteen years a billion of money has been extracted. Of course if that is so, the result must be that not only would the manufacturers under the policy of the Conservative Government put the natural profit into their pockets, but also put into their pockets the amount which it is said is given them, because, and an hon. gentleman repeated it to-day—they have it as pat as a b c, and can go over it as a child can go over its alphabet, but if they go over it for ever it will be useless and have no effect because its monstrously ridiculous character is manifest the moment it is stated—they say the manufacturers get not merely the natural profits on what they manufacture, but also the duty, and not only the duty but the percentage on the duty, and not only that but they put so much in their pockets in addition and they are thus able to fleece the country; and this last sum never goes into the treasury. I have stated that the Reform party in this House is a party of discordant cries, and I find proof of this in the speeches of several hon. members, including the hon. member for Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk, because the hon. member for North Norfolk committed himself to this one point, which I dwell on, for it is the centre of their position, and the falsity of which, if proved before a public audience, breaks through their line of battle. We need not trouble to answer them because they answer themselves. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) makes precisely the same statement as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and precisely the same statement as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Yet in his own speech is found a triumphant answer, where he endeavours to show that the manufacturers were as successful from 1871 to 1878, and from 1868 to 1871, as they were subsequently under the National Policy, and this is what he says:

> If it can be shown that, even though the product was larger in 1871 or in 1881, the business was still unprofitable, some argument would be given in favour of a change which would make the business more profitable. What do the figures show?

He asked triumphantly what do the figures show? And he finds that the percentage of profits in 1871 for the manufacturers was 73 and in 1881 it was 42 per cent. One would think that under this protective system, by which the manufacturers are said, by hon. gentlemen on the Liberal benches, to put large sums of money into their pockets, that the profits would be much higher in 1891, but alas, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) finds that in 1891 the percentage of profit was only 33·6 as compared with a higher profit in 1881, and a still higher profit in 1871. Let us ask these gentlemen: where then did all this money go that was taken out of the pockets of the people and put into the pockets of the manufacturers? The moment they are posed with that question, we have them saying, as the hon. member for Queen's said "Oh, it is taken out of the pockets of the people but nevertheless it ruins the manufacturer." They tell us that the manufacturer gets not only the natural profit on what he produces, but that he also gets a percentage on the very duty, and nevertheless that it ruins him completely. Such a contention as that has only to be stated in order that its absurdity may be seen. The hon. member (Mr. Davies) again made, what struck me as a very peculiar assertion. He told us that the Liberal party were not going to be "free traders as they are in England"; although I confess that I thought I actually heard the leader of the Opposition say so. I thought I heard that the hon.

gentleman (Mr. Laurier) declared for "free trade as they have it in England." If that is not the policy of the Liberal party, then what was the meaning of half the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Davies)? He devoted half his time to showing, that things are in a very prosperous condition in England. Well, there was no necessity to do that, if the Liberals are not going to give us free trade as it is in England. Again he says: Although that is not our policy, we are going to aim at it, and the great principles that underlie free trade as it is in England, are the principles we go by. Well, Sir, it rather struck me as if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) denied that the Liberals wanted free trade as it is in England, and then felt uneasy lest the people were convinced that that was exactly what they wanted, and so he went on to prove that it would be a very good thing indeed. What else was the significance of all which he read out of that little red book? He told us of falls in values, but we all knew about that. He told us that wages had risen comparatively, because the purchasing power of money was greater; or in other words, he told us that the price of labour had not fallen with the same rapidity as the price of commodities. Well, Sir, we all knew that, and we all knew further that the very same thing has happened in Canada, and that the value of commodities in this country have decreased in greater ratio than has that of labour. The hon. gentleman described his chief as "having spoken with a wealth of argument and profusion of illustration rarely equalled." Well, Sir, I have heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) frequently. I have heard him in and out of this House, and all I can say is this: that the only way in which during this debate he varied from his past, was in being more verbose (and I was astonished to find that was possible) more flatulent, more reckless in assertion, more careless of his facts, and altogether weaker than I have ever known him to be for many a year. Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in an excited strain tells us "that there was a wealth of argument and a profussion of illustration that was utterly astonishing" in the speech of his leader (Sir Richard Cartwright). The wealth of argument consisted in giving us two long speeches in which he raised one question after another that had no bearing whatever on the issue before the House, and then leaving the actual issue undiscussed. He told us, in defiance of all statistics prepared even by Reformers, that real estate was reduced in value, and left the subject without an attempt at proof. What, however, has that to do with the tariff? During the course of his two long speeches, he never discussed with any illumination nor with any care the changes made in the tariff, and he utterly failed to grapple with the speech of the Finance Minister. Then, imitating the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) brought forward an illustration about cotton. He told us that year after year, England exported large quantities of cotton than ever before and at lower prices. That we did not need to be told, for every one with any knowledge of contemporary or past history, knows it. Although he was in the House at the time, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) might have known that when parties were on different sides of this House, when steel rails were higher by a vast percentage than they are now, and higher by a vast percentage than when the Reform party went out of power; the hon. gentleman might have known that in a falling market, with scandalous want of prudence, if not scandalous corruption, the Reform party went on buying steel rails. The hon. gentleman said that Canada was deprived of buying these cheap cottons because of the tariff. Well, strange it is, that Canada buys cottons and buys them to a very great extent, giving a large and handsome revenue to the treasury because of the amount she buys. If the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in that respect has any significance at all, it would be in the inference from it, that the prices of cotton had remained the same in Canada as they were some years ago. But let me read the prices in Canada. In 1878, gray cotton sold at 7⅛ cents per yard; in 1885, at 4¾ cents per yard, and in April 1895, at 4½ cents per yard. So on with the various grades. Cotton at 7¾ cents per yard in 1878 fell to 5 cents in April, 1895; cotton at 8¼ cents in 1878 fell to 5½ cents per yard in April, 1895; cotton at 9⅜ cents per yard fell to 6¼ cents in April 1895; cotton sold at 9⅞ cents in 1878, sold for 6¾ cents in April 1895; cotton sold at 11¼ cents in 1878, sold for 7½ cents in 1895. White sheeting which sold for 25½ cents in 1878, sold for 16½ cents in 1895. Canton flannels which sold for 10½ cents in 1878, sold for 8 cents in 1895; what cost 11½ cents in 1878, fell to 8¼ cents in 1895; what cost 12 cents in 1878, cost only 9 cents in 1895; what cost 14 cents in 1878, fell to 10½ cents in 1895; and what cost 17 cents in 1878 cost only 12¼ cents in 1895. The prices of cotton bags fell in the same way; what cost $24.50 in 1878 fell to $18 in 1895; what cost $22.50 in 1878 fell to $14.75 in 1895. Cotton yarns, whites, fell from 23½ cents per pound to 12 cents per pound; and cotton yarns, coloured, fell from 33½ cents per pound to 22 cents per pound. Bleached shirtings fell from 6¾ cents to 5 cents; from 7¾ cents to 6¼ cents; from 9⅛ cents to 6½ cents; from 9¼ cents to 7½ cents; from 10¾ cents to 8¼ cents; from 12¼ cents to 9¼ cents; and so on. Denims, tickings, and ginghams fell in the same ratio; cheese cloth, apron checks and bleached sheeting in about the same ratio. The difference in values to-day as thus shown is about as follows:—Gray cottons, 35 per

cent less than in 1878; bleached sheeting, 20 per cent less; Canton flannels, 27½ per cent less; bags, about 30 per cent less; yarns, 45 per cent less; bleached shirtings, 25 per cent less; tickings, 35 per cent less; apron checks, 40 per cent less; cheese cloth, 40 per cent less. At the same time we have mills employing over 8,000 people, and much capital, and paying over $2,000,000 a year in wages, showing a state of things which surely it would be undesirable not to have in existence. Now, Sir, when prices have fallen here, what is the meaning of the hon. member for Queen's coming forward and telling us that prices have fallen in England? We know they have. The hon. gentleman's argument meant nothing if it did not mean that he would do away with the duty altogether, and let those cheap goods in to the destruction of our manufacturers. Suppose he did, what would be the result? Would not population, to the extent to which it is supported by these manufactories, disappear? And where would he get his revenue? People who remained would not get as good cottons nor one cent cheaper. The hon. gentleman went on to argue that in England, under the policy he still seemed to hanker after, the people were not taxed, and did not complain. Now, it so happens that we know what they are saying in England about the state of things there. Here is the report of Mr. Wilson Fox, assistant commissioner, on the county of Lincolnshire:

> Farmers all protested against being assessed for income tax on half their rental. Many considered that one-fourth of their rental was the most they should be assessed on. As it is, the habit of many of the larger farmers to keep good accounts, a number of them have been successful in recent years in their appeals to the commissioners, and several income-tax commissioners informed me that the number of appeals has been increasing year by year.

Here are farmers complaining that they have to pay income tax on half their rental. Does any one suppose, if the hon. gentleman got rid of the protective policy, as he wants to, that we should not have an income tax here as they have it in England, and that our farmers would not cry out in the same way? Here is what Mr. Harry Rew says in his report on the Salisbury Plain District of Wiltshire:

> I cannot do better than quote the following passage from a statement of his views sent me by Mr. E. A. Rawlence, as it fairly expresses the contention of those who advocate what is commonly termed protection:—"In regard to free trade, whatever may be the wisdom of maintaining this policy, it is useless to endeavour to close our eyes to the fact that the serious depreciation in the prices of all home-grown agricultural products is due to the glutting of our market by the surplus products of our colonies and foreign countries. It must of necessity happen that in some part of the globe there will each year be an abnormally productive crop, and hence a surplus, which must be disposed of at any price.

Then, he gives the argument of this man, who shows from the custom-house returns the duties collected from imported products, such as chicory, coffee, cocoa, and chocolate, tea, currants, raisans, figs, plums, and prunes, making a total of £4,097,739, or over $20,000,000. This farmer goes on to say:

> It can scarcely be disputed that all the items enumerated in the above schedule are absolute necessities of life, as well for the cottager as for the peer, and almost as necessary as wheat and flour, and yet we tax these necessities, which we cannot produce, to the extent of over £4,000,000 per annum.

Now, Sir, the hon. member who preceded me spoke about the expenditure, and one speaker after another on the Opposition side sought to make out that the people are taxed to death. Let us have the duties on tea, coffee, cocoa, and chocolate that were in existence in the time of the previous regime, and we shall very soon have some millions of dollars to make the present deficit disappear. The hon. member, near the close of his remarks, came to the conclusion that there was just $4,000,000 in excess of what ought to have been added to the expenditure. All we have to do to make up that sum is to put aside what we raised by inland revenue, about $4,000,000, if I remember rightly, more than was raised in 1878. Nobody supposes that is a burden on the poor people of this country. Then, if you take the amount we raise from customs duties on such things as wines, diamonds, silks, satins, &c., you will find that we raise nearly as much on these things as would make up that amount which the hon. member thinks may possibly be in excess of what should have been raised. But there is the thing that surprises me; when hon. gentlemen talk about what our expenditure should be, as compared with what it was in 1878, they never enter into a calculation to explain how they would have carried on the public works which we have put into operation in that time. Would they have built the railways? If they would, they would have had to get money. Would they have had to deepen the canals? Nobody doubts that they would. We have at present the finest system of inland waterways in the world and well worth the money. Some hon. gentlemen talk about the income from these canals not being what it should be, but we have the Liberal papers asking now, as they have asked at other times, that there should be no tolls charged at all. Would we have had these put in operation? If so, they would have had to supply the money, and their expenditure would have been just as large as it is to-day, and probably larger. The proper way to estimate the burden is to consider the amount of interest that has to

be paid. That amount, as has been pointed out, not only by myself but by others, is only some 17 or 18 cents more for each individual than it was in 1878. Now, the hon. member quoted Mr. Cleveland, and of course we are not surprised that he should go to President Cleveland for a definition of the Liberal policy, and he also went to the platform of 1893, as laid down in Ottawa. But, Mr. Speaker, we in the west have had the opportunity of judging what the policy of the Reform party would be, because we have had the honour of a visit from the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman spoke at Winnipeg, Regina, Vancouver, and he laid down everywhere—especially in Winnipeg, at the gateway of the Territories—the proposition that his policy was freedom, civil and religious, and freedom of trade as they have it in England. We cannot have it now, he said, but we will aim at it, and we hope in time to get it. We had the same thing from my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davies). Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall not weary the House by explaining what free trade as practised in England means. You have only to go to the Reform almanac to find out what it means, and I shall not weary the House with quotations from English reports, showing what the farmers in England suffer from the system. I have here a report by a Mr. James Hope, in which he says :

> The farmers also complained to me of the practice which has recently been adopted of taxing them on sums paid as fire insurance premiums. These sums ought certainly not to be taxed as income, and I consider the farmers' complaint on this head a most reasonable one. Another matter to which my attention was specially drawn, was the charging of inhabited house duty upon the assumed annual value of farm houses.

This is exactly what we told the farmers who were exposed to the siren voice of our Opposition friends : If you go in for free trade as it is in England, you will have to pay the inhabited house tax and the income tax, and all the other taxes which the farmers of England are protesting against. Another grievance is thus described on page 10 of the report by Mr. James Hope :

> Another grievance which was prominently brought before me, was the principle upon which the income tax is assessed upon the supposed income of farmers, and the charging farmers' houses with the inhabited house duty.

And yet the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us that men in humble circumstances had to pay very little indeed in England. Why, one of the men of whom I have spoken complained bitterly that they had to pay on their tea and all those things which are free of duty in Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford made the statement, and it was also made in a most emphatic manner by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that the manufacturers got hold of the Finance Minister last year and made him alter his tariff resolutions. One of the followers of hon. gentlemen opposite said in the west that the manufacturers got the Finance Minister to change his tariff to such an extent that its own father would not know it. That statement has been made here by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). That hon. gentleman quoted the manufacturers' report, in which the secretary takes credit to himself for having influenced the Minister. This is a matter which has to be cleared up. It has been again and again stated in the west, and I think I have seen the statement in the "Globe" newspaper. We have heard it made in this House also. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) elaborated it the other night in a most emphatic manner. It is said that although the Finance Minister came down with something in the way of tariff reform which was pretty good, the manufacturers got him by the throat, and he had to take it all back. I will just quote the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg :

> In carrying out this promise, the Finance Minister did bring down resolutions, which, if put into force, would have lessened somewhat the imposts then upon the country. He was not allowed, however, to carry his policy into force.

The hon. member for Winnipeg went on to quote this manufacturers' report, just as the hon. member for South Oxford did. I am very sorry that neither the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) nor the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is here, because I would ask them to give me the instances in which the manufacturers made the Finance Minister change his tariff. I would challenge them, as I did on the public platform one of their followers. I put the two tariffs before him, and I said : There is the tariff as it was ultimately agreed to, and there it is as it was first brought down—show me the changes. He said, I will do it some other time. Why, Sir, he was only echoing the lying statements made by the Grit press when they saw the manufacturers' deputations come to Ottawa, just as farmers' deputations came. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and myself were among some few members of Parliament who introduced to Sir John Thompson deputations of farmers. No doubt deputations from the manufacturers came here. But what does that show ? It shows that the tariff had affected them a good deal. I would ask these gentlemen to prove their assertion, because I should not be expected to prove a negative. The statement as made in the press outside, and as made in the west, is false.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What statement is that ?

Mr. DAVIN. That the Finance Minister brought down certain changes in the tariff,

but was made to take back water by the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He took back none?

Mr. DAVIN. I say practically none. I will ask the House to bear with me because I am called on to prove a negative. The only way to prove a negative is by induction. And, although it may be wearisome to the House, and certainly is not pleasant to myself, I will go over the items, and I will stamp that lie once and for all, for what it is. Sir, immediately on the Finance Minister bringing down his financial statement last year, and before a single manufacturer's deputation had time to come, contrary to my rule in these financial discussions, I spoke early in the debate, and I said what has been brought against me again and again. Speaking of the tariff said:

> It is one of the boldest things that have been done in the history of tariffs—and I recall what was done by Mr. Gladstone; it is a bold, sage and a liberal measure, and it will have my undivided support.

That is quoted against me in the west, and they say: "Though he characterized the tariff in that way, what did he do when the manufacturers changed the tariff in such a way that its own father would not know it?" He was as silent as the grave. I explained my position; I put the tariff under their noses, as if the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) was here now, I would do as regards him. I gave them the two tariffs, but they did not dare to accept the challenge, and I said I would show that the statement that any modifications of importance were made was utterly false. Now, Sir, in the course of the speech I wanted to show what had been done to take off taxation, and I wanted to justify the opinions I had formed of the tariff, and I may say I was quite surprised at the length the Finance Minister went. And if I was criticising it from the standpoint taken by hon. members of the Opposition, instead of taking the position that they have taken, I would have taken the position that he had gone too far. Here is what I said in my speech last year just after the tariff was brought down: Lumber, free. That was considered a great boon; we used to pay 20 per cent. Barbed wire, 1½ to ¾ cents. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will note the changes from specific to ad valorem in those articles mentioned in my speech. I will note the changes lowering from a specific to a lower specific duty, and any case where there was a restoration or a partial restoration. I will then, at the end give the number of the changes that were made from specific to ad valorem, the number of the changes that were made from high specific to lower specific, and the number of cases where there was full or partial legislation. Tarred paper, from ½ cent per pound to 25 per cent. There was specinc duty abandoned, No. 1.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What number was that on the tariff?

Mr. DAVIN. I will give you the tariff list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the tariff of last year. What was that last item?

Mr. DAVIN. Tarred paper, from ½ cent per pound to 25 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the final passage of the Bill is it 25 per cent?

Mr. DAVIN. I think so. What do you make it there?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Tarred paper, 25 per cent. When the Bill was introduced it was 20 per cent. It was increased.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. You are quite right. The difference, however, from ½ cent per pound to 25 per cent would be equivalent to a change of about 5 per cent. But, in any case, the point I make is that specific duty was abandoned for ad valorem. I hope my hon. friend will look at it carefully, because I may err in one or two points, and I would be glad to have him correct me.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What item is that?

Mr. DAVIN. The item I have just read.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was not a specific duty at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; it was changed from ½ cent per pound to 25 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You mean it was changed from 20 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. No; it was changed from ½ a cent per pound to 25 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I say it was.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say it was not.

Mr. DAVIN. Axle grease, from 1 cent per pound to 25 per cent. There is another case of specific duty abandoned. Whips, from 50 cents per dozen and 30 per cent to 35 per cent—another case of specific duty abandoned. Axes, chopping axes, from $2 per dozen and 20 per cent to 35 per cent. Scythes, hay knives, from $2 per dozen and 20 per cent to 35 per cent; portable machines, threshers, and separators, from 35 to 30 per cent. Buckthorn fencing, from 1½ cents per pound to 1 cent per pound. Hubs, spokes, felloes, hewn and sawn, from 15 per cent to 10 per cent. This was the original change. I think they are free now. Pails, tubs, churns, from 25 to 20 per cent. Farm and freight wagons, from $10 each specific and 20 per cent ad valorem, to 25 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, if he will allow me, is he reading from the old tariff?

Mr. DAVIN. No; from the speech I made last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. He is all right.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman has no objections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to keep order. This is not a seemly way to carry on the debate.

Mr. DAVIN. I will explain to my hon. friend. I am reading the items of the tariff which was brought down, and which I mentioned in my speech, showing what reductions from the old tariff were made and also all subsequent changes. I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have gone to a great deal of trouble about it, but in such a number of items it is barely possible that one or two mistakes may have crept in, but I do not think so. Fertilizers, from 20 to 10 per cent. Guns and all connected therewith, from 35 to 30 per cent. Flax fibre and flax tow, free. It was from 1 to 2 cents per pound in the old tariff. This is specific duty No. 6 done away with or No. 9, more properly speaking, because I lumped three articles under one item. Saddle jiggers and stirrups, saddle trees and cheap moshan trees for cowboys' saddles, including pack saddle trees, free, instead of 10 per cent. Laths and shingles, free. The duty on common soap was reduced from 1½ to 1 cent per pound. Condensed milk and coffee, sweetened, from 1¼ cents to 35 per cent. This is a case of specific duty being abandoned, and the case before was a case of a specific duty reduced. Unsweetened, from 35 to 30 per cent; this was made 3 cents per pound; oatmeal, from ½ cent per pound to 50 cents; this was further reduced 20 per cent. Cleaned rice, from 1¼ cents per pound to 1 cent; but this was restored. There is a case of restored duty. Biscuits, sweetened, from 35 to 25 per cent; maccaroni, vermicelli, from 2 cents per pound to 25 per cent—another case of specific duty abandoned. Starch, including farina, from 4 cents to 1¼ cents per pound—another case of reduced specific duty; this was changed to 1½ cents per pound. Starch, unsweetened, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound; mustard cake, from 20 to 15 per cent; sweet potatoes, 25 cents to 10 cents per bushel; ad valorem the same, 10 cents. Pickles, from 40 cents per imperial gallon to 35 per cent. There is a case of abandonment of specific duty. Sauces and catsups, 40 to 35 per cent; soy, from 10 cents per gallon to 35 per cent, another case of abandonment of specific duty. Yeast cakes and baking powder, from 8 cents to 6 cents per pound. Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound; raisins, from 40 to 25 per cent; oranges, lemons and limes, from $1.60 to $1.50 per thousand; fruits in cans, reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound; jellies and jams, from 5 cents to 3 cents per pound; coffee, not directly imported, 3 cents to 2 cents per pound; ad valorem being the same. Cocoanuts, when imported directly, from $1 to 50 cents per 100 pounds. Nutmegs and mace, from 25 to 20 per cent—this was restored. That is restoration No. 2. Barrels containing petroleum, from 40 to 20 cents; shoeblacking, from 30 to 25 per cent; earthenware, from 35 to 30 per cent; glass jars, reduced from 35 to 30 per cent. Spectacles and eye glasses were reduced from 30 to 20 per cent, and this was restored. Clothes wringers, from $1 and 30 per cent to 25 cents and 20 per cent; sewing machines, from $3 each and 20 per cent to 30 per cent. That was a case of abandonment of a very high specific duty. Corset clasps and steels, from 30 to 20 per cent, the specific duty of 5 cents remains. Enamelled ironware reduced from 35 to 20 per cent; but this was restored. Plated cutlery, from 50 cents per dozen and 20 per cent to 35 per cent. That is specific duty abandoned. No. 13. Clocks, from 35 to 25; furniture, from 35 to 30; cottons, from 35 to 25; fibre ware, from 30 to 25; sugar candy, from 45 to 35. This is a case of abandonment of specific duty. The old was 1½ cents and 35 per cent. Cotton balls, batting and sheet wadding, dyed and undyed, from 2 cents and 3 cents per pound and 15 per cent, to 22½ per cent. This shows that my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) was entirely astray to-night in his statement of the duty that is paid. No such duty as he stated is paid. Cotton warp and cotton yarn dyed, from 34 to 25 per cent; unbleached cotton fabrics, from 26 to 22½ per cent. The old was 1 cent per square yard and 15 per cent. I calculate it was 26. Bleached cotton, 25 cents instead of 2 cents per square yard, and 15 per cent. This is case No. 17 of the abandonment of specific duty. Shirts—poor man's shirts—costing less than $3 per dozen, from 75 per cent to 35 per cent. All cotton clothing and other manufactures, from 35 to 32½ per cent; lamp wick, from 30 to 25 per cent; caplin, unfinished leghorn hats and manilla hoods, from 20 per cent to free. Coke, from 50 cents per ton to free; cotton yarns, not coarser than No. 40, from 2 cents per pound and 15 per cent, to free; prunella free, instead of 10 per cent; shoe buttons, free, instead of 5 cents gross and 20 per cent; eyelets, hooks, &c., free, instead of 30 per cent; nitrate of soda, free, instead of 20 per cent; woollen and worsted yarns, finer than No. 56, and mohair yarns, free, instead of from 10 to 20 per cent. That, I think, was changed again somewhat, and I put it down as restored. That is No. 5 of a restoration thus far. Glue and mucilage reduced from 30 to 25 per cent each; gum and sizing, from 25 to 10 per cent. The old was 1 cent per

pound. That is the twentieth case of abandonment of specific duty. Muriatic and nitric acid, from 25 to 20 per cent. On sulphuric acid there was a slight reduction, and on acid phosphate, from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound. Essential oils, from 20 to 10 per cent; lubricating oils, from 7 1-5 to 6 cents per gallon; crude petroleum, from 7 1-5 to 3 3-5 cents per gallon; ochres and dry colours, from 30 to 25 per cent; paints and colours ground in oil, from 30 to 20 per cent; spirits of turpentine, from 10 to 5 per cent; varnishes, lacquers, japan driers and the like, from 25 to 20 per cent, the specific being the same. Putty, from 25 to 15 per cent; plate glass, less than 12 square feet, from 6 cents to 4 cents per foot; show cases, from 59 to 35 per cent. The old was $2 each and 35 per cent. That is No. 21 of specific duty abandonment. Plaster of Paris, from 32 to 15 per cent, the old was 10 cents per cwt. Plaster of Paris, calcined, from 27 to 20 per cent. The old was 15 cents per cwt. Rough marble, from 25 to 20 per cent; leather board and leatheroid, from 42 to 20 per cent; old, 2 cents per pound. Leather, japanned or enamelled, from 25 to 22½ per cent; belting, from 25 to 20 per cent; india rubber clothing, from 39 to 35 per cent; old, 10 cents per pound and 25 per cent. That is another case of specific duty abandonment. Composition nails, from 20 to 13 per cent; cut nails, from 1 cent to ¾ cent per pound; cut tacks, under 16 oz., from 2 cents to 1 cent per thousand; cut tacks, over 16 oz., from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound; wood screws of certain lengths, brought down from 6 cents, 8 cents and 11 cents to 3 cents, 6 cents and 8 cents per pound; other screws reduced from 35 to 30 per cent; iron and steel nuts, from 25 to 20 per cent; chopping adzes, from 35 to 20 per cent; picks, from 40 to 35 per cent; then changed back again to 35 per cent. The old was 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent; so that here again we have a specific duty restored. Mattocks and hammers, from 35 to 30 per cent. Here again the duty was changed back to 35 per cent. Surgical and dental instruments, from 20 to 15 per cent; safes, vaults and scales, from 35 to 30 per cent; engines, boilers and machinery, from 30 to 27½ per cent; brass and copper wire, from 15 to 10 per cent; gas fixtures, from 30 to 27½ per cent; bells, from 30 to 25 per cent; brass nails and rivets from 35 to 25 per cent. In this case old duty restored. That is the seventh case of restoration, the duty being restored to 35 per cent. Copper nails and rivets from 30 to 25 per cent; gold and silver leaf from 30 to 25 per cent; cane or rattan from 25 to 12½ per cent; veneers of wood from 10 to 5 per cent. In the case of rattan it was changed to 17½. That is the only case I know of where there was a change made to 17½ per cent. Picture frames from 35 to 30; mouldings, plain wood, from 25 to 20 per cent; guilt from 30 to 25.

Mr. DAVIN.

Cordage—new, 30 per cent, old equal to 1¼ cents per pound and 10 per cent; twine and cotton cordage from 30 to 25 per cent. This was another case in which the old duty was restored. Nitro-glycerine was changed from 10 cents per pound to 25 cents; dynamite from 5 cents per pound and 20 per cent to 2 cents per pound; blasting powder from 3 cents to 2 cents; acids used for medicinal, chemical and manufacturing purpose, not specially provided for, from 20 per cent to free; brass scraps, &c., free; brass in strips for printers rules from 15 per cent to free; coal dust from 10 per cent to free; emery wheels and emery in bulk crushed and ground from 25 per cent to free. Here the old duty was restored. That is number nine of the restored items. Lampblack, ivory black, free instead of 10 per cent; oil—cocoanut and palm, carbolic or heavy oils, oil of roses including attar, free instead of 10 per cent. Platts, chip, manillas, cotton, mohair, free instead of 30 per cent. Hammocks and lawn tennis nets and other like articles manufactured of twine from 35 to 30 per cent; jute cloth dyed or bleached from 25 to 10 per cent: women and gentlemen's dress goods ranging from 25 per cent to 32½ per cent down to 22½. Oil cloth matting and carpets from 40 to 30 per cent. The duty on live hogs was reduced from 2 cents per pound to 25 per cent. A deputation, consisting of the Conservative whip the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and other members of Parliament including myself, introduced Mr. Graham and several farmers to Sir John Thompson, and the consequence was we had the duty on hogs placed at 1½ cents per pound. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was very strong in dwelling on the impossibility of that duty helping the farmers; but he did not dare to say that if the Reform party came into power he would change that duty. He was challenged by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) several times, but he would not commit himself, although he tried to make out that it was of no value whatever. If the hon. gentleman will consult the farmers of the North-west Territories or the farmers of Ontario he will find that they set great store on that duty of 1½ cents per pound. Thus in 26 cases specific duties were wholly abandoned for ad valorem duties. In 16 cases specific duties were reduced; in 10 cases, not very important ones, old duties were either partially or wholly restored. What becomes of the statement which has been made in this House that after the Finance Minister had made good resolutions and brought them down, he at the direction of the manufacturers went and altered them? I have gone over the items, and I have given twenty-six cases of specific duties abandoned for ad valorem duties. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) told the House that last year a gentleman was vapouring

in the corridors and expressing his determination that specific duties should be upheld. The instances of specific duty being restored are few. There are 26 important ones abolished; in 16 cases reductions were from high to low specific duties and there are 10 cases where wholly or partially ad valorem and specific duties were restored to what they were in the old tariff. What becomes then of the statement made again and again in the west, and made in the "Globe" newspaper, although that paper for some time after the tariff was brought down was very fair in its criticism, and made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that when the Finance Minister brought down reforms in the tariff, at the dictation of the manufacturers he had to withdraw them? Sir, I am not now referring to what has been stated in this House but out of this House, and I say I have stamped that statement as what it is—a lie, and after I have proved that exhaustively, no man can make that statement and keep the character of a truthful man afterwards. I am sorry I have had to occupy the time of the House in thus going over the tariff in detail, but it was the only method to adopt unless we could have induced hon. gentlemen opposite to do the fair thing and give us the items on which they based their charge. But hon. gentlemen opposite dare not give their grounds, but by putting forward general statements they hope to influence the farmers and the mechanics. But the fact is we have ample time and opportunity to show the farmers that these extravagant statements are wild and ridiculous. I will not trouble the House by reading the reports of the conditions of farm labour in England, but I will only say this—unless I am challenged to read the report—that the labourer is sometimes in a very bad condition, that his wages are about 10s. per week or $2.50, making an average of about $12 per month. I never can understand some of the arguments put forward by members on the Reform side of the House, and what good can follow efforts to make out that the farm labourer in Canada is not as well off as the wretched farm labourer in England I am at a loss to know. All I can say is that we have evidence now before us, taken by an English commission, which shows that while the labourer in Ontario obtains from $15 to $17 per month, and is fed with eggs and meat, porridge and milk, and fruit three times a day, the farm labourer in England is fed pretty poorly, and in Scotland he only gets his brose and $10 a month. But I took the opportunity in the county of Carleton to obtain statements from two of the farm labourers there, one is a Scotchman and the other an Englishman.—Robert Rennie of Aberdeen, Scotland, and the other Henry Winstanley of Derbyshire, England. The following is the letter:

The Rock Farm, Bell's Corners,
Ottawa, May 15th, 1895.

Sir,—In answer to your inquiry as to the comparative wages and board of farm labourers in Canada and England and Scotland, we beg to say that the information we give is based upon our experience in those two countries.

In England wages differ in the different counties, but in Derbyshire, England, where I was for thirteen years in the midst of a county almost wholly devoted to farming pursuits, the wages for a really good man would be about £16 ($80) per year and board. Lads of about seventeen years of age would get £12 to £14; some only £10, that is, $60, $70 and $50 respectively, and board. The board, so far as my Canadian experience goes, is in Canada far and far away ahead of any to be obtained in England. In fact, the latter is not to be mentioned by the side of the former. In one particular instance I can call to mind where men were required for the hay harvest, 2s. 6d. (60 cents) was offered per day, without board of any description or lodging or beer, which is mostly given on English farms.

In Scotland wages are higher than in England. A really good man is paid £26 per year and board ($130); one not so efficient, £14 per year and board, equals $70; the board not so good as in England by far, the principal food being oatmeal and potatoes, bread and tea only on Sundays. Meat, perhaps, in a place above the usual run of farm board, is given, perhaps, once a month; most places one never has it at all.

Most emphatically I state, as an Englishman, that a farm man is in every respect better off in Canada than in England, where he is mostly put down to be a serf and ignorant, being devoid of intellect and wanting in common sense, and is spoken to in a patronising manner by the village squire and parson, and expected to salute each in passing. The labourer's wife and children are the same. But I thank God that, with the ever-increasing power of self-government given to him, the labourer is gradually shaking off the yoke of parson and squire, and is beginning to think and act for himself, and will not, in a few years' time, be led by the nose by either of the two mentioned.

In Canada I find Jack is as good as his master, but in England it is in many places, "God bless the squire, God bless the parson and all their rich relations, and help us poor people to keep all in our places."

Yes, sir, in nine villages out of ten in England it will be found as I have stated. "Hodge," or "Chaw-bacon," is the name usually applied in England to the farmer's man. Possibly, Mr. McMullen would alter his opinion, had he a little experience of English farm labourers' life and position, or even a little talk with

Yours respectfully,
HENRY WINSTANLEY,
of Derbyshire, Eng., and
ROBERT RENNIE,
of Aberdeen, Scotland.

Mr. Thos. Graham,
Rock Farm, Bell's Corners, Ottawa.

Now, Sir, that, at all events, together with the evidence we have in these books, disposes of the absurd statements that the farm labourer in England or in Scotland is better off than he is with us in Canada. For what purpose such a statement is made in this House. Heaven only knows, unless it be to decry Canada, which one can scarce-

ly believe. I shall not, Mr. Speaker, take up the time of this House, by for the hundredth time going into a comparison between the state of things that existed between the years 1873 and 1878, and the state of things as they have existed from 1878 down to the present time. The record of the period when the Liberal Government was in power is a record of depression, and a record of retrogression; but the record from 1878 when confidence was restored by a Conservative Government coming into power, is a record of advance and progress. Let me deal a little more at length with the speech of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). His somewhat elaborate argument was replied to in a masterly manner by my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Masson), but if I may venture to say so, I wish to make one or two remarks to complete the case so well made out by my hon. friend (Mr. Masson). The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) made a comparison between the nine months of the current year and the 12 months of the preceding year, but, as everybody ought to know, it is impossible for one to make any reliable calculation upon such a basis. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) told us that the imports for the nine months of 1895 down to March 31st, were $42,979,130, dutiable goods; and $31,014,535, free goods, coin and bullion, not included. Why he does not include coin and bullion, I cannot understand, and he does not explain, because they are marketable commodities, and are sold and bought for a profit just like anything else. The duty of $13,278,853 was, as he says, a rate of taxation equal to 17·94, and he compares that with the rate for the whole year of 1893-94, which he finds to be 17·76. Therefore, he declares that the rate for 1895 is higher than the rate for 1893-94. But the disturbing factor in his calculation is the assumption that the rate would be the same for the three months of the year 1895 as in the preceding nine months. As a matter of fact, the rate for the three last months of 1894, after the month of March, was 15·3, which demolishes his calculation at once. Applying the same rule to the three months of 1895, we would have a lower rate than 17·76, which there again, queers his calculation. I asked the Customs Department to send me a return of what was brought in for the month of April, 1895, and I learn that the total of dutiable goods was $4,848,156; duty, $1,468,431; and the free goods, $4,026,937, the coin and bullion being $34,703. The total was $8,909,796, the total duty being $1,468,431, which would give 16·48 for the month of April. No doubt when we have the returns for the next two months the percentage will be still lower, and thus is destroyed completely the calculation which the hon. gentleman made, his assertions that taxation was not very much reduced. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) was more honest than the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That hon. gentleman based his claculation upon the same period, but what did he do? He took the duty on the dutiable goods as though the entire abolition of the duty was no reduction of duty at all. That, of course, was a most dishonest thing, and I am sorry that the same sort of dishonesty—probably that is too strong a word—but I am sorry that the same sort of recklessness, the same sort of unsatisfactoriness characterized a great deal of what he said. What did the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) declare? He declared in that same speech that while a great number of articles had been placed on the free list, there were only three in which the public were in the least interested. Mr. Speaker, I have gone into details too fully: I have trespassed on the patience of the House; but if time permitted, I could take up that tariff and read fifty, sixty or seventy articles which were placed on the free list, many of them by the last tariff, in which the public are deeply interested; and you have only to read them to stultify completely what was stated by the hon. gentlemen. As to the comparison of percentages, let me say that it is deceptive to the ordinary mind, not accustomed to consider matters of this sort—a thorough business man would detect the fallacy at once. Let me point what the results were for the six months ending December, 1893, and for the six months ending December, 1894: I will take the percentages which the hon. gentleman has taken and see what the exact effect of the changes in the tariff is, and you will see that it is very substantial. The general results of the tariff changes made in 1894, as reducing the average customs duties, may be seen as follows: In the six months, July to December, 1893, the last half year altogether under the former tariff, the total value of imported goods was $60,894,062, on which the duties amounted to $10,198,562, the average rate thus being $16.75. In the six months, July to December, 1894, the first half year altogether under the new tariff, the total value of imported goods was $54,572,395, on which the duties amounted to $8,701,037, the average rate thus being $15.94. The rates under the new tariff, therefore, averaged 81 cents less than the rate under the old tariff, being a reduction of 4·84 per cent on the rate before the change. What does that mean to the importer? It means that an importer who would have had to pay $100 of duties under the old tariff would only have to pay $95.16 under the new tariff. If the new instead of the old average rate had prevailed for the last half year of 1893, the duties paid would have been $9,706,513, or $472,049 less for the six months. If the old instead of the new average rate had prevailed for the last half year of 1894, the duties paid would have been $9,140,876, or an additional $439,838 for the six months, something near half

a million. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) made a very ingenious speech, in which he grappled with certain positions taken by the Finance Minister. Homer sometimes nods, and when you are dealing with figures you may be insensibly led to compare percentages; and the hon. member for Winnipeg took a fair point when he said to the Finance Minister "You have argued from percentages, and now I will argue from percentages," and he tried to make out that the progress from 1868 to 1878 was greater than the progress from 1878 to the present time. He takes, for instance, the savings of the people. Let me say you cannot show the relative progress by comparing percentages if you ignore the basic figures from which you start. A man may read off percentages by the yard, and he will make an impression on an ignorant mind; but you "queer" his position at once the moment you ask him to give the basic figure from which he starts his comparison. It is an old fallacy, and it can be illustrated thus: Suppose you compare the progress of a city with 100,000 inhabitants with the progress of a village which commences with two inhabitants. Add two to the population of the village and it increases 100 per cent; add 5,000 to the population of the city, and it increases only 5 per cent; add two more to the village, and it increases 50 per cent more; and so on. Therefore, the hon. gentleman's argument was not valid; it was an 'argumentum ad hominem,' and the hon. gentleman admitted it. There was also an error in his statement of the savings of the people, taken from the Year-Book: he has to go to another page to get the exact savings of the people. He tried to prove that between 1868 and 1878 there was a greater percentage of savings; but all you have to do is to take the exact figures, and you see that whereas things were in a languishing state from 1873 to 1878, there was great progress from 1873 to wards, until at present there are vast sums to the credit of the people in the savings banks and elsewhere. What did the hon. gentleman do further? He made an ingenious argument, and I compliment him upon it. Probably it may have been characteristic, but it was too clever by half. What does he do? He takes not the duties, but the percentage of revenue got by the Conservative Government in certain years, and he says, "If we could have taken the same percentage of revenue in 1875, instead of my hon. friend from South Oxford having had a surplus of $800,000, he would have had a surplus of $8,000,000." He arrives at this conclusion by taking the percentage of duty of 1894 and applying it to the total value of goods, both dutiable and free, entered for consumption in 1874. Now, where is the fallacy here? It assumes that with a population of 3,750,000, with a higher tariff, with exports $28,000,000 less, with an output from factories of $221,000,000 as against $477,000,000 in 1894, the country would still have imported the quantity imported in 1874. It is quite absurd. If you had the present tariff and the same population and only the same amount of exports, it is morally certain that two things would have happened. You would not have had the purchasing power we have nor the need to go outside for the same quantity of goods. Therefore, the whole fabric of my hon. friend from Winnipeg tumbles down completely. In fact all the arguments used by the hon. member were ingenious but misleading and unsound. I paid some attention to his speech because it was more carefully prepared than those of others. He referred to the reduction in values of some $8,000,000. Now, I have shown that there were twenty-six cases in the tariff of specific duties abandoned and the Finance Minister abandoned them in a falling market. That was a dangerous thing for the Finance Minister to do. It bears out what I said that the Budget was a daring thing. I characterized it as a bold Budget. He has paid the price of his boldness for the shrinkage in values would have made no difference in the amount of duty collected on these 26 articles, if the change had not been made from specific to ad valorem, because no matter how values shrink, if the specific duties remain, the Finance Minister gets his revenue. I have shown that in some 26 cases he abandoned the specific duty altogether and in some 16 or 17 he reduced the specific duty from a high to a low rate and so far as the $8,000,000 shrinkage has been affected by the reductions in these items it would, of course, have had no existence had the specific duties remained. Let me just recur to the point I made a moment ago as to the progress in these deposits, which were elaborated upon so much by the hon. member for Winnipeg. The people's deposits amounted to:

In—	
1873	$12,933,834
1874	14,021,270
1875	13,782,000
1876	13,563,347
1877	13,525,087
1878	14,128,185
1879	14,704,487

Then the deposits increased right along until 1894, they reached $55,955,590. Yet my hon. friend would argue from percentages, forgetting the base figure from which he started, in order to show that there had been actually more progress between 1868 and 1878 in the savings of the people than between 1878 and 1894. If that increase between 1878 and 1894 is not a sign of increasing prosperity, it is very extraordinary. You will remember that so great an authority and a statesman of such vast experience as

Sir William Vernon Harcourt argued recently that the savings of the people was one of the truest guarantees you could have of a country's prosperity. Is it not obvious? I can give you an illustration. I remember calling on a friend of mine who had been a fellow student at college and also in the Middle Temple. He had been a little reckless and had got married to one who turned out to be, not only a very pretty, but a very prudent woman. He is now an eminent judge in Great Britain. I said to him: How are you getting on? He said nothing, but went to his bureau, pulled out a drawer, and handed me a bank-book in which there was a considerable sum to his credit. If anybody had told me that my former fellow-student and friend would ever have been able to save any money, I would not have believed him without the evidence. But there was the very best proof you could give of his prosperity and progress, namely, that he was saving money. And it is the best test you can have of the progress of the country. I shall ask the House to bear with me a few minutes longer while I deal with one or two other matters.

An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot dispense. This debate has taken such a form that I must dare to be dull and pay my hon. friends of the Opposition the sincere flattery of imitating them. I always pay the hon. member for South Oxford the respect of carefully reading his amendment. I notice that he himself hangs his cap on his amendment. He behaves as certain excellent preachers do, who give out a text, and then never say a word about it, but go on to something else. None of his friends pay him the compliment of carefully reading the amendment, but I always do. At all events, it has the charm of novelty. It is the one thing in his speech which has the charm of novelty. His speech is, year after year, like an old barrel organ that rolls out the same tune, but the amendment changed each time. I am reminded by the hon. gentleman's yearly speech and amendment, of an old Italian who used to come round the place where I lived as a boy with his barrel organ. The organ and the old Italian were always the same, but every year there was a new monkey. The barrel organ and the Italian have been the same for the last sixteen or seventeen years, but there is always a new monkey—always a fresh policy—and my hon. friend has therefore a new amendment. The first part of the amendment is a matter of account. He then goes on to say that extravagant expenditure should be diminished. But it should not be necessary in any amendment to say extravagant expenditure should be diminished. All you have to do is to prove the extravagance, and it is a truism that it should be diminished. Then the amendments goes on to say:

Mr. DAVIN.

The burden of taxation should be reduced as largely and speedily as possible, and in restoring the equilibrium, the tariff should be made a tariff for revenue only.

I complain of that because it is dubious. Nobody can make out, from the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford or from the speeches of his friends, what that means. They carefully conceal their meaning by the phrase "tariff for revenue." Sometimes it is free trade as it is in England; then it is a tariff such as they had when they were in power. But that is not a tariff for revenue only. Seventeen and a half per cent, under certain conditions, would be a very respectable protection. Therefore, I say, this amendment is dubious. What sort of a speech should we have had to support it? He should prove proposition number one. He should show that there was extravagant expenditure and apply his remedy. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. leader of the Opposition both dislike to apply their tariff for revenue, when they are asked to apply it. Sir, that is not necessarily unreasonable. It would be quite fair for any member of the Opposition to say: We agree with Sir Robert Peel that no one should state his policy in amendment. But they do state their policy in contradistinction to the policy announced from the Government benches, and, stating it, they are bound to show the people how they could carry it out; they are bound to show what they mean. It is not enough for them simply to repeat the words "revenue tariff." What is the use of getting up and denouncing all sorts of duties as robbery of the public, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has been doing? Any man can abuse taxation; but let those hon. gentlemen show how they are going to carry on the government of the country without it; show how the Government in the present condition of this country is to raise its revenues under their tariff. This is a country of vast extent, as compared with what it was when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and how are they going to manage the country to-day under a tariff such as they once had? Therefore, I say they are bound to apply their policy. Well, Sir, the revenue tariff which should reduce the alleged burdens, and especially diminish the alleged extravagant expenditure, and still keep up the management of the country, would certainly take with the people, and all these hon. gentlemen have to do is to show how it will work. The Government has burned its boats behind it; it is bound to the oar and cannot abandon it; and, if the hon. member for Queen's, instead of throwing himself into a theatrical attitude and shouting to gods and men, and calling on all to witness that this is a most unjust and extortionate tariff, will sit down quietly and show how he can carry on the country and save three or four millions, or two millions even, I will promise him that it will not be

only a feeble and unfounded cry that they are raising, that they will get into power, but the country will be glad to accept them and have them effect the saving. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) raises a skeptical laugh, and well he may, for I am certain that the challenge will not be accepted by the hon. member for Queen's. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford, after his manner and the manner of his friends, answered part of his own argument. In his speech, he declared that he had never denied that it was not in the power of the Government to adopt a fiscal policy which would avert disaster. Disaster may come whether you have a free trade policy or a protective policy. Then, what is the meaning of all the arguments that are used by members of the Opposition? They try to make out that the country is in a ruinous condition. The hon. member for South Oxford says that the country has been bleeding away—that is his language—for years and years. Speaking of the present prices of property, he says that, if a careful account were made up of the country to-day, it would be found infinitely worse than it was sixteen years ago, that it is not nearly so wealthy as it was, and that this is true especially of the older provinces. I would not like to take up the time of the House with statistics, but hon. members will find that all they have to do, in order to answer the hon. gentleman, is to take his own words, when he declares that no policy can be adopted which will be certain to avert disaster. But, without going into the figures, let me ask the hon. gentleman to take the assessment of Kingston, the city where he lives, the assessment of Toronto, the assessment of Montreal, the assessment of towns and cities in the lower provinces—to say nothing of the value of farm houses and homesteads. Take the assessment of Winnipeg, which city the leader of the Opposition visited not long ago. In 1878 the assessment of Winnipeg would amount to two million dollars, while to-day it is $22,000,000. The assessment of Brandon which did not exist in 1878 has an assessment of about three or four millions. Portage la Prairie—I speak now from memory—has an assessment of about two and a half millions. Then, you can go further west, to Regina, Calgary and Vancouver. The assessment of Vancouver—a place that did not exist in 1878—is about $19,000,000. And yet the hon. member would try to make out that Canada is worse off to-day, with all this added wealth, than it was in former years. But, even supposing the hon. gentleman's statement to be true, he tells us himself that no policy can be guaranteed to avert disaster. But what does the hon. member do? He actually went into a discussion of the deficits. 1858-59-60-61-62-63. What, in the name of heaven, the deficits in these years have to do with the question before the House, it was hard to understand. Then, taking up more time, he dealt with some rubishy Act of the time of Edward IV., with a view of making some doleful, pointless point with regard to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). But at this period he had to call a halt. He reminded me of a certain English statesman making his first speech. He was a heavy young man, the son of a duke. He has attained to better things than were then expected. He spoke very leisurely and only for half an hour, and in the middle of his speech he actually yawned. When asked what caused him to yawn at such a time, his answer was that he was so plaguey tired of his speech. The hon. member for Oxford seemed so tired of his speech that he had to call a halt and take a rest. After having four days to fit himself, he came once more to the scratch, but, I am sorry to say, proved to be in no better condition than at first. He went into the question of shrinkage of values from 1875 to 1878. As a criminal comes back to the scene of his fatal deed, fascinated thereby, the hon. gentleman came back again and again, fascinated by the doleful memories of the deficits of 1876-78. Now, I will ask the House to bear with me while I treat of one other matter. The hon. member for Winnipeg said he would not deal with the reduction of the Mounted Police, but would leave that question for me to deal with. I may say that I differ with the Government in reducing the number of Mounted Police. The Minister of Finance has reduced the vote by $155,000, and he has reduced the number of men. If we had known in the west that there was to be any reduction, I think we would have shown the Government that it was not a wise course to take. Anyway, as soon as we knew that a reduction had taken place, we made certain representations to the Government, and no further reductions were made. Now, I want to point out to the House why, in my estimation, it is not desirable in the interests of Canada to make further reductions, and why I cannot endorse the changes that have been made. We have in the North-west, 26,439 Indians, making more than 5,000 families, and that would give you some 10,000 fighting men. These are scattered all over the North-west. You have 646 at Fort Pelly: 272 at Cote; 225 at Key; 149 at Kee-see-kouse. These Indians occupy three or four large reserves north-west up in Eastern Assiniboia, fifty or sixty miles from the railway. There are few settlers, comparatively, although the country is a splendid one for settlement. There is good land as far east as Lake Winnipegosis, and north to the Porcupine Hills. There is a vast country to the north of the Saskatchewan, including the Carrot River District, and the valley of the Red Deer River. Now, with these 646 Indians in a country forty or fifty miles from a railway, it is evident that you require policemen. I think there is a police

station within some twenty miles, with one or two men; but if you had no policemen there the settlers would be afraid to go in. As it is, with a few policemen, the settlers can, with confidence, go in. Then down south you have the Moose Mountain Agency with three large reserves, forty or fifty miles south of Moosomin, south of the railway. There is a splendid English settlement there, introduced by my late friend, Mr. Pearse.. There you have 237 Indians, and you require some policemen. Then you have the Crooked Lake Agency, which covers a large tract of country between Broad View and Qu'Appelle Valley, a magnificent country. There are 574 Indians, and do you mean to say that you do not need some police there? Then you have the Assiniboine Agency, with 210 Indians, fifteen miles south of Indian Head. There, again, you require some policemen. Then, at Muscowpetung agency, in the Qu'Appelle Valley, some thirty miles north of Regina, you have a magnificent district, including the Pasquah, Muscowpetung, Piapot and Standing Buffalo reserves. Here there are 708 of an Indian population, and, of course, you cannot allow that country to be without police protection. Then we have the File Hill Agency, including the Little Black Bear, Star Blanket, Okanees, and the Pee-pee-keesis Agencies, with a population of 280, covering an area of country between the Pheasant Hills and the Beaver Hills, a beautiful country, with thousands of acres fit to be taken up. These reserves are some forty miles north of Fort Qu'Appelle, and what are you going to do if you have no body like the Mounted Police to keep order? Then you have the Touchwood Hills Agency where you have the Day Star, Poor Man, George Gordon, Muscowequan and the Yellow Quill reserves, with a population of 839, from fifty to eighty miles north of Fort Qu'Appelle, covering a large section of country in the Little and Big Touchwood Hills. In this district are some of the finest spots for settlement in the whole North-west, such as the Little and Bill Quill lakes, and the Nut lake, farther north. The settlers in this section of the North-west are confined chiefly to the west side of the Beaver Hills. Here, again, you could not allow them to be without the protection of the police. Then we have the Duck Lake Agency, and what I have said about the other agencies can be said of this. Then there is the Carlton Agency, around which there is a splendid country. This is in the part of the North-west where the rebellion commenced. It commenced, you remember, about the Duck Lake Agency, and it is most important that where you have people going into that district from Prince Albert and from Edmonton, you should have police protection. Then you come to the Battleford Agency and the Onion Lake Agency, where there are reserves running from the north-west part of the Bear Hills through the Eagle Hills, and many miles west of Battleford and the Battle River, a grand country for settlers. Being far from the railway it will require police protection for many years. Then for a distance of 80 or 90 miles through the beautiful valley of the Saskatchewan, there are countless acres of good land open for settlers, till we come to the Onion Lake reserves, covering a large section on the Onion and Frog Lakes, and as far west as the Moose Hills. Then you have the Saddle Lake agency, with a population of 698. Here again you have a magnificent country around Saddle Lake that will require police protection. Then you have the Edmonton agency, with a population of 718. Here you have the Enoch, Alexander, Joseph, (Alexis), Paul and Sharphead, Michel and Orphans at St. Albert reserves. People are going in there, and it would never do to leave them without police protection. Then there is the Hobbema agency, of which the same may be said. Then in Treaty No. 7, you have some of the most powerful of all the Indians. You have the Blackfoot agency, the Blood agency and the Piegan agency, containing a population of 4,428. Then there are 5,589 in the Athabasca and Mackenzie River districts: 1,725 in the Peace River district, and 852 in the Nelson and Churchill River district. All these populations make up the total I mentioned of 26,439 Indians. From what we know of the cost of an Indian war in the United States, I think this House will agree with me that it would be very unwise to reduce the number of police further than we have, and for my part I believe, and it is the opinion of those who know the North-west best, that it would be desirable the moment this stringency is past to revert to what the strength of the force was before any change whatever was made. I have trespassed on the patience of the House longer a good deal than I intended, but some of the points taken up have not been dealt with before. Some of them were specially interesting to the part of the country whence I come. I could not expect all would interest the House generally, and therefore I have to thank my friends for their forbearance in allowing me not only to present my views, so far as regards the interests of the country at large, but also as they apply to matters in which the people of the North-west are specially interested. I will only say that even as regards those I hold the country has a general interest in them, and I must say respecting a remark made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other evening, that if his friends came into power they would be able to reduce the expenditure there by some two hundred thousand dollars, that, I fancy, in the North-west Territories at all events, the people will feel that their interest is to abide by a party whose policy has in the main been so successful, and whose action towards the North-west Territories has been so generous, and which is destined, I believe, to be fruit-

ful in producing prosperity and making us in the lapse of not too many years a wealthy and powerful portion of our great Dominion.

Mr. FRECHETTE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SOUTH SHORE SUBURBAN RAILWAY.

Mr. LACHAPELLE moved:

That that part of the Fourth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, referring to Bill (No. 35), to incorporate the South Shore and Suburban Railway Company, be referred back to the said Committee for further consideration.

He said: I think there is one sufficient reason for my bringing this motion before the House. A very serious question of principle has been raised by those opposing the Bill for the incorporation of this company. That question of principle is this: That the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, as they contend, have the exclusive right to give permission to the company to construct the railway over the Guard Pier. That question has been brought before the Railway Committee by the opponents of the Bill, but, as a matter of fact, it has not been sufficiently discussed in the committee; in fact, I think I am within the truth when I say that it has not been discussed at all. It is for this reason that I want the Bill to be again referred to the Railway Committee in such a way that we shall have an expression of opinion from the committee on that question of principle. I think that is a sufficient justification for my making this motion, seconded by Mr. Masson.

Mr. MASSON. In seconding the motion which has been moved by my hon friend, I do so on the ground that the discussion of the Bill in the committee was entirely taken up by those in opposition to it. No member of the committee, except the promoter, and one who made a suggestion in regard to one of the details of the Bill, said a word pro or con on the subject. The question of policy is whether it is in the interest of the public that such a Bill should be passed, the only reason given for reporting against the preamble being that it is not in the interest of the public. Now, the interest of the public is shown by those who are interested in the construction of this railway. On the south side of the St. Lawrence, every municipality for a considerable distance on each side of the proposed bridge is in favour of the Bill. They have expressed their approval of it by their petitions, and I am informed that they are willing to give substantial financial assistance in carrying out the project. Therefore, so far as the south side of the river is concerned, it is clearly in the interest of the public, if the people understand their interest, that the bridge should be built. I am further informed that for the last twenty-four years the building of a bridge, at or near that point, has been a live question in that neighbourhood. On the island side there is no opposition that can be looked upon as having a reasonable basis except what comes from the harbour commissioners, and their opposition refers to a detail and not to the real merits of the scheme. The question of the advisability of having a bridge there does not enter into the discussion, so far as the harbour commissioners are concerned. Their opposition is based on the ground that it is proposed to make use of the Guard Pier, one of the harbour works of Montreal. The plans of that guard pier were submitted to the committee, and they show that at the water's edge it is 250 feet in width, and on the top, 45 feet in width. It was alleged that if an electric tramway were built on the top of that pier, it would be rendered ineffectual for harbour purposes. It was explained by the promoter of the Bill, although the committee did not seem to grasp his statement, that it was not proposed to make use of the top of the pier. It is proposed to make use of the outer side of the pier away from where it is intended by the harbour commissioners at some future time to build wharfs on the inside of the pier, so that the building of the tramway would not in any way, as far as the public is concerned, interfere with the use of the guard pier for harbour purposes. The height of the bridge was referred to, and it was said that it would be impossible of approach except with a very heavy grading. I am informed, and I believe it to be the fact, that that guard pier is at present one mile and one-third in length, and the present height to the top of the embankment or mud-wall bank is 45 feet, so that the difference of grade to reach the pier is not very large. Besides, the promoters of the Bill had an amendment ready, as a matter of detail, providing that the obstruction should be subject to the approval of the harbour commissioners and on such terms as might be agreed upon. The ques-

tion arises whether, as a matter of policy, if the harbour commissioners have such control, it is in the interest of the public or not that they should absolutely refuse all right of access thereto. One of the representatives of the harbour commissioners, in presenting that matter before the committee, said that at some future day undoubtedly a railway would run along that embankment, but they objected to power being given to a railway company to do so. But all the company asks is that they be allowed to do so on such terms as might be agreed upon and settled by the Governor in Council. These are matters of detail, and I submit that the committee were considering more the question of detail than the principle of the Bill when they hurriedly disposed of it this morning. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion that it be referred back to the committee for reconsideration.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Masson) has stated that the opposition in the committee to the Bill came from the harbour commissioners for the port of Montreal. I would remind my hon. friend that the chairman of the board of trade of Montreal——

Mr. MASSON. On the ground of the harbour commission.

Mr. KENNY. No, at the instance of his own council, and by a unanimous vote of the council, the chairman of that board of trade attended the committee and opposed the Bill. I have also to remind my hon. friend that the representative of the largest navigation company of the port of Montreal, the Richelieu Navigation Company—the company which pays the largest amount of fees of any navigation company to the Harbour Commission of Montreal—opposed it, and just here I may say that those of us who are accustomed to deal with matters of navigation and who know the difficulties of navigating in a rapid current like the port of Montreal, recognized how very objectionable the Bill, as proposed, would be from the standpoint of those interested in navigation. Now, my hon. friend must recognize this. It was palpable to every member of the committee this morning. In a question important to Montreal, because the city of Montreal is most concerned, when the chairman of the harbour commission, when the president of the board of trade, and the representative of the largest navigation company on the St. Lawrence all unite in opposing this Bill, I must say that I think the committee did wisely in rejecting it, and the House will, under the circumstances, make a great mistake in re-submitting it. If the matter is one of so very great importance, why cannot it stand until next year? We will all be here next year, and then have a chance of reconsidering it. Under these circumstances, I submit that it would not be wise for us to adopt the motion just made.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has so well presented the case of those who oppose the construction of a bridge at Montreal that it is really unnecessary that anything more should be said with regard to it. But as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) mentions that the opposition came from the harbour commission, I would certainly say, as one of the representatives of Montreal, that in this he was altogether in error, and that the opposition to it is not solely from the harbour commission of Montreal, but from the board of trade, and also from all those who are most largely concerned in the trade and commerce of the city of Montreal. They feel that it would be a very great inconvenience to that trade were such a bridge built there at present at the point spoken of. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) mentioned as an argument in favour of having the bridge built now, or having the Bill sent back to the committee for reconsideration, that it was admitted a bridge might be required, and would be built there at some future time. Well, that may be. Many things come to be required in the future which at present are not wanting, and certainly it is the opinion of the great body of the people of Montreal that at present this bridge is not wanted, and that we would be very much better without it. You have against the Bill the city with its suburbs of some 300,000 people. It may be that you have on the south shore a few hundred who are anxious for it, but surely the opinion and the wish of such a large majority ought to have weight with this House. I would submit that I hope the House will not refer the Bill back to the committee, but, as suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), will leave it for consideration at another session of Parliament.

Mr. CURRAN. In addition to what my hon. friend has just said, I would bring under the notice of the House this fact. It was stated by the chairman of the harbour commissioners this morning that the guard pier which it is the desire of this company to use, will not be completed for perhaps three years, so that the promoters of this Bill will lose nothing by coming back another session. There is plenty of time to dispose of the guard pier and decide whether it is to be handed over to a private company, after the guard pier itself has been fully completed.

Mr. EDGAR. There is one matter connected with the discussion of the Bill before the committee which has not been mentioned, and which is very important. The opposition was made to this Bill by the harbour commissioners. After a consider-

able amount of discussion, the counsel for the railway company agreed to accept a clause which would leave it in the control of the harbour commissioners to regulate the passage of this railway over their works and make what conditions might be agreed upon. That seemed, certainly, to be acceptable to the committee, so far as that branch of the case went, and it looked to me as if they were going to adopt it. Then, the hon. gentleman who makes this motion, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle), who, as a member of the committeee, introduced the Bill, rose and repudiated the authority of the counsel to make that offer, and declared that he would not consent to anything of the kind. Then the Bill was thrown out. I would like the hon. member to settle that matter. I think the House is entitled to know whether the hon. member who had charge of the Bill or the counsel who represented the company had authority when he spoke, because, if the counsel were right, and the hon. member will now say that he would agree to what the counsel said, I certainly, for one, would vote for the reconsideration of the Bill.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. Mr. Speaker, the matter is very important, and I wish to say a few words in answer to the hon. member who has just spoken. Unhappily there was a misapprehension on the part of the attorney of the company. I merely rose to say that I thought there was a misunderstanding on the part of that gentleman, and that we were before the Committee on Railways and the House of Commons, to decide whether, on the one hand, the committee and the House, or, on the other hand, the Board of Harbour Commissioners, has the right to decide who shall have the privilege of passing on the guard pier. That is the point, and it is for that reason I thought it right to present the motion I have made this afternoon. That point has not yet been discussed. The chairman of the Board of Harbour Commissioners has said that that body refused and will always refuse to grant permission to pass on the guard pier. The Minister of Railways asked Mr. Gemmill, the attorney of the company, if it was his intention to ask the harbour commissioners' permission to pass on that pier. By a misapprehension which I cannot understand that gentleman answered: Yes; we will ask the permission of the harbour commissioners. Then the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) said that if it was the intention to ask the permission of the harbour commissioners, there was no use going further with the Bill, as the chairman of the harbour commissioners had already declared that permission would be refused. Then I rose and said that I thought there was a misunderstanding. And I think, because of that misunderstanding, the conclusion has not been made sufficiently clear to justify the refusal of the Bill, and it is for that reason. Mr. Speaker, that I ask the House to decide the very important question whether it is the harbour commissioners who have the right to grant permission on the public wharf—for this is not a private wharf—or whether this House has the right to decide that point. I would say to the hon. member for Halifax that we are not bound to discuss the question during the session. I do not want to make the session longer than it must be. It may be the matter will be discussed next year. Many Bills are not finished the same session, but are passed in the following year after their first introduction. Under the circumstances, I think I am right in asking the House to refer the Bill again to the Committee on Railways.

Mr. LAURIER. For my part, I am waiting to see if the Government had any instruction to offer the House upon this point. The Government is represented on the Committee on Railways, and the House would have been gratified, I think, if the Government had given their views upon the subject. Speaking for myself individually, I would say that, under all the circumstances, I would conceive it to be the duty of the members of the House to support the decision of their committee. In a matter of this kind especially, where a good deal of information is given to the committee which cannot be laid before the House, I cannot conceive that such a motion as that made by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Lachapelle) should be entertained at all, unless it were shown that in the committee there had been a miscarriage of justice or some gross error. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, the statement he makes is tantamount to saying that the vote taken this morning was taken under a misapprehension. If that was the case and the members of the committee were satisfied that they voted under a misapprehension, if they now realized that some information given had not been properly understood, I suppose that the members of the committee would be the first to rise and say so. But, so far, I have not understood any such expression to fall from the members of the committee who have spoken. On the contrary, the opinion expressed by the members of the committee who have spoken is to the effect that the vote was given because of the course taken by the promoters of the Bill before the committee. Under such circumstances, I must say, though I regret it, that I cannot see, for my part, any reason why the decision of the committee should be reversed.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that I think that when the matter was before the committee the whole question was thoroughly understood. The application of the bridge company before the committee was to be

allowed to make use of a certain improvement built by the Harbour Commission of Montreal. The solicitor on behalf of the company stated that he intended to introduce into the Bill, as my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar stated, a clause to the effect that the consent of the harbour commissioners should be given before the company might use the improvement. The promoter of the Bill differed from the solicitor of the company, and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) said that if that cluse was to be inserted in the Bill, the measure might as well be dropped, as the opinion of the harbour commissioners had been expressed, and that they would on no account allow the company to use the harbour improvements for the purpose of building the bridge. I think the question was understood by the committee, and I do not see any reason why the Bill should be sent back to the committee for reconsideration.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Before the House should deal with this motion, I would like to enlighten it as to the state of the public feeling in Montreal and its neighbourhood, in connection with the building of this bridge. The hon. member for Montreal West contended that the three hundred thousand people who form the population of Montreal were opposed to the building of this bridge. I am in a position to state that such is not the case. The great majority of the Montreal people, and those of the south shore would be happy to find that this public work has succeeded. We all know that the Victoria Bridge is now the only one through which direct communication can be had between Montreal and the south shore, and this Parliament often heard of the difficulties raised by the Grand Trunk Company to prevent the other railway companies from communicating with Montreal. In fact, it is almost an impossibility, except on exorbitant terms. The public feeling in Montreal is in favour of the proposed scheme. The opposition offered by the Montreal Board of Trade and Harbour Commission was referred to. But I would like to know what public work in Montreal was not strenuously opposed by these two corporations? Last year, when a new scheme was talked of, it was confronted with as strong an opposition as these two oppositions could offer. There is one thing sure, it is that the Montreal people would like a new bridge opposite their city which would make equal terms to all the railway companies wishing to go into the city of Montreal. This bridge is also required in order to develop the industrial and commercial interests of that section. For particular reasons which I have no desire to review, the Board of Trade and Harbour Commission are opposed to the building of this new bridge, but the enlightened public sentiment is anxious for the success of this work. I understand that this morning, before the Committee on Railways, there was a misunderstanding between the solicitor of the company and the promoter of the work with respect to the interference of the Harbour Commission. The promoters are willing to submit to a certain extent to the control of the Harbour Commission. They admit the right of the Harbour Commissioners to control the building, management and working of this bridge, but they decline to be at their mercy as to their right to exist. Apart from that, they only acknowledge the authority of Parliament. The Montreal Harbour Commission owes its existence to this Parliament and it was appointed to exercise part of the public powers. The company will likewise be dependent on the same body and will acknowledge the supreme authority of the Dominion Parliament. The company ought, therefore, to have an opportunity to form itself and build this bridge without having to go through the objections of the chairman of both the Montreal Board of Trade and Montreal Harbour Commission.

Motion negatived.

REPEAL OF THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. PELLETIER (Translation) moved first reading of Bill (No. 99) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and amending Acts. He said: Mr. Speaker, a similar Bill was moved in this House in 1891. I then voted against such a proposition for the following reasons: A general election had just taken place and about half of the returns were protested. In many cases the election was declared null and void and a new election had to be held. I considered the repeal of the Act was premature owing to the controverted elections which might be declared null and void and would have to be held again under this Act. And, moreover, at that time four more sessions of this Parliament remained to be held. The Bill I am now introducing is consistent with the convictions I always held with respect to this, that the electoral franchise should be regulated by the provincial authority. The main argument by which I support this opinion is that as long as the electoral franchise shall be based on property qualification it ought to fall within the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities, for property exclusively falls under their control. We can only reach property through the local powers, local organizations and municipal councils. One of the reasons given for the maintenance of the law now in force was the necessity of making uniform the federal franchise. This reason does not hold good, since the law, such as it is, does not even carry out that principle. The fact is the law is variously enforced. I always was earnestly opposed to the Act now in force and, as I stated a moment ago, if in 1891, I voted against its repeal, I never intended to vote

for the principle of the Act. I then voted against its repeal because I considered the proposition as premature inasmuch as we needed the Act for the elections which might be declared null and void and which would have to be held again. Here is the Bill, and I move its first reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1894.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

YAMASKA RIVER—LOCK AND DAM.

Mr. MIGNAULT (Translation) asked. What was the total amount paid in each year by the Government for the work of repairs and maintenance, on the dam and lock on the Yamaska River, for the years 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894? 2. How many lock-men are employed at the said lock, and what pay does each of them get? 3. What is the amount derived from the said lock, by the Government, for each of the years 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894? 4. Are the lock-men obliged to remain at the lock during the whole time of the season of navigation?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I may say that the expenditure in connection with the repairs on and maintenance of the river Yamaska dam, was as follows: 1890, $541.73; 1891, $10,499.88; 1892, $3,929.58; 1893, $1,608.09; 1894, $999.68. Two hands are employed during navigation time, each receiving a salary of $40 a month. The receipts from the lock were $222.49 in 1893-94. The answer to the last question is: Yes.

FOREIGN POWERS AND THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. What foreign powers have become entitled under treaties with Great Britain to like commercial privileges with Canada as those granted to France by the treaty of 6th February, 1893, known as the French Treaty? 2. Do each and all of such foreign powers become entitled to all the reductions proposed by Article 1 of said treaty?

Mr. IVES. 1. From the best information at the moment attainable, it appears probable that the following foreign powers will, under treaties with Great Britain, become entitled to like privileges in Canada as those granted to France by the treaty of February 6th, 1893, on its ratification, &c., viz.:

Argentine,	under treaty of	.....	1825
Austria-Hungary	do	.....	1876
Belgium	do	.....	1862
Bolivia	do	.....	1840
Chile	do	.....	1854
Columbia,	under treaty of	.....	1866
Costa Rica	do	.....	1849
Germany (Zollver'n)	do	.....	1865
Muscat	do	.....	1892
Russia	do	.....	1859
Salvador	do	.....	1862
Sweden & Norway	do	.....	1826
Uruguay	do	.....	1885

It is also possible that the treaties with the following countries might be held to be binding on Canada in like manner—although doubtful—the wording in some instances being obscure and in others being subject to further action, which, whether taken or not, it would require time and correspondence to ascertain:

Egypt,	under treaty of	.....	1889
Montenegro	do	.....	1882
Mexico	do	.....	1888
Persia	do	.....	1844
South African Republic,	under treaty of	.....	1884
Venezuela,	under treaty of	.....	1825
Zanzibar	do	.....	1886

The answer to the second question is given as far as possible in that to the first.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the debate to which the House has been listening for the past number of days has taken a very wide range, and the House will therefore pardon me if I take somewhat longer time than is usual at this particular stage of the debate to refer to the different points which have been raised. Hon. gentlemen opposite, from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the humblest member who has spoken from that side of the House, have evidently been endeavouring to make their campaign for the coming election; and, in order to do that, they have been urging this House to believe that they possess certain virtues in all the lines in which public men should be virtuous. And in order that I may answer them this afternoon, I wish to consider the claims which have been urged by hon. gentlemen opposite under four different heads: First, their ability to govern this country; next, their purity as administrators; next, their economy as administrators, and last, the excellence of the trade policy which they have presented to the country. Speaking a very short time ago in the city of Montreal, the leader of the Opposition saw fit to declare his hope, for the hundreth time, that they were about to come into power; and on what was his hope based? Only on this, that the great chieftain of the Conservative party had gone, and that in

consequence the elements which followed him were dissolving and scattering. Well, Sir, it is true the old chieftain is gone, and that willing hands are erecting monuments in his honour is evidence of the great work he did for Canada, notwithstanding the abuse of hon. gentlemen opposite for many years. Succeeding him fell that other great man Sir John Abbott, whose work is also recognized most thoroughly by Canadians now of every class ; and succeeding him and abused as was his predecessors. Sir John Thompson now sleeps in the soil of his native province, notwithstanding the abuse of hon. gentlemen opposite through successive years, wrapped in the robes of a nation's honour and embalmed in the bitterness of a nation's tears. Though those men are gone, though we mourn them, though their colleagues and old supporters mourn them, though we are glad to know that Canadians mourn them because while they mourn them it is a testimony to the work and worth of the Conservative party as well. I want to tell the hon. leader of the Opposition that the Conservative party of this country is not built on men, but is built on principles, and though those leaders have gone the principles live, and when it appeals to the electors, as we must do very soon, he will find the same old vitality and the same old strength put forth in the campaign, and that the same old victories will perch upon our banners as of yore. This fact he should have considered, that since Sir John Macdonald's death we have won from them, no less than 18 seats ; hon. gentlemen opposite have won from us 4 seats. If the hon. gentleman can take any comfort out of that, instead of having been educated at a Scotch school, as he told the people in the province of Ontario, was the case, it seems to me he must have been educated at Dean Swift's Academy at Lagado, where they learned the science of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers. I want to say to my hon. friend that I was somewhat astonished to hear the charge that we were afraid to go to the elections. A few months ago when it was thought we were going to the contest, what was the cry ? The cry then was in column after column of the Toronto "Globe," that we ought not to go, and His Excellency was advised in column after column in that newspaper not to permit us a dissolution because we had no right to appeal to the country ; apparently hon. gentlemen were then not spoiling for the fray. And the hon. gentleman who sits for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is the leading constitutional authority upon the other side of the House, discovered a new constitutional reason which he urged before the people why the Government should not dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country, and what was that reason ? That there was too much snow upon the ground and elections could not be advantageously held. It was not the snow that was upon the ground, but the snow that was to fall that disturbed the peace of hon. gentlemen opposite when they thought they had to face the electors. I want to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that the Conservatives of this country are not afraid of the people. We have appealed to them in the past and have not had very much reason to complain. We are willing to abide by the judgment of the people ; hon. gentlemen opposite seem never willing to abide by the judgment of the people. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has constantly expressed his want of confidence in the people ; but the people are even with him, for they have voted their want of confidence repeatedly in that hon. gentleman. Sir, the debate has taken this line : an attack upon the members of the Government, an attack particularly upon a want of ability, it is said, that has been demonstrated by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who leads this House so ably, and who is no unworthy successor of the distinguished men who have occupied during so many years the place in which he sits in the Parliament of Canada. I wish to say to the hon. member for South Oxford that while members of the Government may not have the confidence of their opponents, we do enjoy the confidence of our friends ; and, thank God, no member of this Government has had to go back to his constituency to fight with his friends to get the party nomination with which to go to the people. Sir, the hon. member of South Oxford cannot say that. For many years that hon. gentleman was wandering up and down the province of Ontario and at last secured a resting place. I took occasion some years ago in the course of a speech in this House to say that that resting place would tire of him, and my prophecy came true only a few months ago when the hon. gentleman was seeking renomination in the constituency of South Oxford. What did they say there ? He was wrathy and he abused them without stint ; and when he found it was difficult to get the nomination—I do not know to whom he referred—when he found men conspiring against him—he referred to some one on his right or left or behind him, when he said this in the convention :

> But he would ask, if it was true that the men be worthy of confidence, who, while pretending to be friendly, were plotting against a colleague. Fair fighting is one thing and assassination is another. While you may call for the head of an enemy, it is not fair warfare to stab a friend under the fifth rib.

And, Sir, it was not a mere local matter, for it was published with the very greatest care by the Toronto "Globe" in order that all and sundry, to use the idiomatic expression of the hon. gentleman opposite, might know exactly what he meant. There came a time, however, when the matter was settled. That time was when a gentleman in Toronto

wrote a letter into the riding, a gentleman who had recently been organizer of the Liberal party, stating:

That, in view of the active canvas being made for the Liberal nomination, it might not be uninteresting to Mr. Jackson (to whom he was writing), to know that, when it was decided by the party leaders, subsequent to the general elections of 1887, that an early appeal should be made to friends of the party for substantial assistance, so as to make the necessary preparations for the next general elections, the only Liberal in Toronto who was asked to subscribe, and positively refused, was Mr. S. H. Janes. He told a friend and myself, when presented with the subscription book, that he had no funds for party purposes.

Well, Sir, immediately that was heard, and immediately that letter was sent abroad, these purists in South Oxford decided that Mr. Janes was unworthy of the nomination of the Liberal party, and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was selected as a candidate once more; due to the fact evidently that he had been more liberal in the giving of substantial aid. Mr. Speaker, this is a new phrase we have. We have heard it in times past called "Big Push"; we have heard it called "human devices"; we have heard it called "putting down bribery and corruption"; we have heard it called "mesmerism"; we have heard it called "relief for the poor"; but here is a new phrase in the vocabulary of purity: "Substantial aid," and to my mind it expresses it better than any of the other terms. I understand now—and here is another evidence that appears to me as if my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is being stabbed under the fifth rib by some of his friends—I understand that the Liberal party of Toronto are advertising for a new campaign song. Evidently the old song he sings seems to have been played out in the minds of gentlemen in Toronto, because they are asking for a new campaign song. I would suggest to my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and who is the poet of his party, who it is said is competing for the prize, that he should compose a poem in which he should employ his genius in settling in proper background, before the electorate of this country, these beautiful gems which are evidence of Liberal purity. But, after the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) had his nomination, he was not even then safe, and his ribs were still in danger, because my hon. friend knows that there is a Liberal paper published in the town of Aylmer, in the province of Quebec, and that Liberal paper had something to say in regard to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and here is what it said. Nothing ever so hard was said of him by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House:

An enthusiastic Liberal of Montreal said the other day: If the Lord would only lay Sir Richard Cartwright on a bed of sickness for the next six months, nothing in the Dominion or out of it could prevent the Liberal party getting into power.

That, Sir, is how my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems to be appreciated among the very gentlemen who he says are so enthusiastically united against the Conservative party of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, who are the gentlemen who are asking the electors of this country to dismiss this Government, and to place them in power? They are gentlemen who have always claimed electoral purity and who have always practised electoral corruption. They are the men who, in 1874, passed an Act forbidding corruption at elections, and yet in the next election no less than thirty of these were shown to have purchased their seats; and since the introduction of that law, eighty-three Liberal purists have fallen, to 48 Conservatives. Eight purist Liberals have been disqualified to one Conservative. They are the gentlemen who have always claimed that they were the party of righteous legislation in regard to election matters, and yet I remember when they were in power, that every one of these gentlemen voted for a Bill to take a Liberal township, a Liberal stronghold, from a constituency in which it had done its duty for a Liberal candidate at the general election, and to place it over into another constituency where it might do double duty in a by-election. Every one of the Liberals, Sir, voted for it under the guise of righteous legislation. They are the gentlemen who claim to be the party of low taxation, but I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, as I have challenged them in the country, to name one single item in all their five years of power—except the one item of coal oil, and then they took off an excise duty on coal oil and put a customs tax on tea to make up the loss—on which they reduced taxation. I say that in all these five years of power, they never reduced one single dollar of taxation on the people of this country, but on the contrary, they constantly added taxation on their shoulders, in all adding a customs taxation of three million dollars. Not only that, Sir, but they tell us: They are men who want to take office for the public good. I have their campaign sheet here which says "All they want is office for the public good." Look at them, Mr. Speaker, see the hungry look in their faces and see if it is the public good they are after. When they went into power on just the same cry before, only three or four years elapsed when eight of their Cabinet Ministers "who went into power for the public good," slipped into office for their private good," and one Cabinet Minister who went into office "for the public good," or rather for his family's good, put fifteen of his relatives as pensioners in the public treasury of this country. Sir, the fact is, as I shall show, that

in five years of office these Liberals made such a record of blundering stupidity and incapacity, that they were hurled from power by an indignant electorate and so long as the electors of this country remember that they ever were in power, their chances are very blue for ever getting into power again. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me ask: Why am I discussing these matters?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will tell my hon. friend in a moment. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) is smiling, but it is a smile of the lips and he will know it before I get through. Why do I discuss these matters? I discuss them because my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) last night said: When we get into power, we will do just the same as we did when we were in power before. My hon. friend will know that there is very little chance of my making any comparison with the future record of the Liberal party. That is away in the dim and distant future, and the House will therefore pardon me if I say something this afternoon as to their past record, more particularly as we have the certificate of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), that when he gets into power: "He will do the same as they did before." I want to say, Sir, in the first place: that standing here to-day, twenty-seven years from confederation, the records of this country show that hon. gentlemen opposite as a party have been wrong on every great public question upon which they ever declared a policy. In all the history of our years as a Dominion, these men have never propounded a policy that subsequent events had shown to be a proper one. Why, Sir, let me in the light of the present, read the announcement of their great leader in 1871, as to a great public enterprise in this country. Mr. Mackenzie on page 672 of the "Hansard" of 1871, says as follows, as regards the Canadian Pacific Railway:—

Mr. LAURIER. What are you quoting from?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The "Hansard" of 1871.

Mr. LAURIER. There was no "Hansard" in 1871.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a "Hansard" in the Library made from "Globe" reports of the debates of that year.

Mr. LISTER. There was no "Hansard" then.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is taking refuge behind a very slim willow. I want my hon. friends from the west to listen to what Mr. Mackenzie said then, and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to take a mental note of it, too, and to say what they think of their policy. Mr. Mackenzie said:

> He would recommend a cheap narrow-gauge railway, with steamers on the lakes, instead of a costly broad-gauge road, for the North-west and British Columbia, and the railway across the prairies need not be constructed for many years.

Sir, that was the policy of the Liberal party. Looking back now, was it right or wrong? Looking back now, is there a man who will say it is right?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes. It was right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that it is right. Well, he has always been a narrow-gauge politician, but no Canadian having an atom of regard for public opinion of his judgment will say as he says. I am old enough to remember, and old enough parliamentarian to know, that hon. gentlemen opposite opposed the construction of the great Sault Canal which gives us a water way independent of the people of the United States. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, last year could not refrain from expressing his pride at the construction of that great work, and thus admitted that he was wrong with regard to it when he opposed it. Why, Sir, let me just read a few extracts, because they are matters of history and the people of this country ought to know them, as to what these gentlemen opposite thought of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Here is what my friend the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) says:

> This was a contract from which there was no escape politically or commercially, excepting one, and that is annexation to the United States. It is escape that no politician likes to talk about, but it will come one day, and, when it comes, we must take our chance and make the best bargain we can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am reading from a report of a speech delivered in Charlottetown in the year 1880.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is the report?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will show the report to my hon. friend. Does he deny the utterance?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From what paper?

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend has a custom of denying statements in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will show to-day that my hon. friend denies them sometimes——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman knows, if he will allow me——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I asked a question of hon. gentlemen opposite, and you ruled, very strongly indeed, and very peremptorily I thought, that

I was decidedly out of order. I now ask for your ruling, though I ask for no pity from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling, as I stated then—if my ruling is called in question, of course it may be appealed against—is that no hon. member is permitted to interrupt an hon. member who has the floor, except on a question of order.

Mr. LAURIER. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this point. The hon. gentleman stated that my hon. friend beside me has the habit of denying statements made by him. I ask if that is in order ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I doubt very much if I can be called upon to rule upon that. If the hon. Secretary of State states that the hon. member for Queen's is in the habit of denying statements made by him on the floor of this House, then it certainly is not in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS (to Mr. Laurier). Hear, hear ; take it back.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend, I think, entirely misunderstood me, for the very reason that he would not allow me to proceed with my sentence. I said that my hon. friend was in the habit of denying statements which were attributed to him in this House, and I was about to say immediately afterwards that I intended to deal with some of those statements a little later on in my speech. If there is any question of order in the point raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I shall be very glad, Mr. Speaker, as I always am, to submit to your ruling. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the House to this fact, that instead of the Canadian Pacific Railway compelling us to seek annexation to the United States, it is the one great work which has enabled us to hold ourselves politically independent, and commercially independent, of the people of those states. Sir, let us take a look at a speech delivered by my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who always grows vigorous in his denunciations of the Conservative policy. He said :

> This scheme, whether designed or not, is a great crime. Its supporters in the Government may take the attitude of criminal complicity or of stupidity. If they choose the latter alternative, posterity will accord each a coat of arms, the central figure a head, with dropping ears and pensive countenance, the head of the meditative donkey.

Again I refer to a speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, in which he said :

> Of course, the projectors and promoters of the enterprise would claim that after the road was opened from ocean to ocean, a large amount of through business would be developed, but he thought there was a great deal of fallacy in the estimate of the probable amount of through freight.

Indeed, the whole thing would be a fizzle from beginning to end. That was the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I am quoting it now to show——

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is it contained ?

Mr. MONTAGUE in the "Hansard"—that hon. gentlemen opposite were wrong upon that great public question. Sir, see the business which has been developed. View their predictions now in the light of subsequent events. Here is another prediction of the hon. member for North Norfolk :

> He believed that the estimate of Asiatic trade likely to be secured was greatly exaggerated.
>
> He had often heard the grievance of British Columbia on the floor of the House. * * * * * Those men from that province had seats here, and they made more noise than the delegates from any other province.

Well, Sir, my hon. friend who took that stand went a few years afterwards to Victoria, in the province of British Columbia, and declared that it was the great Liberal party of this country that had promoted and constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway.

> It is hard to realize, sir, the vastness and magnitude of the Dominion. Of course, I came by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it affords me great pleasure to bear unequivocal testimony as to the courteousness of its officials, the completeness of its equipment and the character of the road, and I congratulate you most sincerely on the completion of the great work, which promises British Columbia more intimate relations with the sister provinces. I doubt not that the time is not far distant when lines of steamers will be established between here and Asia, Australia, and the north-western coast of America, and I hope that your most extravagant dreams will be more than realized. The great Liberal party had always been the friends of the Canadian Pacific. The province owed them much with regard to it.

And not only did he praise the Canadian Pacific, and, going still further, he denounced the Conservative Premier, Sir John Macdonald, for not having spent more public money in the harbour of Victoria. My hon. friend will not deny that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do deny it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was made in a speech delivered on the 26th of August, 1886, and reported in the British Columbia papers.

Mr. CHARLTON. Read the extract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I shall be most happy to do so. The extract is this :

> What has Sir John Macdonald done for this city when its representative and Premier of the Dominion ? I might ask why Victoria, the fourth port of the Dominion, why for this port there has only been set apart in the Estimates the paltry sum of $8,500 for harbour improvements, and why for these numerous harbours, bays and inlets there is but a grant of $10,500 ? Why is it that British Columbia has not received one cent to improve the navigation of the Fraser River ?

Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be ever the same. They try to put east against

west, and province against province. Even this year while the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues were promising public expenditures in the west, his friends at the same time in the east were attacking us for doing justice to the west. So much with regard to the opposition which these hon. gentlemen displayed against the Canadian Pacific Railway in its early days. Now, Sir, there was a time when the question was how much of the railway should be constructed. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that the line around the North Shore of Lake Superior was no good, and they opposed it with might and main. I want to ask this House now of what use the Canadian Pacific Railway would be to Canada if we had not this great connecting link—how much of a national work it would be? Were we right or were they right? They were wrong. In a thousand ways they have been compelled to admit since. Then there came a time when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was in distress, a time when danger threatened them, and when they came to this House and asked for aid; and if that aid had not been given, the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been bankrupt, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway had become bankrupt, the credit and progress of this country would have been destroyed for the next half century. Where did these men stand then? They were still, Sir, on the narrow-gauge policy; they were still unable to appreciate the opportunities and possibilities of this country. Here was their policy, as laid down by the member for West Huron, Mr. M. C. Cameron, who is not now in this House, to be found on page 2642 of "Hansard" of 1885:

> I say the name of any Parliament, in the face of these facts, that would ratify these resolutions, will stink in the nostrils of every honest man, and the names of its members will go down to future generations as political time-servers and slaves, who for the third time, at the bidding of an unscrupulous and corrupt Government, sold this country to this corporation.

Were we right or were we wrong? Hon. gentlemen opposite know that they were wrong; they know now, in the light of history, that the Conservative party were not time-servers and slaves, but patriotic men, willing to stake the credit of this country, because they knew that in staking its credit they were going to build up the credit and the future of the Dominion. That money loaned at that time was paid back. We lost not a dollar, but we averted a national calamity. Well, Sir, I now come down to more recent times. I come to the great trade fight of 1891, when hon. gentlemen opposite asked us to adopt the policy of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. Were they right or were they wrong? Once more, Sir, they were wrong, and so wrong that they are now ashamed of it themselves; so wrong that they now deny that they ever supported it; so wrong that not a Canadian with investments in this country but trembles when he thinks how near Canada came to accepting that sham policy that would have been destructive to the Dominion in times of danger. So much, Sir, for the points of history in regard to the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite upon great public questions. Now, they are calling for economy. Well, Sir, it is an old cry, the cry of economy, with hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend the member for North Norfolk, when he spoke to the Patrons, declared it to be a time-honoured rule of the Liberal party,—and he might have observed that it was a rule more honoured in the breach than in the observance, as I think I shall be able to show when I deal with that part of the subject. Sir, I want for a few moments to speak as to some of the economies of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have heard a great deal in this House about the question of superannuation. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were coming into power—before they were in power—cried out for economy in our superannuation, just as they are crying out now; and yet, when they were in power, they increased the vote necessary for that service 100 per cent in five years, and superannuated many a man that still walks the streets of Ottawa and elsewhere—superannuated them ostensibly because their health was poor, but really because they wanted places for their supporters who were anxious to "serve the public for the public good." Not only that. While they were thus losing money to the country by their mismanagement of superannuation, and I am absolutely correct in my figures, as hon. gentlemen will find—$53,000 and $106,000 were the figures when they began and closed—while they were thus constantly losing money to the country, they devised no scheme by which the income and the outgo should be made to balance. And now they attack us notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance brought down a Bill two years ago which goes a long way towards evening up income and expenditure in that branch, and has another on the paper which will wipe out the balance on the wrong side altogether, and make the superannuation fund pay its own way. That is what this Government mean to accomplish. They attacked my hon. friend the Minister of Railways for his expenditure on the Intercolonial. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in a table which he made of expenses that they could save—a table which, I am bound to say, if I am not unparliamentary, was not drawn up with a due regard to the rules of Sabbath observance—tried to make out that the Minister of Railways ought to have saved another $100,000 on the Intercolonial. But, let me here take a note of what my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies),

said, when he exclaimed, "What we did then, we will do again." Let us see what they did then in order that we may judge what they will do again. Sir, these economical gentlemen had 714 miles of railway under their control. And on that economically-managed railway, in 1876-77, they lost $507,000; and in 1877-78, $432,000; and now, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has actually wiped out the deficit and made the Intercolonial contribute $5,000 a year to the treasury of Canada, the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) exclaims: Let us come in again and see what we can do in regard to the Intercolonial. And remember this, Sir, that the management was then in the hands of a gentleman who said that he had to sit on the treasury with a gun in order to keep his friends behind him out of that treasury. The Minister of Railways has done a great service to the country in connection with the Intercolonial. The past two years have been most trying years upon railway management. Our Canadian railway companies have been compelled to present most discouraging showings, and in the United States the great railway corporations have been in the direst distress. In the whole Republic, with an increase mileage of 1,000 miles, the earnings, as compared with the previous year, fell off $30,000,000. One-third of all their railway mileage went into the hands of receivers, roads with a capital of $79,924,000 were sold by the sheriff, while in the receivers hands railway property worth $1,500,000,000 were placed. In the face of these facts the management of the Minister of Railways cannot be too highly complimented. Ask any great railway man in Canada as to the management of that road under him and they will tell you it is splendidly run, and hon. gentlemen in attacking it are but showing their hypocrisy and determination to find fault. What he did last year, Sir, he is doing again this year, viz., bringing it out without loss. How is he doing it? The trade has been less upon it as upon other lines. He is doing it by careful business management, and business management that is fully appreciated in the country. Then, Sir, I want to speak with regard to another matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are economists as regards the number of Ministers of the Crown. Why, that is as familiar as the voice of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It was an old cry in 1873 and 1874. And what did they do when in power? They said that the salaries were too large. Possibly, for they ought to have known their own worth, and were their own judges. The salaries were too big and the number was too great, they said. But what followed? They filled every place, drew every cent of salary, and added one gentleman to the Cabinet without portfolio—in defiance of their professions previous to the elections upon that point. Perhaps I should say, however, that they did introduce a Bill to do away with one of the ministerial places. They introduced a Bill to do away with the Receiver Generalship; but in order that one of the gentlemen who "took office for the public good only" should not be dispensed with altogether, they made for him another office, and called it the Attorney Generalship. When the Bill creating that office went to the Senate and the Senate threw it out, the effect of that rejection was to reduce the Cabinet by one, but, Sir, that did not suit them. So they withdrew the Bill, all of course "for the public good." We hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the salaries of the Civil Service. I am not here to defend the Civil Service. I am here to say that we on this side, all agree that when a man is in the Civil Service, he ought to earn every dollar the country pays him, and that is the policy of this Government. But hon. gentlemen opposite should not say anything with regard to the salaries of the Civil Service. History and the record of public documents sometimes tell tales. Here is a Bill I wish to show the House, introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the 8th March, 1875, in relation to the Civil Service of this country. And what does that Bill provide? Second-class clerks, under his Bill, would have had from $800 to $1,600 per year. Under the present law, their salaries are $1,100 to $1,400. First-class clerks, under his Bill, $1,600 to $2,000 per year; under our Bill, $1,400 to $1,800. Chief clerks, under his Bill, from $2,000 to $2,800; under our Bill, $1,800 to $2,400. Messengers, under his Bill, $400 to $600: under our Bill, $300 to $500. Temporary clerks, under his Bill, not to exceed $730 per annum; under our Bill, not to exceed $400 per annum. Extra work of civil servants, under his Bill, 50 cents per hour; under our Bill, the payment of a single cent of extra money to these gentlemen is strictly forbidden, unless voted by Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite may take all the comfort they like out of this record upon Civil Service salaries. Now, then, I shall take up one more question, and I do this partly in defence of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and partly because it is a matter on which the people have a right to know the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. Somewhere in the western part of Ontario, my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is said to have declared that the leader of the Opposition had agreed to the Interprovincial Conference resolutions. My hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) brought the matter up and made a great ado about it. He (Mr. Macdonald) made a speech in which he declared that if the Minister of Railways did make such a statement, he should have the manliness to repeat it here, so that the leader of the Opposition might have the opportunity of

contradicting those false statements made on public platforms before the electorate of this country. That is very plain. Then he (Mr. Macdonald) went on to moralize upon the evil practice of making statements not correct. Sir, let him take his lesson home to himself. Now, I am here to give an opportunity to the leader of the Opposition of denying that statement of the Minister of Railways. I say here that the hon. leader of the Opposition did agree to the terms of the Interprovincial Conference. I say to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that when he charged the Minister of Railways with having made a false statement, it was he himself and not the Minister of Railways who was guilty. I say still further that that agreement of the leader of the Opposition to support the Interprovincial Conference resolutions is in the public records of this country. You will find, in the speech of an hon. gentleman who formerly represented L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins), a conversation across the floor between the leader of the Opposition and Mr. Desjardins. Mr. Desjardins said :

I have the right to ask the leader of the Opposition, if it is true that he pledged himself to Mr. Mercier to increase the subsidies to the provinces and to carry out the resolutions of the Interprovincial Conference, if he got into power.

And the leader of the Opposition thus replied :

I am sorry that the hon. gentleman, who is so versed in political matters, has not done me the honour to read my speeches during the last three or four years. I have spoken on that question in Toronto and Quebec, and have always asserted that I was in favour of the Interprovincial Conference resolutions.

The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) have been telling the people of Ontario that the Minister of Railways spoke falsely when he charged the leader of the Opposition with being in favour of those resolutions. I now ask the leader of the Opposition to rise up—like the gentleman that he is—and say that we were not telling falsehoods, but speaking from the public records of the country upon a grave and serious matter, and that the gentlemen behind him did not know the mind of their own leader on that great question. Sir, the leader of the Opposition will not rise, and he dare not deny the record I read. I say that this is a matter of public concern, because here are his lieutenants in Ontario saying that he will not support those resolutions. But against their statement, here is his public declaration in the Parliament of Canada saying that he does support those resolutions. He made a similar declaration in answer to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I say now, in the light of Parliament, that he did make such a declaration, and I say still further that that will add $1,700,000 to the public expenditure of this country, and the hon. gentleman knows it just as well as I do, and the men behind him ought to know it too. So much with regard to their economy ; now I want to say a word or two as to their purity. Sir, they had not been in power a year when they wrote a letter to the superintendent of one of the canals of this country telling him to purchase supplies, from whom do you think ? From a gentleman who sat behind them in this House of Commons, supporting their Administration ; and without public competition at that. Has this Government done anything of that kind ? If we did do so, would not hon. gentlemen opposite howl ? Here is the letter :

Public Works Department,
Ottawa, May 5, 1876.

Sir,—I am directed to authorize you to purchase until further orders from Messrs. Frothingham & Workman such iron as may be required in connection with the canals under your charge.

F. BRAUN,
Secretary.

J. G. Sippell, C.E., Montreal.

And what else did they do ? They gave to a member of this House who sat in the Speaker's place, which you adorn, Sir, a contract for public printing, without competition, and at rates 50 per cent higher than the work would have been done for by any other job printing office in the country, and when he lost his seat by reason of that contract, they elected him again to the chair. They appointed to office a man who, in London, had been reported as a corruptionist in the courts of the country. And then when they wanted land to carry on a public undertaking, land which could have been purchased at $75 an acre, they gave private information—see the sworn evidence given before the Senate Committee, a copy of which I have here—they gave information to one of the gentlemen sitting behind them ; that man with some associates purchased another part of land just near where this public work was to be erected ; the Government of the day, instead of following the usual method of procuring property in such cases, appointed partisan valuators to value the property ; and then, in order to help the men who wanted to sell, they appointed as Government agent, to assist them in the purchase, a lawyer, one of the very men who owned the property. And the result was that they paid $500 an acre for land which ought to have been bought at $75 an acre, and they paid for improvements against the purchase of which even these partisan valuators had reported to the Government, they paid thousands of dollars, notwithstanding that they had not even the affidavit of the men who spent the

money. In this whole transaction, the evidence of which is upon record in our public documents, the country lost a hundred thousand dollars. It was open and barefaced piece of corruption. Now, Sir, let me refer to another case. My hon. friend from East Huron—and I deal with this now partly in answer to my hon. friend from South Oxford—said: We only increased the debt by reason of the fact that we were compelled to carry out the obligations left by the Tory party when they went out of office. He then referred to the Welland canal contracts. I tell the hon. gentleman, they were not obliged to carry out the obligations of the Tory party unless it was a good work and in the public interests, and I tell him further that if they had carried out the obligations and practices of the Conservative party, they would have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars to the country. What did they do with regard to the Welland Canal contracts? My hon. friend says that no contracts were cancelled. He was technically right, but morally he was very wrong. The Conservative Government called for tenders for work on the Welland Canal in 1873. These tenders came in in October, 1873, but before they were acted upon, hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. And what did they do? They wrote a letter to the engineer asking whether there was not some informality with regard to these tenders. And there was some informality of course! I have the letter here, Sir, if hon. gentlemen dispute what I say. And the consequence was that these tenders were laid aside, and other tenders were called for. And I am here with the evidence afforded by the public records to give my hon. friend the result of that second call for tenders. On section 2 of the Welland Canal the lowest of the first tenders which were called for and received by the Conservative Government, was $321,000. In the second calling for tenders the lowest was $396,000. And the contract was let to the lowest tenderer. In section 3 there was only a difference of $30,000 between the lowest of the first tenders, and the amount at which the contract was let. On section 5 the lowest tender on the first call was $266,000, and on the second call, $312,000; and the contract was let to the fifth lowest tenderer at $352,000. On section 14, the lowest tender on the first call was $292,000, and the work was let for $321,000, notwithstanding that upon the second calling for tenders there was a tender put in for $292,000. On section 12, the lowest tender on the first call was $302,000, and on the second call, $327,000, and the work was let for $551,000. On section 7, first call, lowest tender, $251,000; second call, lowest tender, $283,000; and the work was let by these purity and economy-loving gentlemen at $327,000. On section 13, the lowest of the first tenders was $270,000; the lowest of the second tenders, $313,000; and the work was let for $325,000. It will be seen, Sir, first, that the prices at which the Conservative Government would have got the work done was much the lowest, and second, that the lowest tenders were passed over by these gentlemen. Now, just a word as to the method of argument pursued by my hon. friend from East Huron. Taking a certain number of years, he said that the average of contracts to the lowest tenderer in the time of Sir John Macdonald, was 35 per cent, while in the time of Mr. Mackenzie it was 84 per cent. For his comparison he took the years 1874, 1875, and 1876, of Mr. Mackenzie's time. But he forgot this—that the system had changed, that a deposit was required in Mr. Mackenzie's time, while no deposit was required in Sir John Macdonald's time, the consequence being that all the men who tendered under Mr. Mackenzie had to put up evidence and did put up evidence of their ability to do the work, and there was no excuse for neglecting them. Still further, the hon. gentleman omitted to take the year 1877 into his calculation. Had he done so, he would have found this percentage suffer material damage, because, in 1877, this economy and purity-loving party gave forty-two contracts, all told, of which seventeen were let to the second, third, fourth, or fifth lowest tenderers. I want now to discuss another point that came up in the speech of my hon. friend from East Huron, and afterwards to discuss the general trade policy of the country. In the first place, it seems to me that the effort of hon. gentlemen opposite has been mainly to prove that they have not changed their views upon the trade question. I am not going to discuss the question whether they have changed their policy or not. Surely it is patent enough to the people of this country; surely it has become notorious that they have been skipping about from pillar to post, and have discredited themselves before the people of Canada. The only reason they can possibly have for hoping to convince the people that they have not changed their trade policy is that they share the belief of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) "that the masses of this country are not remarkable for their intelligence," anyway, which opinion the hon. gentleman expressed in a famous letter to the people of the United States some few years ago. As regards the question of protection or free trade, I want to begin my argument by showing that the hon. member for South Oxford has always been the controlling spirit of hon. gentlemen opposite. The light and airy, beautiful nothings of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition do not count against the vigorous demands of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford; and while the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) may talk gracefully and beautifully, the man who says

it shall be thus and so is the man from South Oxford—and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to remember that when I come to discuss this question of the trade policy. Let me begin by saying that when he sat on the treasury benches—at I want his attention, his distinguished attention for a moment—the men behind him were demanding, night and day, the introduction of protection into Canada. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and my hon. friend who then represented Halifax (Mr. Jones), even the hon. leader of the Opposition himself, in season and out of season, were demanding fair-play for the industries of Canada. I say it to their credit, but I charge it up to their weakness that they failed; and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island last night complimented the hon. gentleman from South Oxford that he resisted all this pressure, that, notwithstanding the howl and turmoil there was around him for protection, he came out victorious, and stood by his guns, and refused to give it. Now, the fact that he is the leader, the real controller of hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding that they squirm occasionally, is an important fact to be remembered as I come to discuss the position of that party at present upon the trade question. Now, Sir, one or two words as to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who impugned some of my motives, I fancy, and doubted my accuracy when I was speaking in the west upon some of these questions. Sir, I had stated, it appears, that in 1887 the gentlemen opposite adopted protection as their policy. I then stated the truth. I stated the fact that Mr. Blake saw that he was wrong, and publicly went back on his course. I am now here to prove what I stated. Does my hon. friend want me to do so? He says they issued no circular to the manufacturers. Well, my hon. friend cannot expect me to carry around all their campaign literature with me. Surely, my hon. friend does not expect me to have all these circulars and to keep them for a number of years. But I state the fact for my hon. friend's information, that such a circular was issued to the manufacturers, trying to humbug them, telling them that they need not be afraid of the advent of hon. gentlemen opposite to power.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a pity you have not the circular.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It would be a pity if I did not have it, but I have. Here is the circular, Mr. Speaker. This was the circular sent to every manufacturer in the country, and it was handed to me by a manufacturer in the country. Here is the heading, in great, black type:

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. Blake on the tariff. Manufacturers have nothing to fear.

It further adds that the condition of the country wont allow a reduction of the tariff to any extent, and that stability of tariffs was what Canada wanted, and that was sent to every manufacturer in the country, and I am glad for the advantage of my hon. friend that I have it. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I have a speech of my hon. friend, too. Here is a speech my hon. friend delivered in Toronto, in the year 1887, in the same year, and in the same campaign; and here is what my hon. friend who wants to see the circular in Toronto in the campaign of 1887:

Mr. Charlton said that the circumstances were such that the question of the National Policy was now out of court. That the high taxation, as the reports goes on to say, which was then existing, had to be maintained.

Not only that, Sir, but in the session of 1887, it was the first session I was in this Parliament, the then Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper), complimented Mr. Blake across the floor after his conversion to a safe policy, and Mr. Blake did not by the lightest sign attempt to signify his disapproval. My object now is to show that at that particular moment, the hon. member for West Durham, the Hon. Mr. Blake, was on top. He did not stay there very long, however, and our hope that men might thereafter invest their capital in the development of Canadian enterprise without having it made the foot-ball of a party in their mad and unceasing struggle for office. But we were disappointed, Sir. The hon. member for South Oxford got in his sledge hammer blows again, and scarcely had the echoes of Mr. Blake's protection speech died away in the country, when the hon. member for South Oxford was controlling again. There was a new hand on th helm of the ship, there was a new voice dominant among the crew of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Liberal ship was drifting for the purpose of catching a breeze that would take them into office, but always threatening and meaning the destruction of the platform of assistance and encouragement to the industries of Canada. Sir, what is the fact? The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) saw that it was a will-o'-the-wisp that the hon. gentlemen were pursuing, and decided to abandon it. He got control for a moment, but the hon. member for South Oxford very soon supplanted him again. I want hon. gentlemen to remember that, because I want them to remember that the hon. member for South Oxford is still in control. He is the real leader, he says so himself. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) is the titual leader; but I want this House to know what the real leader, and the dominant spirit, and con-

trolling influence of hon. gentlemen opposite, says on this question, and to see how much weight they are to attach to the oily and airy nothings that have been put before this country as an excuse for their trade policy. Now, just one word more. I am dealing now with specific denials made in this debate. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), I think, made a specific denial that no gentleman on the other side of the House, or belonging to that party, had ever supported free trade between Canada and the United States. That is what he said, and here are his words:

I mean to say, in answer to the inquiry from me, that no hon. gentleman on that side of the House can point out one line in which the Liberal party have ever advocated the abolition of duties upon articles imported into this country from the United States, through any system of reciprocity.

Great heavens! Mr. Speaker, has it come to this, that in this Parliament, and within easy reach of the library of Parliament, hon. gentlemen will so far forget themselves as to make such a statement as that? I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman did it intentionally. The hon. gentleman did not think that his party had ever adopted any such foolish policy. He never gave them credit for having so little sense. Sir, he had not judged them properly; I will not read now from the speech of my hon. friend at Boston, which was read last night, which advocated such a policy as absolute free trade, but I will read the resolution that was moved in this House by the hon. member for South Oxford himself in 1889, and I want my hon. friend from Yarmouth to insert this in his speech when he sends it to his constituents, just after his statement that they had never advocated any such policy. Here is the resolution, and every Liberal in the House voted for it, including the leader upon that side:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse shall obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of said countries should be admitted free into the other.

Now, I want to show the position in which hon. gentlemen are. Either the hon. gentleman was absolutely misrepresenting—but I do not believe that, he is not that kind of a gentleman,—or he was passing judgment by imputation when he says that surely no Liberal ever could have been so silly, could have been so lacking in judgment, as to have supported any such policy as that. Sir, I ask him to look down to the front benches and see the gentleman who moved it, and to look down still further on the front benches to the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, time and time again, in his beautiful words, declared with great sentiment that he was willing to stand by it, to live by it, and to die by it, if necessary. Sir, I ask my hon. friend from Yarmouth not to forget this when he goes to speak to his constituents, but, in the meantime, to make a moral resolve never to trust to the hon. gentleman's opinions on the trade question before he has carefully looked up the record in the library of this Parliament. Then, once more my hon. friend from Yarmouth made another specific denial, and that specific denial was that no gentleman on the other side had ever supported commercial union. I said at the time, "Oh, yes, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)," and the hon. member for Queen's said: "Oh, no." The hon. member for Queen's said: "I have denied it time and again in this House." Well, I will tell you what the hon. member for Queen's denied. He denied a speech which he made at the Charlottetown Board of Trade, and the reason he gave for denying that speech was because, he said, it was not correctly reported, that it was reported in an Opposition paper which had done him injustice, and he therefore denied and repudiated it. Did the hon. gentleman ever make any other speeches on commercial union? The hon. gentleman is silent. The hon. gentleman did make another speech on that subject—and I am not saying now that I do not always accept the hon. gentleman's denial.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, you do not. You would not allow me to explain a moment ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I always accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but I want to give the House the grounds on which he makes the denial, because, surely, that is fair to the hon. gentleman. There is a paper published in Charlottetown called the "Patriot." I think the hon. gentleman is connected with the publishing company, indeed, I believe, he is president. That journal published a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman on 21st August, 1887, on the subject of political union, and here is what he said at Cape Traverse, P.E.I.:

Commercial union would also settle the nasty questions arising respecting our fisheries. The idea that we would be disloyal to the British flag under commercial union was humbug. He wanted to live under the flag as well as any one, but he wanted a flag under which he could live. The keynote should be struck in the banner province. Commercial union means a uniform tariff from the North Pole to the Gulf of Mexico. The reciprocity treaty of 1854 he was prepared to accept, but he was afraid the Americans were unwilling to concede it. As commercial union seemed to be more easily attainable, he was prepared to support it, because he believed it would secure to us wealth, peace and happiness.

This report was not published in an Opposition paper, but in the "Patriot," of Charlottetown, and the hon. gentleman was or is the president of the company. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they have not recently

changed their trade policy. I am not disposed to quarrel very much with that statement, indeed, I am prepared to accept it in a very large measure, because I want to be fair to hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire to note the resolution moved at the convention held in Ottawa, in 1893. In that resolution hon. gentlemen called for certain things, for a reduction of taxation, for freer trade, for a return to a tariff that would raise revenue; but I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show a line in which they declared for tariff for revenue only. True, there is nothing in that resolution which declares tariff for revenue only, but I fancy the resolution ought to be read in the light of the speeches which were made at that convention, because the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) last night claimed that we are divorcing sentence from sentence, and I propose uniting sentence to sentence and sentences to the resolution in order that hon. gentlemen may have a fair presentation of their case. In those speeches at the convention as I shall show the cry was for free trade as it is in England, though the resolution was vague and indefinite, the speeches were definite indeed. I do say this though that the hon. gentlemen opposite while they have not, as I admit, changed their policy very recently, they have changed the name of it, just as they did in 1889 and 1890. They supported commercial union. The member for West Ontario wrote a letter in which he said it was unwise to call it commercial union, so they called it unrestricted reciprocity, on the ground that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet"; and so instead of calling the policy now free trade as they have it in England, hon. gentlemen call it a tariff for revenue only, which being interpreted means the system they have in England just as sure as we are standing here to-day. In the resolution now proposed hon. gentlemen say:

> The existing tariff should be modified so that it be made a tariff for revenue only.

No protection there—every vestige of protection is to be removed; there is to be no incidental protection, because if such had been their intention it would have been stated. We must accept what hon. gentlemen opposite say, and what they say is that they are not in favour of protection in the slightest degree, but favour a tariff for revenue only. What does that mean? Consult any of the works upon political economy. It means, Sir, the system in vogue in England. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to conceal that fact; they have been saying, we are in favour of a tariff of incidental protection. Did the hon. member for South Oxford ever say that? Has any one ever heard that hon. gentleman say a word about incidental protection? What was the speech to which this resolution was the conclusion? Half of it was the bitterest kind of attack on any kind of protection, and the other half was a defence of the English system of taxation. I want to read the resolution of my hon. friend in the light of the speeches that were made before it, and in the light of speeches made after it, and I will leave this House and the country to draw their conclusion. Here are some of the speeches made before it. The leader of the Opposition said at Newmarket:

> Not a vestige of protection shall be allowed to remain.

At St. Thomas, he said:

> Our policy is the antipodes of theirs.

At Winnipeg:

> It was a system of bondage and slavery.

Surely hon. gentlemen opposite will not leave a trace of slavery. At St. Thomas the hon. gentleman said:

> Protection is a fraud. We want the policy of Britain, the policy which has made England the greatest nation in the world. Free trade as it exists in Britain is the goal which henceforth the Liberal party of Canada will struggle to attain.

Mr. GILLMOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Charlotte says "hear, hear." I will just in a moment mention how delighted my hon. friend who is a free trader was when his friends adopted this policy at the convention, and he patted them on the back and said: That is right, boys, I believe in that policy. But that compliment to them is death to the contention they are now making, that they are not for free trade as it is in England. At the Ottawa convention the leader of the Opposition said:

> I submit to your judgment that the servile copy of the American system which has been brought amongst us by the leaders of the Conservatives, is, like its prototype, a fraud and a robbery. I call upon you, one and all, to pronounce at once and give your emphatic support to the proposition that we shall never rest until we have wiped away from our system that fraud and robbery under which Canadians suffer.

Again, the hon. gentleman said:

> My loyalty does not ooze from the pores of my body.

I never knew that charge to be made against the hon. gentleman. But he said further:

> I do want to go for an example to the mother country, and not to the United States, much as I respect and love the people on the other side of the line.

And once more:

> I preach to you the gospel of absolute destruction to protection. Not a vestige shall remain.

Once more:

> We shall never rest until it is wiped out entirely.

And once more, at Montreal, the hon. gentleman said:

Our object was the destruction of protection; there can be no compromise. We stand here against protection, a system of protection has been the bane and curse of Canada. The Liberal party believes in free trade on the broad lines that exist in Great Britain.

In the county of Peel, he said:

I propose we shall follow England's example, and open our ports to the products of the world.

Is there any incidental protection there? Not by any means, but it is free trade, if the hon. gentleman understood what he was talking about. Now, let me say that we have heard in this House during the present debate an hon. gentleman opposite state:

That the leader of the Opposition at any time in his life has not gone back on any great trade policy which he had advocated for Canada, and put before the people.

Well, Sir, he has not changed possibly; but, Sir, he has renamed his policy of free trade as they have it in England in order that the pill might go down better with the Canadian people. I have another gentleman to read from. I do not need to name that hon. gentleman because the extracts bear his ear-marks and are self-announceful of their author:

These men and their bonused manufacturers are scoundrels great and scoundrels small.

Again:

It is the most villainous system to be found on earth.

Again:

It is thievery, villainy and highway robbery.

And so on. Again:

The condition of the people was like a house on fire. The Liberal party were coming to the rescue.

Surely not to put it half out. Again, from the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright):

The National Policy was worse than war, pestilence and famine.

Surely these things are not to be only partially wiped out. And now we come to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), as to how he interprets it, and this is what he says:

It is a system accursed of God and man.

What did the hon. gentleman propose? Did he ever propose "free trade as it was in England"? My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) looks dubious now, as to whether he should answer or not; but for his information I will tell him that he did. I will tell him so from a speech which he scattered broadcast in the provinces by the sea; a speech which is said to be "A great deliverance of the Hon. L. H. Davies at Middleton. A masterly discussion of the Trade Question." Now, I want to read what that hon. gentleman proposed, and I want not to divorce that speech from the resolution which calls for a tariff for revenue only; but I want to unite them, as they should be united in their life, and as they will be united in death. Here is what he says:

To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with such an issue. And the next contest in this country is to be one between free trade and protection.

Did the hon. member (Mr. Davies) mean just the same kind of fight as they had in England? My hon. friend is still dubious, but for his information I had better read on:

That great issue——

What great issue, Sir? The word "that" is an important word there:

—That great issue, (the issue between free trade and protection,) was faced years ago by our fathers at home. Free trade won, and has ever since been the policy of Great Britain.

My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) smiles, but he does not deny his utterance. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is not alone, because the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) presented the same policy down by the sea, as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) presented in the convention, and also throughout the country. And now, Mr. Speaker, as to how other people understood it besides the Conservatives. How did my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) understand it? He did not misjudge his leader surely. He said "hear, hear," when I said "free trade" a few moments ago. He was pleased. His speech is found on page 53 of the convention report, a document issued officially by the Liberal party, and here is what the hon. gentleman from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) said:

Our leaders propose to follow the example of England in trade matters. You cannot find so good an example in all the world.

The hon. member (Mr. Gillmor) said that after he had heard the speeches.

England has fought many of the best battles in the world, but the best battle she ever fought was the battle of free trade. Free trade is good enough for me. Talk about conditions; conditions do not affect it at all.

And, Mr. Speaker, that announcement of the hon. member (Mr. Gillmor) was met by cheers on the part of the gentlemen who had come together for the purpose of making a policy for hon. gentlemen opposite to put before the country. Reading that resolution of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and reading those speeches, I ask any man in this House, or any man in this country, what could they possibly be understood to mean but the English system of tariff; the English system as it was explained by the leader of the Opposition? But what have we heard since? The narrow-gauge member from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has declared:

That what the people want is to be severely let alone.

That is the laissez faire system of England; that is the free trade system of England. He said further:

The Government is trying to fool the farmers when they tell them that protection on pork is any good for them. It is something that no intelligent and well-informed farmer will ever believe.

The member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) advocates the removal of beef duties and he wants free trade in beef. On page 1174 of "Hansard," he says:

The statement is made that farmers are protected. I deny that most emphatically.

The member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says:

It is audacity to say that the duties placed on agricultural products are of any value.

The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says:

I deny in toto that the farmer requires protection.

Again, he says:

I contend that the free and untrammelled admission of grains under the tariff of 1878 was in any degree detrimental to the agricultural interests.

Again, he says:

The importation of Indian corn was advantageous for Canada.

And I did not see the member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) cheer when he made that statement. And once more the member for North Norfolk says:

The duty on pork is absolutely useless.

Just here let me say this Government differs most emphatically with these gentlemen upon the question of agricultural protection. We say to the people of the United States: If you will give us your markets we will reciprocate, but we won't yield up ours without something in return. Every man in this House ought to stand by that policy. Look, Sir just at the pork protection upon which the member for North Norfolk said we got no advantage. In 1889, we discovered that American prices were so low that they could pay the small duty we had against them and come in here and undersell our farmers in their own market. We sent up the duty, Sir, and this table shows the results, both as to imports and exports, the exports being increased by reason of the industry being encouraged by the protection of the home market:

LARD, HAM, SHOULDER BACON AND PORK.

Imports—	Lbs.
1889	27,000,000
1891	14,000,000
1892	11,000,000
1893	4,000,000

Exports—	Lbs.
1889	4,000,000
1891	7,000,000
1892	12,000,000
1893	20,000,000

So much, Sir, as to the hon. gentleman's opinion upon pork. Now, Sir, reading these statements with the statements made previous to the resolution; reading these statements with the resolution passed, I want to ask the House what these gentlemen could expect us to understand their policy to be? Certainly the country understood it. Certainly every man in this House who applied a fair judgment to it, understood as the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) declared:

That their next fight would be upon the question of free trade and protection.

I wish now, Sir, to refer to a matter to which I have briefly alluded several times in my address. Who is to be the maker of the new tariff? Hon. gentlemen opposite may talk as to a half-way system, but who is to be the maker of the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite? Well, we have the announcement, and the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has given notice, that he is to be the Finance Minister when hon. gentlemen opposite get into power. He has made the statement a long while in advance, and so he is safe. But he is to be the Finance Minister when they come into power, and now I want to read into that resolution what the coming Finance Minister says as to his position on this question. At Ingersoll, he said this:

There are some people of the Liberal party who are there for their flesh-pots and their stock of cotton or some other stock, who did him the justice to believe that he would do what he promised, and that he would not be satisfied with half measures.

Once more, at Montreal, he (Sir Richard Cartwright) said:

There is no Canadian manufacturer who need be afraid to face the competition of the world. Our policy is death to protection.

You see, Sir, there is no mistaking what that means. And once more he says, with regard to the fight in the United States, and the defeat of the Democratic party there:

There are two lessons which I think the Reformers of Canada ought to learn. One is presented for our warning and example in the fate which has befallen the Democratic party in the United States. It shows to all who choose to read the signs of the times, that when a party is placed at the head of a great popular movement, if that party is half-hearted in the prosecution of its aim, it will be deservedly swept out of power by the very people who have sustained and advanced it.

And he says then:

When we get into power, there will be no half measures. We will destroy this policy, root and branch.

Now, Sir, in the light of all these announcements I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, what is this House to understand? They are to

understand one of two things: Either that hon. gentlemen opposite will destroy protection root and branch and go to free trade; or that they are misleading the people of this country. Let them take either horn of the dilemma that they like, because they certainly must except either one position or the other. No half measure; no half way-house; destructive root and branch is to be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; and I give notice to the men who have invested their money in the industries of this country, and to the toiling thousands who are supplying their wives and children with bread, that if ever these hon. gentlemen get into power, the hand of the spoiler will be up on them, and that spoiler will be the hon. member for South Oxford, the coming Finance Minister in any Liberal Government that may be formed. And now let me tell hon. gentlemen what is thought of their policy in trade circles. Here is what the "Trade Bulletin," of Montreal, of 15th February, 1895, says in substance, in the course of a long article:

> If it were not for the momentous consequences that we fear hang upon the reversal of our present trade policy at this juncture, we would unhesitatingly advocate a change of Government, as too long tenure of office often leads to an abuse of power. The commercial life of a nation is passing through a critical period, and it should be remembered that any radical change in our fiscal system might result in upheavals as disastrous as those which have occurred in Australia and the Argentine Republic, and which have shook the United States to its foundation. The introduction of a policy based on the broad lines of British free trade would be a fatal mistake, and might hurl us into a commercial pitfall from which it would take us years to emerge. It is too well known that if our protective barricade, which insures a home market for our manufactures, were removed, or even lowered to any great extent, the Americans would at once monopolize the home trade.

I have now given the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite; I have given the interpretation of their policy by their own friends; I have given its interpretation by independent trade journals; and I say to them that they are either on the broad lines of free trade, or else they have been humbugging the people of this country—humbugging some classes by a cry of free trade and humbug others by other means—sending circulars around possibly to the manufacturers and others who have invested their capital, telling them that they need not be afraid. But the hon. member for South Oxford will control, and he says there will be no half measures when he gets into power.

An hon. MEMBER. When?

Mr. MONTAGUE. When? Early in the next century, some time, it is said, but certainly not in this. Now, I want to say a word or two about my hon. friend's growing funny at my expense in connection with protection in Great Britain. I am delighted to have caused the hon. member for South Oxford a smile. He has been fishing so long with such a melancholy bait, and with such disastrous bad fortune, that the smile that was said to have been a German silver smile, which he wore in days gone by, has gradually changed into that bluish hue with which artists have always painted that space that lies between abandoned hope and absolute despair. Well, Sir, I am glad to cause even a smile at my own expense, and I do not begrudge him the pleasure. What did I say in the country? I said this, that England, after four or five centuries of protection, took down her barriers and bade defiance to the world. That is what I said, and the hon. gentleman proceeded to prove it. The hon. gentleman read a Tariff Act passed in England some hundreds of years ago; and his only answer to my assertion that the only country which had adopted the policy he had been advocating had done so only after centuries of protection, was to cause this House to smile at the absurd wording of that Tariff Act. Some of the hon. gentleman's newspapers alleged that I had not told the truth when I said that England had been a protective country for centuries; and I am here now to say to my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who paid me great attention in connection with this subject in the country, that I did not state one word that was untrue. I said that the woollen industry, the cotton industry, the iron industry, and every other great industry of England had been built up under a system of protection; and I now say, further, that no country has ever grown great that has not grown great by protection. Do hon. gentlemen deny it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) smiles and denies. Why, Sir, it is the statement of my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk, made in 1878. I am quoting it literally. These gentlemen are like the old ballad, "The Hunting of the Snark." You remember the story. When the butcher and the beaver did not agree very well, the butcher contrived to make a separate sally; but in a short time he found himself alongside the beaver again. Then the ballad continues:

> Neither betrayed by a word or a look
> The disgust that appeared in his face,
> But the valley grew narrow and narrower still,
> And the evening grew darker and colder;
> Until from sheer nervousness, not from good will,
> They marched along, shoulder to shoulder.

Now, the statement has been made, and it has been made constantly in this debate,

that England was brought to the verge of ruin by protection.

Mr. GILLMOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend says, "hear, hear." I was sure my hon. friend would say that, and he has had evidence of it from the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. Here is a work of a free trade historian who was patronized by John Bright, and who wrote his books at the bidding of the Cobden Club. Here is what this author, Augustus Mongredien, says on page 133 of his book :

> This adoption of free trade principles was not the result of pressure from adverse circumstances. The country was flourishing, trade was prosperous, the revenue showed a surplus, railways were being constructed with unexampled rapidity, the working classes were fully and remuneratively employed, the imperial average of wheat for the week ending June 28th was 47s. 11d. per quarter, and bread was cheaper than it had been for many years. The prevailing convergence towards free trade principles simply proceeded from a conscientious recognition of economic truths.

My hon. friend smiles. No doubt he has read it. My hon. friend states that he is above the authority of the historians of the Cobden Club ; but I prefer to take their opinion, even to that of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), or that of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Langelier).

Mr. GILLMOR. He says it was an immoral practice.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, I am not dealing with morals or with immorality. That is not in my department ; it belongs to the department of the hon. member for North Norfolk. What I stated was this, that England grew prosperous by protection, and I have proven it out of the mouth of a free-trade Cobden Club historian who, I think, will be accepted by this House. I have quoted him for this reason, that when I made some such statement in the country, the Toronto "Globe," whose representative is here, said that I had misquoted Mongredien ; and if the "Globe" reporter wants this copy of the book, he can have it in order that he may retract that misstatement of his paper. I quote it because I wish to say to this House and to the country that neither in this House nor on a public platform have I ever stated what I believed to be untrue, or stated a fact as to which I had not made all the inquiries in my power to substantiate its truth. Now, what has been the history of England on the trade question ? Why did she adopt free trade ?

Mr. LAURIER. What is the title ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Here it is, I will pass it over—History of the free trade movement in England, by Augustus Mongredien.

Mr. GIBSON. What about the proclamation to the Indians ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hon gentlemen opposite are in a bad way. Now, I want to discuss why England adopted free trade and what her previous policy was. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that Mr. Cobden made a prophecy. What was the prophecy ? It was that in ten years every country under the sun would adopt the same method and the same tariff. That is why England adopted free trade—largely to get the markets of the world. Did she get them ? Just let me give the hon. gentleman some examples. The duty levied against Manchester goods by the French in 1860, was 12½ per cent ; in 1882, it rose to 16 per cent ; and in 1882, it was 42 per cent. The duty in France on Leeds goods in 1860 was 10 per cent ; in 1882, 32 per cent : and in 1892, 50½ per cent, in other words, France is a sample of just what the nations of the world are doing, namely, shutting their markets to England. And England, as I shall show from English resolutions and from the English "Hansard," is beginning very severely to feel that effect herself. She had enjoyed protection for 400 years. The hon. member for South Oxford taunted me with having gone back 400 years and he said, that is the spirit which dictates the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I want to show that the spirit of modern times is the same and a good deal stronger than was the spirit then. Austria adopted protection in 1879 ; Russia increased her tariff in 1877 and 1881. Germany put up hers higher in 1879 ; France increased her tariff in 1882 for purely protective purposes ; Spain did the same in 1887 and 1888 ; Greece adopted a high protective tariff in 1889 ; Switzerland took the same course in the same year. Sweden and Norway also followed suit, and Italy began protection to her agriculture last year—and so on through the whole list of European countries. What I want to show to the hon. gentlemen and the people of this country is that the policy which the Opposition propound is one which every other country has rejected, and I put this question to the people. There are two teachers before them. The one is the teacher of history and experience, cool, calm and unbiassed, that gives its warning. The other teacher is hon. gentlemen opposite who are anxious to get into power—for the public good, they say themselves—for the pleasure and profits of office, we know very well from their history. I ask the people of this country : Are they going to accept the teaching of history and experience ? or are they going to accept the teaching of hon. gentlemen opposite, who in five years have adopted five policies, and each time declared that the policy they then adopted was the true and only policy for the redemption and salvation of Canada ? Just a word or two with regard to the United States. I remem-

ber saying in 1893, in this House, that the United States had not adopted free trade, that they would not very materially reduce their tariff, and that if their Government did so, the Democratic party would be defeated and turned out of power. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shook their heads and smiled an incredulous smile, and said: You do not know anything about it. We are now in the course of the year 1895, and events have proved that I was right.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, the Democratic party were not defeated in the United States and the tariff reform did not get a death blow in the United States! Surely the hon. gentleman does not assert that?

Mr. LAURIER. Tariff reform and the Democratic party are two things.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend says that tariff reform and the Democratic party are two things. So also, Sir, honest tariff reform and hon. gentlemen opposite are two things. The Democratic party in the United States have pursued just about the same policy of turning and twisting on the trade question as hon. gentlemen opposite have, and the fate of the Democratic party in the United States will be the fate of hon. gentlemen opposite in the coming campaign. What caused the defeat of the Democratic party in the United States? The hon. member for South Oxford declares that they did not go half far enough, and that was the reason they were defeated, and he proposed to go still further in this country. Just a word or two concerning the condition of England; and I do this because of the constant reference which has been made to the glowing condition of England by hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken from time to time. I have here,—and I must here pay the highest compliment to my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) who discussed this question so thoroughly—a report to show just the condition of agriculture in England at present. The commissioners appointed to inquire into the agricultural depression have obtained reliable data, and in their report of 15th March, 1895, they state as follows:—

The gross value of land in the United Kingdom has fallen in the last thirteen years by £13,400,000 and rents have been reduced from 5 to 75 per cent.

The wheat crop, which averaged £31,000,000 from 1870 to 1875, has fallen in 1894 to £7,600,000.

Every kind of crops in regard to which the English farmers looked for profit, has fallen in price.

And the "Field," an agricultural journal, says:

Last year we imported agricultural products to the value of £142,000,000, £18,000,000 of which could have been raised upon the fields of Great Britain, had foreign competition not been allowed to prevail.

Here is a message sent to Canada by a gentleman from the county of Simcoe, and who has written to the Orillia "Packet." Here is what that gentleman says:

Things are bad in England among the farmers. Everything comes from abroad. Cassells are even now issuing a book printed in Holland. The Bibles from the Oxford press have a little note to show that they were printed in Germany. However well free trade may sound in theory, practically it is a failure, and I sincerely trust that Canada will never adopt it. England gets her eggs from Holland, her butter from Denmark, her cheese from America, and her beef and mutton from Australia. In the meantime the Essex farmers are going through the Bankruptcy Courts at the rate of 300 a year.

Just one word more. An agricultural society in England recently passed a resolution. What was that resolution? It was that the difficulty with English farmers was that no matter how bad the harvest, they never had a good market or increased prices. That contains a lesson for us. We have had a high protective duty on wheat. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that it never did us any good. The time has come now when the National Policy is doing us good now on wheat.

Mr. CHARLTON. Why?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Because it is 15 cents lower in the United States than it is in Canada, and because we have a high tariff against the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: But there is a corner in wheat. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have taken pains to find out what this duty means now to the Canadian farmers. I have wired to various sections——

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no wheat in the farmer's hands.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is always wrong, I am afraid. If he had allowed me to show that circular before he asked for it, he would have saved himself some confusion, and if he had allowed me to read telegrams from men whose opinions he will not dispute, he would have saved himself some confusion and some regret. I have telegrams from every section, the facts concerning which I read. I will pass them over to the hon. gentleman if he wishes, and I think he will accept as conclusive the one I shall read at the end. At Seaforth, my informant tells me, 4,000 bushels of wheat have been marketed at the higher price, and 15,000 bushels are still held by the farmers. In St. Mary's, according to my informant, 5,000 bushels have been marketed at the higher price, and 20,000 bushels are still held. At Dunnville, 5,000 bushels sold, and 40,000 bushels still held. At Brampton, 2,500 sold, and 20,000 bushels

are to be found in half the county. At Mitchell, 1,000 bushels sold, and 20,000 bushels held by the farmers. At Lucan, only 500 bushels sold, but 25,000 bushels still held by the farmers. At Hagersville, 5,000 bushels sold, within the last month, and 15,000 still held. At Exeter, 10,000 bushels sold, and some farmers, my informant says, are holding from 300 to 800 bushels, many thousands of bushels being held in the township, and many farmers around this village are holding two and three years' crops. The unfortunate down-trodden farmers whom my hon. friend has been talking about have been able to hold three years' crops of wheat. Now, this is the report from Mr. W. W. Ogilvie, of Montreal, who knows, perhaps, just as much about the wheat question as my hon. friend from North Norfolk. By telegram, dated 27th May, Mr. Ogilvie writes:

Late reports show that from a million and a half to two million bushels wheat are still held by farmers in Ontario. As usual in cases like the present, they are holding for still higher prices. Some districts in Manitoba are delivering freely at present prices.

There is the telegram of Mr. Ogilvie, of Montreal, who knows his business. What does that mean? Let us take his lowest estimate of a million and a half bushels of wheat held by the farmers of Ontario. According to the "Globe" newspaper of 24th May, they are getting from 14 to 15 cents more than they are getting in corresponding towns in the United States. Multiply 1,500,000 by 14 cents, and you have $210,000 given to the farmers of the province of Ontario by the National Policy, on wheat alone. My hon. friend from Charlottetown (Mr. Davies) smiles at that. He does not like it. These are facts he does not like and he never will like; but the farmers like them, and the farmers to-day are thanking their stars that they did not take down the bars and allow American wheat in free as the hon. gentlemen did in 1878, and yet what is the policy of hon. gentlemen? It is this Let us take off the farmers protection! Let us import foreign grain and foreign meats, and destroy our home market. Sir, we are against that from start to finish unless we can get other markets in return.

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

After Recess.

NOVA SCOTIA STEEL COMPANY.

Mr. FRASER moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 56) to amend the Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).

Mr. DENISON. This Bill is one in which the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is very much interested, and I think it was understood that it should stand over until after his return. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow it to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes: I think that was the understanding.

Motion withdrawn.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the St. John River Bridge Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Hamilton Distillery Company (Limited).—(Mr. McKay.)

CAMP HARMONY ANGLING CLUB.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Camp Harmony Angling Club.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

On section 6.

(In the Committee.)

On section 6.

Mr. TISDALE. I think this clause should be amended. As passed by the committee, it would enable this club to buy up all the fishing rights and fishing streams in the two provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec. I think there should be some limit to the counties or streams, in order that the clause may not cover both provinces.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with the view of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and I think that probably this clause might establish a bad precedent, although I do not think in this case there is any danger of the club exceeding the powers that Parliament means to give them. I think that all the club requires under the Act could be given if the clause were modified as proposed; and to that end, I have prepared the following amendment as a substitute to the first part of the clause:—

6. The club may from time to time acquire and hold, by purchase, lease, license or otherwise, such lands, riparian rights, fishing rights (including lands, riparian rights, leasehold and other interests in fishing rights owned by all or any of the said petitioners) on the Restigouche and Upsalquitch rivers and their tributaries, in the county of Restigouche, in the province of New Brunswick, and in the counties of Bonaventure and Rimouski, in the province of Quebec, as is deemed advisable by the club.

As the committee will see, that clause limits the operations of the club to these three counties, instead of the two provinces, as in the Bill now drawn.

Mr. McALISTER. I do not see any necessity of putting in a clause providing that the Government shall not be responsible for the guardianship or protection of the river.

As it is now, they are not responsible in any way, and the guardians are put on and kept on by the anglers and by the club. While I do not think the clause is objectionable in one respect, yet it may look as a reflection upon the parties asking for incorporation, and as if the Government wished to shirk all responsibility. I do not think that clause should be inserted.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether, in the absence of that clause, any responsibility whatever could devolve upon the Crown.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is to prevent any responsibility being thrown upon the Government. The clause can do no harm, and it may do good.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it can do harm to the Government in this way, that if in a Bill like this we begin by saying that the Government is not to be responsible, the omission of such a clause in a subsequent Bill may justify the opposite conclusion. It is clear that the Crown is not in the slightest degree responsible for the guardianship of the river at the present moment. The words are so much surplusage, and whoever is interested in the Bill, can have no objections to their being there, because they do not accomplish anything; but I think it is a very unwise precedent to adopt. The absence of such a provision in any subsequent measure may be the foundation for a conclusion establishing responsibility.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Red Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

Bill No. 95) to incorporate the Grand Falls Water-Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have already occupied so much time that I propose to reduce what I have to say to the briefest possible space. Before you left the Chair, Sir, I was speaking upon the question of the effect of the protective tariff on the price of wheat. Since you left the Chair, I have had placed in my hands further evidence of the truth I then asserted. The prices, I am told, at Gretna, Manitoba, on May 20th, were from 72 cents to 74 cents per bushel, while at Niche, North Dakota, the price was only 60 cents, the one point being only a short distance across the border from the other, this showing that the same effect has been attained in Manitoba as has been secured in the province of Ontario. I am still further able to inform the House that an hon. gentleman sitting opposite to me sold only a few days ago something like 3,500 bushels of wheat at Fort William for $1.00 per bushel, while the price at Duluth was only 81½ cents on the same date. I had, Mr. Speaker, before the House rose for dinner stated what my view was with respect to the adoption by England of a free trade policy. I have shown, I think, to the satisfaction of the House that the effort of Great Britain and the hope of Great Britain was to secure other markets abroad, thinking that other countries would follow her own example. I showed also that Britain was disappointed in that hope, that instead of her securing other markets, those other markets were being closed still more against her as the years went by. I have now to say in reference to what some hon. gentlemen have urged on the other side of the House, that no farmer can be found in Great Britain who is not a protectionist so far as his industry in concerned; and I have still further to say that the policy of free trade was carried in Great Britain, not by the votes of farmers, but by the very strongest support of manufacturers, who contributed large campaign funds to the Cobden Club and carried it in spite of the agricultural population of that country. I have still further to say that every protectionist fight that has been won in the countries of the world has been won largely by the influence of the farmers. And I have not to go abroad, nor have I to bring any evidence that will be disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite, for in 1878 the protective tariff fight was won by the farmers of this country who not only wanted their home market for themselves, but who had the broad and proper idea that the creation of a varied industry extended the home market and gave them a better opportunity to sell their products. I have not to go outside the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite for evidence of what I have said, because in a speech recently delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he admitted that the defeat of the Liberal party in 1878 was aided by the votes of 30,000 Liberal farmers who left the Liberal ranks to join the Conservatives in putting these gentlemen out of office. And why? Because they had refused to keep the home

market for the Canadian farmer. Some of my hon. friends smile at that. Well, I suppose they put no faith whatever in the statement of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I am quoting him literally. Now, Sir, not only has England failed in regard to securing the markets of other countries, but England is to-day—and I say it in the light of evidence which I have in my possession—England is to-day in many respects growing very weary of the policy which was adopted then; and not only that, but as I shall prove to this House, to the absolute satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite. England in the very highest places is beginning to reverse the policy of free trade which she adopted some years ago. Sir, I thought no truer word was ever spoken than was spoken by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other day when he declared to this House that England was the slaughter market for creation. No people have appreciated that fact better than the capitalists, and the artisans, and the agriculturists of that country. English boards of trade, trades unions, consuls abroad, agricultural societies, as I can prove by the evidence of the official debates in the English House of Commons, are now moving in the direction of a defensive tariff, and the English Parliament itself has practically, in one sense, abandoned the free trade policy and adopted in one respect a protective policy. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) dissents, but I will prove to my hon. friend that I am absolutely right. I suppose he (Mr. Mills) will not controvert me in this statement: That the ideal policy that England had in view was, that the cheaper she could buy the products for her people, no matter where they came from, the better it was. That was the ideal policy in Great Britain, and I can show the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), that they have abandoned that policy only very recently in the House of Commons in England. Just a word or so, Mr. Speaker, as to some of the industries of Great Britain. First, as regards the iron industry. Ryland's Iron Circular, which is the official voice of the English trade, on 22nd September, 1894, contained the following:—

For a number of years past very serious apprehensions have been aroused by the circumstances of the iron industry in the United Kingdom, more especially in view of the progress made by competitive countries. In commercial circles it is now quite a common thing to hear our iron industries spoken of as a manufacture that has ceased to make progress and is doomed to gradual decay. An examination of the returns for some years past appears to confirm this view.

It says further:

The summary of the situation is that there reigneth hand-to-mouth buying, keen foreign and home competition. This applies as well to iron as steel. The export trade of bars, sheets and wires has gone to the continent, so much that more than one prominent iron merchant is contemplating the establishment of a foreign office for facilitating the buying of continental iron.

A late annual report of the secretary of the British Iron Trade Association, says:

The iron trade has for several years been having a bad time of it in this country, as various foreign countries are now our active competitors in it. As a sign of the times, and an illustration how continental countries are now competing with us in the one article of iron alone, I may state that the Great Central Railway station at Birmingham, the very centre of the British iron trade, which is one of the largest—if not the largest—in England, had recently been constructed exclusively of Belgian iron.

I commend this sign of the times to gentlemen who say that workingmen are rushing to England looking for work. A Belgian firm was doing work in England while thousands of English workingmen were standing idle looking at them, and as a result of this, English iron being driven out of English markets, what has come? Sir, blackened blast furnaces, silent mills and idle employees by the thousands. Sir, I have here Ryland's Circular for 1894. In the one of the numbers, 22nd December, 1894, you have an article upon the decline of the iron trade. It is called "In memorium." And it tells a sad and disheartening tale. Let me quote its words:

The summary of our list shows that there are about 406 blast furnaces standing idle, that will never be put into blast again, and 126 finished iron works that will probably never be worked again.

And, Sir, why is this? Let the London "Iron and Coal Trade Review" make answer:

We have pointed out that the threat of successful competition in netural markets on the part of the United States is not a mere bogie; it has become a stern reality. It was shown at a recent meeting of the Middlesboro' Chamber of Commerce by Sir Edmund Head in unmistakable terms that in Alabama iron is produced and sold at about five shillings per ton less than it costs at Cleveland, the cheapest centre of the pig iron industry in this country.

And here let me give you some figures to show how the manufacture of iron, once monopolized by England, has gone to other lands. The following table shows how England is being met with competition abroad:

TONS OF IRON PRODUCED.

	1856.	1886.	1893.
Great Britain.....	3,586,387	6,870,665	6,977,000
Germany	363,881	3,339,863	4,937,461
United States.....	883,137	5,684,543	9,157,000

England doubles her production since 1856; the United States multiplies hers by 11, and Germany hers by 12, during the same period. The "London Iron and Trades Journal" recently said:

If iron manufacturers and steel producers have been carefully watching the course of the English and foreign markets during the last few months, the figures that have come under their eyes must have caused them not a little astonishment and anxiety as to the future. The enemy is again at our gates in the form of foreign competition, but it is not this time either Germany, or Belgium, or France with whom we have to reckon, but our most protected kinsmen in the United States.

I shall quote here from a recent speech made by Mr. Lowther, M.P., in the House of Commons of England, upon this very subject, as reported in the English "Hansard" of March 15, 1895 :

They were always told that the idea of any country in the world being able to compete with the United Kingdom was absurd. The President of the Board of Trade was aware that at this moment the pig iron manufacture of the Southern States of America, Alabama, was being landed at Glasgow at a price lower than that at which it could be produced at a profit in the great iron-producing centres of the United Kingdom.

Sir, what are the facts shown by the English "Hansard," which I have here. Recently, the Chambers of Commerce, of Sheffield, of Birmingham, of Bolton, of Bristol, of Cardiff, of Newcastle, of Stockton, of North Staffordshire, and other great manufacturing places, have all passed resolutions showing that the depression in this great trade was on account of two facts : first, that the home market was consumed by foreign products, and second, that the foreign markets have not been opened to English productions. Now, Sir, let us see for a moment as to another great industry. Take the sugar industry of England. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that the sugar industry of England is prosperous ? Is there a gentleman there who will state that ? Let me tell them that Germany has become the greatest competitor of England, not only in her own markets, but in the markets of the world as well. In 1836, Germany began to give bounties, and that year the production was 141 tons of sugar, while in 1893, Germany produced 1,745,137 tons. And what has England been doing ? In 1893 she took no less than $50,000,000 worth of sugar from Germany, while Germany brought not one single pound of sugar from Great Britain. And what has been the result ? Here is the result to be seen in the Liverpool "Courier" of a recent date :

Another well-known Liverpool house has resolved upon the stoppage of their works. Messrs. Jas. Leitch & Co., 10 Dale Street, and with a refinery on Blackstock Street, have determined upon this serious step in consequence of the condition of circumstances which prevent the manufacture of cane being a profitable business. The closing of their refinery means, at any rate, that 200 men, many married and with families to support, will be added to the already too large army of the Liverpool unemployed. This firm has been in existence for about fifty years.

Mr. Gladstone's consolation that more sweets are now manufactured in this country is no salve to the hundreds and thousands who have been deprived of their livelihood in a war of which all the glory falls to the peddling philosopher and political schemer, and all the profits to the bounty-maintained foreigner or the speculator who are to be found preying upon the disasters of commmerce.

The closure of the refineries or Messrs. Heap, Jaeger Bros. has now been followed by the stoppage of Messrs. Leitch & Co.'s works. Outside Liverpool the results are worse. Bristol has practically ceased to refine, there are only a few Clyde refineries continuing the struggle, and the London sugar refineries will certainly not boast of being prosperous, the well-known firm of Martineau having stopped their works temporarily.

My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) wants to apply the same policy to Canada, because the sugar industry is one of the industries in which the hon. gentleman has the knife up to the hilt, and when he spoke in Montreal he said : Let the people of Canada buy their sugar abroad like the people of England do, and let the refiners put their sugars into jams and make jams instead of supplying Canada with sugar. Does any one want such a policy here, yet that is the policy which hon. gentlemen propose. Now, Sir, just a word or two as to the general trade of Great Britain. We find that Germany is gaining ten to one on Great Britain in the markets of the world in the supply of manufactured articles. The hon. gentleman will find that statement in the report of the English consul resident last year at Berlin, and here is what Sir Lothian Bell said the other day to his association :

Cottons, woollens, rails, machinery will be produced as heretofore, and in overflowing measure : they may be produced even by Englishmen, or by men of English race, as now ; but they will be produced by them, not in Lancashire, Staffordshire, Lanarkshire or Yorkshire, but on the banks of the Ohio, at the foot of the Alleghany, or it may be in even more distant quarters still.

We find also that England is losing the trade of India, and it is going where ? To protected countries. She has lost her markets in other countries, and her colonies largely as well. Now, Sir, is all this being suffered meekly by the British people without a murmur ? By no means, Sir. If my hon. friends will consult the English "Hansard" of 27th February, 1895, they will find that in the House of Commons the statement was made by one of the most prominent members of that House that already twelve hundred million dollars of British capital has been driven to investment in foreign countries, and what is the reason ? My hon. friend smiles too soon again. The reason, as given in the Parliament of Great Britain, is that it has gone abroad to get beyond the reach of hostile tariffs, because it cannot be invested in England to supply those foreign countries with the products. Now, Sir, is Parliament sleeping ? My hon. friend smiled when I said that the Parliament of England had taken this matter into their own hands. Let me re-state the principle, which I declared was the principle of absolute

free trade, namely, that the cheaper the people can buy the manufactured product, the better for the people. Let us see how England regards that. In the English House of Commons, on the 19th February, 1895, a resolution was passed, and passed unanimously, which was in fact a protection resolution. Man after man was challenged to say a word against it, and did not do so. That resolution—and mark its wording—was as follows :—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is incumbent upon Her Majesty's Government, in the interests of the industrial classes of the United Kingdom, to restrict the importation of goods made in foreign prisons by the forced labour of convicts and felons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friends smile ; but what difference does it make where the goods are made, so long as the people get them cheap ? My hon. friend says that had nothing to do with the question of free trade or protection. Let me tell him what a great member of the British House of Commons said with regard to that question, and then we shall see at whom he was sneering when he said it did not mean protection. Here is what Mr. Joseph Chamberlain said :

He (the President of the Board of Trade) does not come to the consideration of this question biassed in any way by those eternal principles which were laid down the other day by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and which teach us that the lower the price of commodities the better it is for the nation. He has flung aside these proposals as though they were the proposals of belated philosophers.

Speaking thus of the speech of the president of the English Board of Trade, who supported that resolution, on which there was a discussion occupying 44 columns of "Hansard," and not a single man to be found to raise his voice against it. What was the reason of that ? The reason was that the brush industry of England has been ruined by the competition of foreign prison-made goods coming from Germany. What matters it whether the goods are made in prison or anywhere else, so far as the principle is concerned ? The brushes were good, the prices were low. Then why are they to be shut out of England ? Because their importation has ruined the British brush industry and left British brushmakers without labour. If that is not protecion, Sir, I do not know what is. England has begun in that resolution the protection of her own industrial classes. Not only that, but let me tell hon. gentlemen that Mr. Chamberlain, speaking recently on the question which hon. gentlemen say is dead in Great Britain, declared :

I am inclined to think that in our staple trades —for instance, in the coal trade, in the iron trade, in the cotton trade, and, above all, in the greatest of all our trades, the trade of agriculture—the margin of profit has entirely disappeared. Up to the present time wages have not fallen at all in proportion, but if the present state of things continues it is simply inevitable either that wages will have to be considerably reduced or that works will be closed, land will lie idle, and the numbers of the unemployed will be largely increased. * * * I find that there are a number of people, and I think an increasing number, who under the present conditions of trade are coming to the conclusion that our free trade policy has been a failure, and who would therefore be ready to go back in the direction of protection.

When she opened her markets to the world, she had a monopoly of two things. First, of the world's markets, and second, of skilled labour and the most improved machinery. The time has come when she has lost both monopolies, and not only that but her markets at home largely. Not many years hence, we may look for a reversal to some considerable extent at least, of her policy of trade. That is my conviction, and it is borne out by the signs of the times. Now, Sir, I want to speak for a few moments as to the result of the elections recently held in the United States, and to draw a comparison between that country and Canada in regard to the recent depression. While the depression was wide-spread, there can be no doubt that the depression in the United States was intensified and multiplied a hundredfold by the uncertainty which existed in regard to the tariff of that country. That is certainly in accordance with hon. gentlemen's knowledge ; they know it as well as I know it. The very first scare was that the protective policy would be entirely destroyed. Capital ceased to be invested ; the product of the factories began to be shortened ; labour was lessened also—people were thrown out of employment and their families out of bread. The second cause of that depression was that there was a largely increased importation in consequence of the tariff reductions which were made. Though they were nothing so radical as the hon. gentleman from South Oxford professes here, these importations lessened the employment of home labour, of course. Let us take an extract from the Dublin "Evening Telegram" of February 2nd, 1894, when the tariff Bill was going through United States Senate. It spoke as follows :—

There is at present going through the United States Senate a measure which ought to be of vast importance to Irish industries, especially to the woollen and linen industry of this country. The time to take the field is not after the new tariff has been in operation for some time, but on the day it comes into operation.

And, suiting the action to the word, in the city of New York on the day the tariff went into operation 1,908,274 pounds of English and Irish woollen cloth and 7,822,829 square yards of dress goods were waiting to be entered at the customs house of New York to compete with the product of the labouring people of the United States themselves, while from September, 1893, to 1st March, 1894, there were imported into the United States,

of manufactured woollens, cottons, silks, flax and hemp goods, $44,000,000 worth from Great Britain. Under the changed tariff, from September, 1894, to March, 1895, there was imported $78,000,000 worth, the labour in the making of which was taken away from the American people and given to British people. That was good for the British people, but it was bad for the people of the United States. And, Sir, that would be just the result of the destruction of our tariff here, as hon. gentlemen know very well. They know that the reductions which were made in the United States tariff did not bring it down to the present height of our tariff; they know that the United States tariff is still higher than ours; and yet the hon. member for South Oxford declares that they did not go half far enough and that when he gets into power there will be no half measures. Now, as to the depression which existed in this country between 1874 and 1878, had the importation of foreign goods anything to do with it? I think I shall be able to prove that the importation of foreign goods had something to do with it. What evidence do hon. gentlemen opposite want? Surely nothing better than the hon. gentlemen themselves. I can produce here the speech of my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), saying that there was disastrous competition from the United States; the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, saying that there was competition and that it ought to be done away with; the speech of Mr. Jones, of Halifax, saying that our sugar refiners were being ruined and praying to Heaven and the Finance Minister to do something for those sugar refiners when he refused the clamour, as my hon. friend from Queen's would say, for aid to our industries. I will prove it not only by these gentlemen but by the official circular issued by Mr. Burpee, then Minister of Customs, who advised his collectors all over the country that American goods were being imported, at slaughter prices in our markets, and that they had better look out sharply for the value of goods as they came in. If that is not sufficient, I have the report of the American counsul at Toronto, in 1877, who, writing to his home Government, said in effect: We have accomplished it at last; we have killed the industries of Ontario. Your export of goods is growing from year to year, and we have fixed the Canadian industries so that they never shall revive again. Is not this an evidence that the importation of these goods had something to do with regard to the depression which then existed? I want to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as explained at present, is a policy which gets nothing and gives everything. Unrestricted reciprocity had its faults, and they were great and serious; but under unrestricted reciprocity, though we gave everything to the United States we got something, however small it might have been, in return. But to-day if you follow out the policy pronounced upon favourably by hon. gentlemen opposite, we give everything to every country in the world and we get nothing from any country in return. As to the question of depression, have we felt the depression of these last few years to anything like the same extent as we felt the depression from 1874 to 1878? Why one financial paper says that Canada stands as a chimney in a burnt factory compared with other countries of the world, and the London "Financial New," says that Canada seems to be the only country doing well in these times of distress, speaking of the way in which Canada weathered the storm. The "Canadian Journal of Commerce," speaking on the same subject, says:

> The manfacturers there (in the United States) have stocks on hand which are unsaleable. They are in great need of ready cash, and if Canada's market were now unprotected, there would be such an influx of American goods as would drown out the industries of this country like one burst from a reservoir. The calamity would bring the manufacturers of Canada into a worse financial and industrial plight than that in which the Americans are. The tariff, with all its faults, is demonstrating at this time more than it has ever done the value and the necessity of guarding our industries from slaughtering operations.

That is the opinion of the commercial world voiced by the mouthpiece of commercial institutions, which treats of commercial matters free from any political bias. Now, I have a word to say as to the temper into which the hon. member for South Oxford worked himself over the free list. Ice was free, he said, and leeches were free. I only stop to ask this House whether it is worthy of any public man pretending to have statesmanlike views, to enter into such pettifogging criticism at a time when his utterances on the policy of his party are being looked to with great interest, and when people look to him instead to propound a policy which would be of some utility to the country. As to the free list, the hon. gentleman said that it contained only three articles which went into general consumption, and that everything else was for the purpose of aiding the manufacturers. Well, I have no hesitation in saying that the policy of the Government is a policy of free raw materials as much as possible, for the manufacturing industries of Canada, because such a policy must result in giving cheaper goods to the consumers and at the same time give employment to Canadians engaged in the manufactures into which these raw materials enter, and by giving employment to them an enlarged home market to the agriculturists. The hon. gentleman has found fault with our tariff as regards raw materials, but what was the policy of

the hon. gentleman himself, in 1873, when in power? He found a few things on the free list for the benefit of the manufacturing interests and he put his knife in to them at once. He added nothing to the free list, but the first act of the hon. gentleman was by Chap. 6, Victoria 37, 1874, to put 10 per cent on each of the following articles, which were on the free list, under his predecessor, in order to destroy, if possible, the industries of the country :—

Cotton netting for rubber shoes.
Cotton warp.
Plush for hatters' use.
Felt for hats and boots.
Prunella.
Silk twist for sewing hats and boots.
Machinery for mills and factories, not made in Canada.

Has the hon. gentleman's policy changed? We will now come to the titular leader of the Opposition, who made a speech in Winnipeg a short time ago. He said this :

We shall attempt to get this money which will be lost, if we take off some of the present taxation, and to make up the deficit which will arise, it will be necessary to get an addition from some other sources. This will be attempted to be done in this manner : in the first place, there will be a difference made in the present tax imposed upon raw material which is to be used for manufacturing articles.

Did the hon. gentleman mean that as a tax upon raw material? If I understand the English language that is what he meant, and although the Toronto "Globe" has been apologizing ever since, the hon. gentleman has never yet taken it back, so that his policy remains at that at present. Not only did hon. gentlemen opposite thus tax these small articles, but they put 50 per cent upon raw sugar, 40 per cent on refined, and the result was that every refinery in Canada was closed notwithstanding the protests of Mr. Jones, of Halifax, and other Liberals interested, and we were consuming foreign sugar, while our own people were idle. Another fallacy to which I want to call the attention of the House is the charge by the hon. member for South Oxford that because he had taken off some taxes and declared that by so doing he had received the burdens of the people that therefore the Finance Minister admitted that the National Policy was a tax on the people. Was ever assertion more ridiculous? What kind of taxes has the Finance Minister taken off? In the first place, we admit that a tax on raw material is always a tax which the people have to pay. The Finance Minister, first of all, took the tax off raw sugar ; then he took the duty off tea, and then the duty off coffee ; then the bill stamps law was done away with as well as the newspaper postage which was a direct tax to almost every family, and if the hon. member for South Oxford will add these various items up he will find that we have taken some ten million dollars off in these very items, not to mention the reductions made last year at all. The assertion, therefore, that because the Finance Minister reduced the taxes and claimed credit for it, he admitted that this tariff policy was a policy of taxation of the people, is an assertion so utterly absurd as scarcely to require refutation. In all their changes of policy, Sir, I am bound to admit there has been one idea common to all the schemes and that idea has been to destroy the industries of the country. If anything were ever wanting to show that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is absolutely to destroy the industries of Canada, that want was supplied by the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford as well as the speeches of the hon. gentleman who succeeded him. For, from beginning to end, it was an attack upon the industries of Canada. I have here, Sir, the campaign book of the Liberal party.

An hon. MEMBER. The new one?

Mr. MONTAGUE. A new one, yes. It says that the Liberal party lives upon the decay of principles that are opposed to it ; and it says, further, that the Liberal party is a party whose leaves are ever green. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, that sort of description applied to my hon. friend from South Oxford, a gentleman whose leaves of hope are ever green. But the Liberal party not only lives upon the principles that are opposed to it, but if I am not mistaken, the only way in which it wishes to live is by the decay of the industries of the country ; for nothing gives the hon. gentlemen greater pleasure than to find a vacant shop or a silent factory. They rejoice over an individual being out of work as if they had even returned to power itself. Now, just to show how anxious hon. gentlemen are that our industries should not prosper, I want to say a few words, which I may address to the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman went down to Montreal and made a speech there, telling the people of Montreal : You have increased in population from 1881 to 1891 by 39 per cent, while from 1871 to 1881 you increased 31 per cent —a miserable 8 per cent improvement under this great National Policy. But the hon. gentleman forgot to include a part of the county of Hochelaga, into which the city of Montreal has grown by her artisans taking up their residence there. Instead of the miserable increase of which the hon. gentleman spoke, he should have given an increase of 102,000 between 1881 and 1891, as against an increase of 62,000 between 1871 and 1881. But, Sir, after the hon. gentleman had spoken in Montreal, and told them there that the National Policy was doing them no good, he went to Winnipeg. He had attacked us in Montreal for not creating industries in Montreal. But what was the policy he pursued in Winnipeg? Speaking to the people of Manitoba, what did he

encourage them to do? Did he encourage them to trade with other parts of Canada, to help to build up an interprovincial trade in order that we might be mutually interdependent and mutually prosperous? Did he encourage them to help build up Montreal? No; he told them that there proper places to trade with were St. Paul, Minneapolis and Chicago. The hon. gentleman did not repeat these sentiments at Montreal. But he got compliments upon that speech. Not from Canada—he never gets compliments from the Canadian people: the policy of these hon. gentlemen draws compliments from abroad. The Conservative party are always opposed by outside elements. What we ask for is the support of the Canadian people themselves. Here is a compliment to the hon. gentleman's speech from the Minneapolis "Tribune":

During the thirteen years that we had the Canadian markets, up to 1866, trade with the North-west provinces of Canada was very large and profitable. Our jobbers in all common lines and our manufacturers of flour, lumber, furniture and farm implements all testify to desirable Manitoba trade, which Mr. Laurier's policy would again make possible for them.

Sir, the hon. gentleman is welcome to the congratulations of the Minneapolis press, but the congratulations of the Minneapolis press will never carry him into power in this Canadian country. The hon. gentleman seems always to talk for American applause and I am bound to say that he succeeds in getting it. Now, Sir, just a word or two as to the industries of Canada. We have had specific charges in this House as to our industries, and now I have some specific information. I will not give in detail the figures as to raw materials, as they have often been given in the House. Here are, however, some of them and they indicate the increased employment given to our people:

RAW MATERIALS IMPORTED.

	1871.	1879.	1893.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Wool	2,061,576	4,976,758	10,503,645
Cotton	1,245,208	9,720,708	40,263,333
	$	$	$
Gutta percha...	90,536	133,214	862,113
Silk	.....	35,556	206,471
Hemp	.....	199,179	1,115,134
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Sugar	21,000,000	22,000,000	343,000,000

But I want to say a word or two as to our cotton and sugar and some other industries generally, and then I shall go on to some specific points. Here is a table which shows what we have been doing.

	Hands.	Wages.	Capital.
Cotton—			
1891	8,502	$2,102,603	$13,208,121
1881	3,527	714,250	3,476,500
Woollen—			
1891	7,156	1,884,483	9,357,658
1881	6,877	1,382,859	5,272,376
Foundries and machine shops—			
1891	12,808	5,152,157	16,736,703
1881	7,788	2,724,898	7,675,911
Rolling mills—			
1891	2,006	843,500	2,307,540
1881	699	255,020	697,500
Smelting works—			
1891	1,901	851,980	4,159,481
1881	974	279,449	2,172,100
Agricultural implements—			
1891	4,543	1,812,050	8,624,893
1881	3,656	1,241,279	3,995,782
Carriages and wagon-making—			
1891	9,056	2,999,572	8,029,621
1881	8,713	2,275,290	3,798,861
Rolling stock—			
1891	5,018	2,235,524	2,592,984
1881	3,154	1,295,841	1,630,598

Tin and sheet-iron working were not separated. By comparison they stand thus:

	Wages.	Capital.	Output.
1891	$1,729,680	$4,557,578	$6,749,056
1881	953,736	1,993,054	3,733,246

In 1878, we had 2,200 looms in our cotton mills; in 1895, we have 12,104. We had 111,000 spindles in 1878; to-day we have 491,000. In 1878, these mills employed 1,310 men, women and children; now they employ 8,216. At that time they paid $276,000 in wages; to-day they are paying $2,102,330. And, notwithstanding the contentions of hon. gentlemen opposite, it has been demonstrated in a masterly way by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that cotton was being sold here, quality considered, just as cheap as in the markets in England. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) still doubts. He would doubt no matter what sort of evidence I brought forward, so I need not pursue the subject in detail. Then, Sir, as to sugar refineries. In 1878, there were four refineries. How many men did they employ and what wages did they pay? Not a single hand did they employ and not a single dollar of wages was paid. In 1891, they employed 1,927 hands and their product was $17,127,000. It is the policy of the Government to maintain these industries rather than bring in the product of foreign labour from the United States, or from any other country, more particularly as, within the walls of that protective tariff, we have produced a competition which has given prices to which no Canadian can object. I take the town from which my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) comes. I am sorry my hon. friend is not here. He has admitted that the National Policy has made him rich. I think I have seen the question in the "Globe": "Has the National Policy made you rich?" The National Policy has made the hon. gentleman from South Brant rich, and I am

glad it has. But the hon. member says that is not the question ; has it done anything for you ? I tell my hon. friend that he could not grow rich without affording opportunities for labour to hundreds and thousands of people through all these years ; and, as he has grown rich he has, I have no doubt, paid his people a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, I am glad to know that the men who work for him have been buying their houses and growing rich as well. Well, Sir, Mr. Paterson's confectionery works, according to the commercial reports, were rated in 1878 at from $6,000 to $10,000. In 1895 it was rated at from $75,000 to $150,000. Then as to other industries there : Buck's stove works, in 1878, were rated at from $50,000 to $75,000 ; to-day they are rated at from $200,000 to $300,000. Harris, Son & Co., agricultural works, were rated, in 1878, at from $30,000 to $50,000, and to-day their works are assessed at $135,000. The Waterous engine works have risen from $150,000 to $200,000 or $300,000. And only the other day, when the Waterous Company proposed to leave the city of Brantford, the city granted them a large bonus, which is, perhaps, the most expensive protection we can possibly have, and if the hon. member for South Brant were here I would challenge him to deny that he had voted for that bonus, because he was anxious to keep these people in the city of Brantford, for the reason that, as the paper supporting him declared, it was better to keep them there if they could, not only to give strength and prosperity to the city, but to afford a market to the farmers around the city. But my hon. friend from Brant has been making a public utterance as to his own business under the National Policy. He admits that he prospered, but he says it is not due to the National Policy. Speaking last fall he said as follows :—

> He would make the comparison with 1893. The National Policy was to keep the Canadian market for the Canadian manufacturers. Well, in 1878, $88,000 worth of candies came into Canada ; in 1893, $86,000 worth came in. It kept out $2,000 worth—only $2,000 worth all over the Dominion. In biscuits, Canada imported in 1878, $24,000 worth, and in 1893 we imported $32,000 worth. What chance had Mr. Paterson to be rich with that ? In 1878 $97,646 worth of pickles came into the country, and in 1893 it had risen to $109,580 worth. Those figures did not bear out the assertion that the National Policy had made him rich.

In that is a very ingenious statement. But what has become of the greatly increased consumption ? It is true that the imports are about the same. Had it not been for the National Policy they would have been much larger and we should have been using the products of foreign labour. The way to measure the fourth of the business in which he is engaged is to look at the evidence of these figures. As to pickle-making and bakers and confectioners :

Pickle-making—		
Establishments	3	17
Hands employed.....	25	89
Wages	$ 4,200	$ 20,090
Output	24,000	119,000
Bakeries and confectioneries—		
Establishments	1,180	1,836
Hands employed	3,963	7,043
Wages	$1,122,266	$2,283,553
Output	9,476,975	15,433,198

It will thus be seen, Sir, that the market has grown immensely, and that Canadian labour has been supplying it. This fact the member for Brant did not mention. Just a word or two as to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). You remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year when the question of canned tomatoes came up in this House, my hon. friend was extremely solicitous about a cent being taken off canned tomatoes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Peaches.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Peaches, yes ; but tomatoes as well. Peaches and tomatoes were the especial object of my hon. friend's solicitude then, just as wrecking privileges were the especial object of his solicitude in other days. Well, Sir, what is the reason that he is so anxious about canned tomatoes and canned peaches ? I find that in 1881 there were four canning factories in North and South Norfolk. I do not think there were any before 1878. I find that the capital invested was $13,000 ; that the number of hands employed was 91 ; and that the value of the produce was $34,000. I find that in 1891, under this iniquitous policy which my hon. friend denounces from platform to platform, the number had not increased, but that the capital had risen from $13,000 to $144,000, that the number of hands had risen from 91 to 409, and that the value of products had risen from $34,000 to $273,000. These figures are for the county of Norfolk alone. This explains the anxiety of my hon. friend that these canning men should have a special advantage. Well, he was anxious for them, but he was anxious for the farmers of the county of Norfolk who have devoted their fields to raising the articles which are used in these canning factories, and out of which the farmers are making more money than they possibly could in any other line from the same soil. Taking the country over, in animal and vegetable goods, canned and cured, in 1881 the wages paid were $4,432,000 ; in 1891 the wages were $8,408,992. And how have prices ruled ? I sent down to Mr. Kavanagh's grocery, in Sparks Street, Ottawa, to get the prices, and I found out that before the National

Policy came in, these canned tomatoes for which my hon. friend has so great a solicitude, were worth $2 per dozen; while last fall they were selling at 98 and 99 cents per dozen. And yet the hon. gentleman says that the duty is always added to the price. Which is best, Sir, that we should consume American canned goods put up by American labour, fed by American farmers, or consume our own vegetables, raised by our own farmers, put up by Canadian men and women who are fed by the Canadian farmer? Well, let me speak of some other points which I, in company with my colleagues, visited. I am only now dealing with small points. There is no point as to the industries of the cities. Hon. gentlemen admit that point. I went to Chatham, and discovered that these National Policy industries were not all existing within the great cities. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) will be able to tell me whether there was a great wagon industry before 1878; or whether there was a great fanning mill industry in Chatham before 1878.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend says, yes; but I have telegrams here from proprietors and other men, and from the mayor of Chatham. The hon. gentleman will admit that Mr. Manson Campbell, mayor of Chatham, is a reputable man: and Mr. Manson Campbell's telegrams states that:

> In 1878 there were less than 50 wagons a year built in Chatham. The Chatham Wagon Company was established in 1882; it makes 2,000 wagons this year, and other factories make 600 or 800 in the town of Chatham.

In fanning mills, Mr. Campbell himself made 300 in 1878. In the last three years he made 6,000 mills each year, and the price of these same fanning mills to the farmers have gone down one-fourth. My hon. friend from Kent seems to have blundered. Would he like to see this wagon factory destroyed? His policy will do it. Now, as to the town of Wingham, from which my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) comes. We held a meeting at Wingham, and we found new factories there; we found a furniture factory which did not exist previous to 1878.

Mr. MACDONALD. The town of Wingham gave large sums of money for the purpose of helping this industry.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And my hon. friend voted for those sums, my hon. friend voted for those bonuses, my hon. friend voted to place a direct tax on every man in the town of Wingham for the purpose of starting an industry in that town, and yet he supports a policy which will destroy the industries of Canada. I can tell him that industries in the town of Wingham did not amount to much before 1878. I have the telegrams here if he wants to see them. And I will tell him that the chair factory——

Mr. MACDONALD. The population of the town of Wingham increased 1,500 from 1872 to 1878, but from 1881 to 1891 it only increased 247.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not got the population figures. It may be that they are like the circular letter to the manufacturers which my hon. friend spoke about. But I want to tell him that the chair factory was established in 1888. I want to tell him that a large furniture factory was established in 1887 and that its capacity was largely increased in 1888. I want to tell him that when I went to the town of Wingham they said to me about my hon. friend from East Huron, "He makes long speeches, but we believe with the London "Advertiser," that one smoke-stack is worth a ten-acre field of men that talk, and talk, and talk." I want now to say that we visited the town of Galt, the Manchester of Canada. The lights were in the factory windows at night, the factories were working overtime, and the workingmen came to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and said: "Don't change this policy, but let us earn our living on Canadian soil." The farmers came to us and said: "We have got the very best home market that is to be found on this continent." We went to the town of Peterboro', and we did not find a Liberal who was in favour of the trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. When you mentioned it to them they denied it, and they said they were for protection, and they would not allow the hon. gentlemen opposite, if they got into power, to give anything else. We went to Listowel, and we found a piano industry. They said to us, "Keep up the duty on pianos, we want the industry to prosper." We went to the town of Bowmanville, and we found that they had recently, by vote of 444 to 4, paid a big bonus to keep an industry in that town to employ their own people, and to furnish a home market for the farmers. Now, I want to tell the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who lives in London, and who has grown so jolly of late, that new industries have started in London.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I must accept the statement of my hon. friend, but my hon. friend must accept the proof which I give him of my statement in reply. I want to tell him that previous to 1895 not a pound of iron enamelled ware was made in London. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the ware that was consumed in Canada was brought from Germany and the United States. I desire to inform him further that

the manufacture of that ware was begun this year by the McLary Company, of London, who have invested $150,000 in the business, and who are turning out a weekly product of $1,500, and they wire me that in a few weeks they will be doubling their output and supplying a large part of the market of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that is not a new industry, that it existed in London before. The hon. gentleman knows it did not, just as well as I know it at the present time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I can tell the hon. gentleman that Elliott's factory was a very large one in 1878, that it is dead and went into bankruptcy. The Globe Manufacturing Company also went into bankruptcy. The London Manufacturing Company—two of them—also went into bankruptcy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has not substantiated his statement. The buildings once occupied by these industries are now occupied by others. The hon. gentleman has gone out of a very small hole. I stated that new industries were being established in London, and the hon. gentleman said, no. I have established my point, and the hon. gentleman has gone around by a circuitous route to answer me. I want to say not only that, but further that we are not only establishing, and, indeed, have established sugar industries, cotton industries, agricultural industries, but we are beginning to establish a great iron industry.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for North Norfolk says, "Hear, hear." The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., also smiles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman seems to think this is purely an Ontario policy. "I tell him there is no reason why New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island should not be manufacturing just as well as Ontario." Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Hastings showed that the union itself was a calamity.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from Bothwell grows dubious again. Let me tell him for his comfort that I am quoting the member for Brant in a speech he made in 1876, in this House, in which he said he desired protection for all Canada, not for any particular part of it, and that the eastern provinces should be better off than even Ontario under it. Hon. gentlemen opposite certainly have declared that they will destroy any hope of an iron industry being established in this country. To-day, a great iron industry is about to be established in Kingston. These will cover the construction and operation of a blast furnace, steel plant, blooming mill, and rolling mill. The works are to cost $600,000; daily capacity of furnace will be 250,000 pounds of pig iron; the capacity of steel plant will be 30,000 pound of steel blooms; capacity of blooming mill, 80,000 pounds of steel or iron bars; hands required, 300 to 500. Kingston is to provide $250,000, secured by a first mortgage. Where are the returns expected from at first to recoup Kingston? Largely from the bounties given by this Government, and not only by this Government, but by the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat. While hon. gentlemen opposite are standing here railing against the policy of encouraging Canadian industries, their leader in the province of Ontario has done what? He has passed a statute under which he gives $125,000 a year, or $1 per ton over what the Dominion Government gives for every ton of pig iron produced in Ontario. Not only is this industry being established at Kingston, but at Hamilton, as well as an iron industry is being started. I received a telegram yesterday from prominent Hamilton people.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend doubts again. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that this enterprise was on paper merely. I tell them now that the cost of the smelting plant will be $400,000; that all the foundations are laid; that all stacks and smelting arrangements and casting house are erected; that everything is on the ground except engines, boilers, and connections; that the cost of steel plant will be $200,000 more; that the company will employ 100 hands in the iron department, and 200 or more in the steel department. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite are they going for ever to abandon the idea of establishing an iron industry in Canada? They ought surely to give the House an answer to that question, because they say they will destroy protection to that industry at once. They say that that industry can be established with this market. In reply, I say that the same statements were put forward when the attempt was first made to establish an iron industry in Great Britain, and the same statement was made in regard to the iron industry of the United States. And what is the result? In the United States, by the system of protection and bounties given they are producing iron, which is being sold in the markets of Great Britain cheaper than it can be produced in Great Britain itself. Do hon. gentlemen accept that statement?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not deny it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman had better not deny it. I have here the English "Hansard," because some of the journals supporting the hon. gentleman did deny it. I have a letter, moreover, from

the manager of the Alabama Iron Works giving figures with respect to iron production and prices, and I have speeches delivered in the House of Commons in which the attention of the president of the English board of trade is called to the fact that iron from Alabama is being laid down at Liverpool cheaper than it can possibly be produced at Cleveland, which is the centre of the black district of England. Sir, there is no use in multiplying illustrations. It is child's play. Everywhere in all the lines of industry capital is being invested and increasing numbers of our people are being employed. Hon. gentlemen know it and dread it, but the people of Canada appreciate it. One or two words more as to our industries, and then I shall close. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made a very strong attack on our census—they have attacked trifling points in it. They are dealing in small figures and attacking little points which in any census are peculiar. This, Sir, is not the business of statesmen. It is trifling with the House and the country. Where is the real and great increase of our industries shown? It is shown in the industries where the output is over the value of $50,000 per annum. Industries having a yearly output under $2,000 only represent 6·7 per cent of the whole and only increased 55·6 per cent. On the other hand, industries having a yearly output of $50,000 and over, formed 54·8 per cent of the whole, and increased 69·6 per cent during the decade. Not only so, but hon. gentlemen opposite assert that the manufacturers have grown rich and the labourers have grown poor. Take the fifth group of industries, with an output of $50,000 and over, and hon. gentlemen opposite will find that these establishments in 1891 took $155,460,492 of raw material and worked it up into $260,795,190 of finished product, the added value being $105,334,698. Labour received of this, $46,842,640, or 44·5 per cent; while capital received $58,492,056, or 55·5 per cent. In 1881, $96,361,536 of raw materials was worked up into a finished product of $153,767,771, the added value being $57,462,235. Of this, labour received 41·8 per cent, and capital 58·20 per cent. So the artisan is better off individually under the present policy than he was under the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite while the number employed is very largely increasing. I have shown, I think, from start to finish not only by the facts I have adduced, but by the very sneers which I have produced from hon. gentlemen opposite, that no matter what they may name their policy it has had one central and leading idea, namely, that industries should not be established in this country, and that the Liberal party would destroy every item of encouragement for those industries, should the party get into power. That is the policy they have supported, and that is the policy which hon. members on this side of the House cannot and will not accept. We are proud to say we have encouraged industries; we are proud to believe we have to a very large extent increased the home market; we are proud to know that home competition has produced its legitimate effect, namely, low prices; we are proud to know we have done some thing towards making a better, a greater, a more harmonious and more independent national life, because you cannot have a successful national life without you have the various industrial classes, without you have the warp as well as the woof, the industries and the farmers to supply the wants of the artisans who are engaged in those industries.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much pleased with the speech which has been delivered by the Secretary of State. I am a little surprised at the tone of that speech, for I do not think it exactly becomes a Cabinet Minister, and it is a little more aggressive than it should be. I like the voice of the hon. gentleman. It is mellow, and so is the matter of his speech. I have heard that address, however, ever since I have heard the hon. gentleman speak. The hon. gentleman spoke in glowing terms of the late Sir John Macdonald, and I was glad to hear him do so. But a gentleman told me the other night that Sir John Macdonald once said about the Secretary of State: "He is good at making long speeches, but he is good at nothing else." The hon. gentleman spoke very kindly of Sir John Macdonald, of Sir John Thompson, and of Sir John Abbott, the Premiers who are gone, but he forgot what was due to his leader, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and he never even mentioned his name once. Are we to live in memory of the past? Are the men who now lead the destinies of the party to be ignored? The Prime Ministers who are dead are eulogized by the Secretary of State, but he had not one word to say for the Prime Minister who is alive. What we want in Canada to-day is strong and able men to lead the Government. We do not want a Government composed of factions, or a Cabinet, in which its youngest member ignores his leader, owing to factions that exist in that Cabinet. Why did not the Secretary of State tell us of the qualities and of the abilities of Sir Mackenzie Bowell.

An hon. MEMBER. He is not his leader.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am reminded that the leader of the Secretary of State is not the Premier of Canada, but that his leader is the Minister of Railways. Well, the Secretary of State referred to the Minister of Railways often. They remind me of the heavenly twins, and I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman ignored the Premier and praised up the Minister of Railways. I expected a tariff speech from the Secretary of State, but I heard only the same old speech vamped over that I heard him deliver first

in the village of Elmwood. That was just seven years ago; just a year after Judge Upper put the Secretary of State in this House. That was a few years also, before he issued a proclamation to the Indians. He told us then of somebody writing a letter to the Superintendent of Canals—there was no Tay Canal at that time—and he told us all these little things that he has gone over to-night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) read extracts from speeches, and therein his own speech was remarkably good. The extracts he read were from the speeches of gentlemen on this side of the House, and so, of course, they were the best portions of his speech. He spoke considerably about England, Germany and the United States, and of the poor benighted statesmen of those countries who were letting their country go to the dogs, when they might be able to run things on a much better scale if they sent for a gentleman of the ability and experience of the Secretary of State. According to him, Gladstone, and Salisbury, and all the distinguished men of England do not know their business. He could inform them.

Again the hon. gentleman told us of the decay of England, and I think it is about time that the Cabinet Ministers of this Government should give up their fusilades against Great Britain. Sir, she is the mistress of the world. She is the land above all other lands, that has proclaimed liberty of speech, liberty of the press, liberty of the subject, liberty of conscience and the liberty of Parliament. It is from her that we have learned our liberty, and so we on this side of the House value our connection with England and with the Empire. We do not believe in gentlemen opposite who say: If this system of protection is bad for British connection, so much the worse for British connection. That kind of loyalty is not our loyalty. The Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State, the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and several other Conservative members have made a tirade against the institutions of England in this House. I hurl back their accusations at them, and I tell them that England is a good example for this country to follow. When they tell us that England is going to the dogs they know better. They know that England still leads and that she will ever lead as long as British statesmen are true to the principles of liberty and freedom. Look at England as she is to-day. She has nearly as much foreign trade as France and the German Zollverein combined. She has more foreign trade than Belgium, Holland, Russia and the United States all put together. She has as great a foreign trade as Russia, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Portugal and the United States put together. Yet in face of this, hon. gentlemen opposite for the sake of gaining a little political popularity as they think, and for the sake of appealing to the baser passions, stand up in a Parliament under the British flag and assail the institutions of the motherland. What a pitiable position for men to take who have sworn to be loyal to the Queen. Sir, Britain's export trade nearly equals that of France and the German Zollverein combined, and it is greater than that of Holland, Russia, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Portugal and the United States all put together. Hon. gentlemen opposite may read extracts out of little newspapers, but this is the glorious truth about England. They may read extracts out of little papers, which are just as unreliable as the men who read them, but that does not alter the fact. Britain's tonnage exceeds that of Russia, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Germany and Holland all put together by 8,000,000 tons. She has six millions more tonnage than France, Italy and the United States combined, and her tonnage is nearly half of the entire tonnage of all Europe and North America put together. Is it not wonderful, Sir, that these gentlemen who pretend to be loyal will get up in this House and decry Britain when she has such a wonderful showing as that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was much pleased at all events with one statement made by the Secretary of State. He said that he never told a lie on a public platform. Well, he qualified it and he added the words "public platform." Surely the hon. gentleman must have taken Holy Orders. Did he make that statement to contrast himself with his confreres? Did he mean to say that he was better than any of the other Cabinet Ministers, and did he mean that they would occasionally stretch a point on the platform, although he never did. Perhaps, Sir, there is some hope for the country when a Minister of the Crown, without any provocation, finds it necessary to say that he never told a lie on a public platform. When he was decrying Britain, when he looks for hope and security to the United States, and when he looks to Germany and other foreign countries, what does he call that? Well, Sir, if the Premier was here I might make a recommendation to him, and I know he would do anything I tell him, almost. I would recommend him to send the Secretary of State to teach the poor benighted political heathens in England and other places. Judging of the estimate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) has of his own capacity, he is the one who should undertake that mission and it might be a wise and prudent thing to send him. We had four Conservative Governments in Canada within four years. Well, Sir, we regret the causes of the changes. We have some new men in the Government it is true, but I almost believe that they are worse than the old ones, and in that connection I am reminded of a little story about a difficulty that arose in a church. They had had four ministers in the church, and the last

one tendered his resignation. A lady in the congregation went to the minister and asked him to withdraw his resignation. Well, he said, I don't think I can, but when I am gone you will get a better man. "Oh, no," said she, "unless we change our faith, we cannot get better, for I find that in the four ministers we have had in this church the last one was always worse than the one we had before." It does appear to me, Sir, that the Conservative Governments are getting worse as they are getting older. I do not think it would be any offence to say that the leaders of this Government are not equal to the leaders who have gone before, although I suppose in their own minds they feel that although they have less experience, they are safer to guide this country than any others. But the Secretary of State let them down very nicely. He said the Conservatives never thought of the kind of men they had—it was principle they were after. I quite agree with him that they do not look into the calibre of the men they put into the Government. The Secretary of State seemed to be very happy because a certain gentleman opposed the nomination of the hon. member for South Oxford in his constituency; he extracted a great deal of comfort out of that fact; he seemed to delight in it. I wonder if he knew that he was stabbing the leader of the House just then. The leader of the House was elected for King's, N.B., but he found the climate of that county not very salubrious, so he left it for his health, and crossed the Fredericton bridge into the county of York. I think the Secretary of State might have spared his leader, and not have drawn me out to reply in this manner. I remember that Conservative leaders in times past had to change their constituencies—Sir John Macdonald himself—and I will try to console the leader of the House with this reflection—left Kingston on one occasion and took another constituency. I suppose the Secretary of State was thoughtless, as young men occasionally are, and I hope the leader of the House will not take it very badly, because he represented a constituency for a few years until the people found him out, and then he had to change. Perhaps after the people find us all out, we shall all have to change. But the leader of the House ought to warn the Secretary of State not to speak of these things, because they might cause discord in the Cabinet; for I believe they have had some discord in the Cabinet. The Minister of Justice resigned, and for a little time became Attorney General for the human race. Then he came back very much improved; but his health broke down entirely after his return from Antigonish. It is wonderful what a bad effect that election had on the health of the Minister of Justice, and the other members of the Government. Now the hon. Secretary of State spoke of a circular that was issued to the manufacturers. There was no name to that circular: but I will read to you a circular which was not of a nodescript character, but which was issued by the Secretary of State himself: and it will show you that he ought not to talk about circulars. Here is his own:

To the Indians.—The Queen has always loved her dear, loyal subjects, the Indians. She wants them to be good men and women, and she wants them to live on the land that they have, and she expects in a little while, if her great chief, John A. gets into Government again, to be very kind to the Indians, and to make them very happy. She wants them to go and vote, and to all vote for Doctor Montague, who is the Queen's agent. He is their friend, and by voting for him every one of the Indians will please Queen Victoria.

It does not appear to me that the hon. gentleman is the agent of the Queen to-night. He has been railing about the Queen and her institutions and her public men. He read an extract from a speech of Mr. Chamberlain: and I will read that speech to you just to show how much he read of it. Why, the Secretary of State never told a lie on a public platform, and I want to corroborate his statement. But he does not want to confine himself: no doubt he leaves himself free in the House. Here is the quotation he made from Mr. Chamberlain's speech:

I find that there are a number of people who, under the present condition of trade, are coming to the conclusion that our free trade policy has been a failure, and who would, therefore, be ready to go back in the direction of protection. This opinion is not to be treated lightly. It ought to be carefully considered.

Now, that is a very important thing for a statement to read to the House. Why did not the hon. gentleman finish Mr. Chamberlain's speech? Mr. Chamberlain goes on to say:

I will only lay before you two reasons why I differ from those who desire to abandon it. My first reason is this: In times past in this country, when England was under protection, and in foreign countries to-day which are also under protection, notably in the United States and in France, trade is even worse than it is here. My second reason is a little more complicated, but I think I can make it clear to you. We cannot maintain by ourselves, by our own efforts alone, the vast population that is crowded within the limits of our territory. We depend upon our foreign trade. But if by any means, by protection or any other, you shut the door upon foreign goods, you may be quite certain that the result will be that there will be fewer English goods that will go abroad.

Bear in mind that depression in trade is not a new thing in this country. We have had depression in trade very great and extending over very long periods, at different times in our history. Why, the other day I was reading a most interesting work entitled "A Social History of England," and I happened to come across a description of the state of things in the reign of Henry the VIII.; and the complaints made at that time of the state of trade and the social conditions which were brought about by the depression of trade, might be made at the present moment by any one of us.

That is about the time of the halcyon period of which the Secretary of State spoke —some 400 years ago. In speaking of the Fredericton bridge, I might recall the statement the Finance Minister made that once the matter was brought to the notice of the leader of the House by a gentleman of weight and character and standing, he would give him an answer. Well, the leader of the House took a somewhat strange ground at that time. It was the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who put the question, and to whom the reply was made. He is one of the hard-working members of this House. He works incessantly and endeavours, as far as possible, to see that the public money is properly expended. I wonder why the leader of the House should have taken such ground on this question. I was reminded, by his answer, of what I once read, and which applies to this case: McMullen and Foster—what should there be in that Foster? Why should his name be sounded more than McMullen? Write them together and McMullen is as fair a name. Sound them, it becomes the mouth as well. Weigh them, it is as heavy. Conjure with them, and McMullen will start a spirit as soon as Foster. In the name of all the gods at once, upon what meat does this, our Foster, feed that he has grown so great? When the question was asked with reference to the money thrown away on the Fredericton bridge, why should the leader of the House have taken such high ground. It appears that there was one who lived some years ago who understood the situation better than did the Finance Minister.

That hon. gentleman says that we have had different platforms. Well, ever since I have been in this House, the Liberals have had the same platform. Suppose that everything the hon. gentleman said about our platform were true, which I deny, I would a hundred thousand times rather have it than protection. You could not mention scarcely a single thing that has been advocated in this country which I would not prefer to protection. Protection is unjust in its design, and unjust in its carrying out. It takes the money that one man earns and gives it to another. It is without scientific basis. When they tell us that protection should exist everywhere in order that we should build up industries, they do not defend it on any scientific basis. The hon. Secretary of State spoke of it as a universal need which every country must apply to itself. Every country, say our friends opposite, must have protection in order to prosper. Before the union of the British Empire, England had a tariff against Ireland and against Scotland, and Ireland had a tariff against England, and Scotland had a tariff against England. When they were united, these hostile tariffs ceased to exist. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if it was good for these kingdoms, before the union, to have these hostile tariffs against each other, why would it not be good for them to continue these tariffs. If the principle was good before the union, why should it not be good afterwards? Before the union in the United States, every state had the power to impose a tariff against every other state. After the union this power was taken away. If it was good before the union that each state should have a hostile tariff against the others and exclude the goods of the others, why should not the same principle hold good after the union? What is the reason that the different states do not now need protection against each other? When Alsace and Lorraine were French provinces they had free trade with France and a tariff against Germany. After they became German, they had a tariff against France and free trade with Germany. If it was good for them to have free trade with France before, why is it not good for them to have it still? These things show you conclusively that there is no scientific basis to protection, that it was instituted for the benefit of those who invented it, and that it was devised to raise money for the benefit of the few. The idea that nations should live at enmity with one another is contrary to all law and against the best interests of all people. If you are going to apply this principle, you must apply it to every division of the country. Take, for instance, the Dominion. If it was good for Nova Scotia to have a tariff against the rest of Canada before the union, is it not equally good for her to have that tariff now? If it was good for New Brunswick to have a tariff against the other provinces before the union, would it not be equally advantageous for her to continue that tariff? If each province required protection against the others before the union, why should it not have the same protection now? You can devise no system of protection for the Dominion that will suit all her people, any more than the same shoe will fit everybody in this country. Our productions vary so much that it is impossible to apply any system of protection which will satisfy all the requirements of all the people. The Secretary of State told us to-night that protection does not raise prices—that it encourages manufactures, but does not raise prices. If it does not raise prices how does it encourage the manufacturer? Does he mean to tell us that it encourages them without giving them anything.

When hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that their policy of encouraging an industry does not mean that the consumers of the products of that industry pay higher prices they are talking unadulterated nonsense. I do not see how you can encourage people unless you give them something with which to encourage them: and to say that you encourage them without giving them anything is simply to state an absurdity. I wonder that a gentleman who talks so well as the Secretary of State would talk in a way that he knows is at

variance with common sense. The hon. Secretary of State would lead us to believe that trade is aggressive—that foreign trade is forced on us whether we like it or not. That is not the meaning of foreign trade. For every seller there must be a buyer and you cannot buy anything unless you find some one who has that thing to sell. You neither buy nor sell unless it is to your advantage to do so. People do not manufacture goods in order to slaughter them. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the slaughtering of goods in 1878. They talk about the slaughtering of furniture, but there is more furniture brought in now than there was in 1878. And they pay the duty on it. And yet you say you are shutting out the goods and protecting the people. You are preventing your own people doing what they want to do. You are not protecting the people against foreigners; you are protecting the people against themselves. There is where the case is misunderstood, and there is one of the falacies of protection. A protective tariff is not raised against foreigners but against the people themselves. If importers bring in goods from abroad, why do they do it? Because these goods are demanded here and they bring them in even though there is a tariff. You cannot entirely prevent trade by means of a tariff and it would not be advisable if you could. What is the use of a railway system, what is the use of making large grants with a view to building up that system, if, on the other hand you try to destroy trade? What is the use of shipping if you try to destroy the exchange of goods? Civilized nations do not use their armies to close ports in time of peace, but only in time of war. And why do they do it? To prevent goods being brought in. And what nations do in time of war, is precisely what governments do in the time of peace, by their system of protection. Now, England opened the ports of China and the United States those of Japan. But this would not make any difference if the people did not want to trade. It did not compel them to trade, but it allowed them to trade if they wished to do so. It is as natural for people to trade as it is for the blood to circulate, and anything which is a serious barrier or a serious detriment to trade should not be allowed in this country. You cannot protect everybody in the country by any system of protection. Men of different nations trade with one another—for the same reason that men of the same nation trade with one another—because it is to their advantage. Goods will not be imported into any country unless they can be obtained more easily by exchange than by producing them directly; and hence, to restrict importations must lessen productive power and reduce the fund from which all revenues are drawn.

Now, I was a little surprised at the Secretary of State on another point. He rather sneered at the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) because he had introduced moral legislation in this House. The Secretary of State thought that was a very grave offence. I believe there are a great many people in this country who think quite otherwise, and I think it ill became a member of the Cabinet, who should be an upholder of public morality to sneer at any one who endeavours by legislation to promote public morality, no matter whether he may agree with the legislation that is introduced or not. Now, the hon. gentleman read from a certain pamphlet, and I will have to ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I finish the quotation which he began from Mongredien's history of the "free trade movement." I think the hon. gentleman left off before he finished the clause. I will finish it and he can add it to his own quotation at his convenience:

> The prevailing convergence towards free trade principles simply proceeded from a conscientious recognition of economic truths. It was felt that the continuance of the existing prosperity could not be ensured unless our commercial policy were conducted in conformity with scientific principles.

I will read you a short extract on the effects of free trade upon the prosperity of England:

> The way to proceed will be briefly to compare the state of the country in the year 1840 with its state in 1878. We select 1840 because it was one of the most prosperous years under the old protective policy. On the other hand, 1878 was a year of commercial depression, so that the comparison rests on the most favourable data for the old policy. If this change from that to a free trade policy had been inimical to the interests of the nation, the evil would manifest itself in the shape of diminished trade, diminished wealth, diminished prosperity and arrested progress. But if, instead of such a result, the trade, wealth, prosperity and progress of the United Kingdom should, under the new system of commercial freedom, have enormously increased—increased in a ratio far beyond that of any former period, and of any other country it must then be conceded that the provisions of the enlightened statesmen who effected the change, have been justified by the event.
>
> Let us collect a few data for forming our judgment.
>
> Population.—In 1840 the population of the United Kingdom was 26,487,000; in 1878 it was estimated at 33,799,000. Increase, 7,312,000. In the former year London contained 1,700,000 inhabitants; in the latter, 3,800,000. Increase, 2,100,000. So that the growth of London during the last thirty-eight years largely exceeded the total growth it had attained during the previous thousand years. In 1878 the emigration of British subjects to America, Australia, and all other places, comprised 112,902 persons. The number who embarked at our ports for those places was much greater, but it consisted largely of emigrants from Germany and other continental states, who took their way through this country for the convenience of passage. On the other hand, the number of immigrants in 1878 was 77,951, many of them being returned emigrants; so that, on the balance, the yearly exodus from the United Kingdom is much smaller than is generally imagined.
>
> Trade.—In 1840 the foreign trade of the United Kingdom (combined exports and imports) amount-

ed to £172,133,000, equivalent to £6 9s. 11½d. per head of the population. In 1878 it amounted to £614,255,000. or £18 3s. 6d. per head, a marvellous rate of increase! In the United States the proportion of foreign trade to the population is £4 13s. per head. In France it was in 1876 £8 3s. per head. In Russia it was in 1876 £1 9s. per head.

Hon. gentlemen would do well to read this book. I would particularly recommend the Secretary of State to read it all through, and I would also recommend him, when he reads an extract, to read it all and not allow his followers to fall into the error of believing that Great Britain, the motherland, is falling into decay. I was particularly struck with one point in the speech of the gallant knight who represents the city of Ottawa (Sir James Grant). I was much pleased with his speech as I always am pleased with his speech. He indicated that the National Policy was decaying and that now it was only fit to be used as a fertilizer. I thought the hon. gentleman had applied it to the best use that it had ever been applied to in its history. I could read page after page from this book from which I have quoted to show still further the marvellous growth and prosperity of England under its present fiscal system. Now, I cannot devote all my attention to the hon. Secretary of State. At any rate, so far as the tariff is concerned, he had very little to say about it. But a gentleman spoke last night who did speak of it and I wish to reply to some of the things he said. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim some credit for the change in the tariff last session, and claim that they are entitled to be called tariff reformers. Now, I prepared a table, and my table differs entirely from that produced last night by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I cannot understand upon what basis he arranged his table, because I find that out of 75 changes that the Finance Minister proposed in his Budget speech, 63 of them were afterwards changed one way or the other. Out of those that were changed from ad valorem to specific, 31 were changed back again. I will read the list, so that the Controller of Customs, if he has the time, and the Minister of Finance, may look into it. I will show them where they can find the items, and I will give them the number of each, and I will show them how changes were made subsequent to the final passage of the tariff Bill:

No. in Tariff Bill, 1894.	Duty on final Revision.	Duty proposed in Budget.
12. Live hogs	1½c. p. lb.	25 p.c.
18. Lard, lard compound, &c	2c. p. lb.	25 p.c.
31. Condensed milk	3c. p. lb.	30 p.c.
42. Barley	30 p.c.	15c. p. bush.
48. Oatmeal	20 p.c	50c. p. brl.
49. Rice, uncleaned, &c.	$\frac{4}{10}$c. p. lb.	$\frac{3}{10}$c.
50. Rice, cleaned	1¼c. p. lb.	1c.
52. Rice, for making starch	¾c. p. lb.	25 p.c.
57. Starch, including farina, &c	1½c. p. lb.	1¼c.
96. Cocoanut, desiccated, &c	5c. p. lb.	4c.
98. Spices, &c	12½ p. c.	15 p.c.
111. Paper hangings, borders, &c	1½c. p. roll & 25 p.c.	35 p.c.
114. Straw boards, in sheets, &c.	30c. p. 100.	40c. p. 100.
116. Paper, tarred	25 p.c.	20 p.c.
121. Acid, acetic and pyroligneous, &c	15c. p. gall. & 2c. addl.	1c. 25 p.c.
123. Glacial acetic acid, &c	15c. p. gall. & 1c. addl.	
134. Coal oil, &c	6c. p. gall.	7½c.
136. Crude petroleum, &c.	3c. p. gall.	3$\frac{3}{5}$c.
161. Earthenware and stoneware, jugs, &c	3c. p. gall.	2c. p. gall.
174. Plate glass in panes over 70 feet	9c. p. sq. ft.	8c. p. sq. ft.
175. Silvered glass	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
176. do bevelled.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
186. Plaster of Paris, calcined, &c	40c. p. brl. of 300 lbs.	20 p.c.
191. Blocks or slabs of marble, sawn, &c.	10 p.c.	20 p.c.
195. Slate pencils	25 p.c.	20 p.c.
196. Slates, slate mantels, &c	30 p.c.	20 p.c.
220. Upper leather, including dongola, &c.	17½ p.c.	15 p.c.
237. Ferro-silicon, &c	5 p.c.	10 p.c.
243. Iron or steel hoops, bands, &c	$10 p. ton.	5 p.c.
245. Iron, steel bars, rods, strips, &c	½c. p. lb.	5 p.c.
251. Railway fish-plates, &c	$10 p. ton.	30 p.c.
253. Axle springs, &c., for railway	$20 p. ton.	35 p.c.
254. Axles, springs, &c	1c. p. lb.	35 p.c.
267. Wire nails	1c. p. lb.	¾c.
268. Cut nails and spikes.	¾c. p. lb.	30 p.c.
270. Cut tacks, brads, &c.	1½c. p. 1000.	1c.
281. Picks, mattocks, &c.	35 p.c.	30 p.c.
284. Shovels and spades, &c	50c. p. doz.	35 p.c.
304. Stereotypes, electrotypes, &c	⅜c. p. sq. in.	¾c.
326. Brass and copper nails, &c	30 p.c.	25 p.c.
332. Lead pipe and lead shot, &c	$\frac{4}{10}$c. p. lb. & 25 p.c.	30 p.c.
336. Enamelled iron or steel ware	35 p.c.	30 p.c.
352. Cases for jewels, &c.	5c. each & 30 p.c.	35 p.c.
360. Cane, reed or rattan, &c	17½ p.c.	12½ p.c.
368. Veneers of wood	10 p.c.	5 p.c.
379. Buggies, carriages, &c	$5 each & 25 p.c.	25 p.c.
393. Glucose, or grape sugar, &c	1c. p. lb.	1½c.

No. in Tariff Bill, 1894.	Duty on final Revision.	Duty proposed in Budget.
406. Shirts, more than $3 per doz....	25 p.c. & $1 p. doz.	25 p.c.
407. Shirts, n.e.s.....	35 p.c.	25 p.c.
415. Cotton, sewing thread in hanks.....	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
417. Cordage, &c.....	1¼c. p. lb. & 10 p.c.	30 p.c.
437. Yarns, wholly or in part wool.....	5c. p. lb. & 20 p.c.	30 p.c.
440. Manufactures, wholly or in part wool.....	5c. p. lb. & 25 p.c.	30 p.c.
445. Socks and stockings..	10c. p. doz. prs. & 35 p.c.	35 p.c.
449. Ingrain carpets, 2 and 3-ply.....	3c. p. sq. yd. & 25 p.c.	30 p.c.
450. Treble ingrain, 2 and 3-ply carpets.....	5c. p. sq. yd. & 25 p.c.	30 p.c.
452. Oiled silk and cloth..	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
453. Enamelled oilcloth...	30 p.c., but not less than 4c. p. sq. yd.	30 p.c.
455. Window shades in piece or cut, &c....	35 p.c., but not less than 5c. p. sq. yd.	35 p.c.
457. Ready-made clothing, &c.....	5c. p. lb. & 30 p.c.	32½ p.c.
474. Blasting and mining powder.....	2c. p. lb.	25 p.c.
475. Sporting powder, &c..	3c. p. lb.	25 p.c.
476. Nitro-glycerine, &c ..	4c. p. lb.	25 p.c.

So that 63 were changed back from the Budget list, and 31 were changed back from ad valorem to specific and ad valorem. These facts show that although the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) might have endeavoured to tell what was strictly correct, the list which I have read, I am quite satisfied, is correct. Out of 75 changes proposed in the first place, 63 were changed back again, a few were lowered, but nearly all were increased. Well, Sir, the Secretary of State, while he was decrying England, and running down her industries, speaking of the poverty of her citizens, speaking of the distress that prevailed there, was still obliged to send to old England, as a mark of compassion, I suppose, and bring out a private secretary. He did not give the situation to any of his friends from Hagarsville, or Jarvis, or Caledonia, or Cayuga, but he went to old England. I suppose out of compassion to those poor people, who were starving by the scores and hundreds in the motherland. I just notice this in order to say that it is another thing that will perhaps excuse him to some extent in the motherland for the attempt he has been making to decry the glory of Britain:

> The land that, girt by friend or foe,
> A man may speak the things he will,
> The land of civil government,
> The land of old and brave renown,
> Where freedom broadens slowly down,
> From precedent to precedent.

I hope hon. gentlemen will think of that when they are going on with these tirades against the motherland. Talk about substantial aid! He has been stabbing every Minister. I believe he expects to get to the head, and he is going to kill them off. I would recommend the Controller of Customs to look out, because when he talks of substantial aid, what about stabbing in the back? I think the young man has been very discursive to-night. He has been harder on his friends than on his opponents, because every shot that he gave to his opponents, he brought it back like a boomerang upon every member of the Government. He told us about wheat. He says they saved $200,000 by their protection to wheat. Gracious goodness! Why did they let the farmers sell their wheat last fall for 40c. per bushel? If wheat goes down they are not to blame for it, but if wheat goes up, they claim all the credit. It is a very peculiar policy. I have seen great changes in the Tory policy. I remember when the Mackenzie Government was in power, and when the distinguished gentleman from South Oxford was Minister of Finance, a gentleman that thoroughly understands the finances of this country, and who is well versed in the finances of other countries, not crammed with figures, but knowing from practical experience whereof he speaks. I remember when he had that low tariff. They said it was a mark of incapacity, that no Finance Minister was fit to hold the position who would have a deficit. Time passed on, and hon. gentlemen opposite had a deficit in one year larger than all the deficits during the five years which the hon. member for South Oxford administered our financial affairs. Then it was deemed by hon. gentlemen opposite an evidence of statesmanship to have a deficit.

Truly they are departing from the old landmarks of the Conservative party. Formerly it was a cardinal doctrine that whatever was was right; but it now appears to be that, when they are in, whatever is is right, that when they are out whatever is is wrong. That is about the manner in which they change their policy, that is about the way they apply it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly speaking of the prosperity of the country and the great advantages which the people enjoy. The Secretary of State travelled around the country telling the people about the wonders he saw and how people in different places looked out of their windows to see him.

The hon. gentleman spoke of being at Listowel. In 1881 it had a population of 2,688; in 1891, ten years afterwards, there were of people to look out of the windows less by 200 or 300 than previously, the population being then only 2,597. In Bowmanville, where we were informed the people were delighted to see the hon. gentleman and his party, the population in 1881 was 3,550, and in 1891 it was 3,377. I think we should pass an edict and not allow the Secretary of State and his company to visit these places any more, for it appears their visits have been as bad as a pestilence and their demonstrations have driven more people out of these towns and cities than any pestilence which passed through them. But they are loyal; and no doubt they will remain loyal so long as the salaries hold out. Put a Tory out of office and he will be a rebel the next day if he cannot get in again; those hon. gentlemen talk much about honesty and truthfulness, but I recommend the members of the House and the people of the country to watch them. The Secretary of State has called upon me to do something which I would rather avoid. He read an extract from a newspaper in the village of Aylmer in regard to the distinguished member for South Oxford, and what that paper thought of him. I have here what a newspaper has said about the Secretary of State, and I think when he has introduced a system like that, he cannot blame me if I give him a little taste of his own medicine. I do not like to do it, but I will do it because I think it is my duty to do so, for he has brought it on himself. I will read from "Saturday Night," a Conservative paper published in Toronto, what it says about the Secretary of State. It is a Conservative paper, not published in the province of Quebec, and its editor was the Conservative candidate in Haldimand at one time, with the concurrence and consent of the hon. gentleman opposite. Now, I want to read what a paper, whose editor knows the hon. gentleman, says, in order to show the estimation in which that paper holds him. It is a pretty long piece, but it is worth reading:

> The Manitoba school question continues to be the burning spot on the much hardened flesh of the electorate of Canada. There is no startlingly new phase of it excepting the election of Dr. Montague in Haldimand. His election is certainly a well-deserved tribute to his popularity, not to his principles, for he has none. His personality is exceedingly attractive to an audience composed of those who would rather listen than reason, and the belief that he is more than an average man lasts with those who never inquire, after listening, as to what they have brought away with them. Notoriously he is oratorical without being educational, eloquent mostly in the devising of statements that are misleading, courageous mostly when he has a majority of supporters, and up to date has shown his bravery of character almost entirely in doing wrong rather than in advocating right.
>
> He is an evidence that it is easier for electors to follow men than principles. The elector of Haldimand is not perhaps aware that he has made his fight on other people's money. There is no man in the Ottawa Ministry who has been a more subservient political hack than Dr. Montague. Everywhere he has been the paid spouter, the tap through which the wind of the Ottawa Ministry has been squirted, and if any of his enthusiastic friends ever pause to examine the situation, they will notice that all his oratorical periods are paid for by some one who puts up his money in order to gain an advantage that the people of Canada, intelligently considering the question, would not grant. It is neither politic nor prudent, perhaps, to reflect upon this class of politician. He is omnipresent, because he has a pass or his railway fare is paid; his powers of convincing the public are not hindered by thoughts of a neglected business or an ungrasped opportunity, yet he is the most dangerous quantity that could be injected into the already tainted blood of Canadian politics. If men of this sort are to be our rulers, we have a right to ask ourselves, how must we expect to be ruled? Is mouth to be chosen in preference to principles? Are audacity and indomitable cheek to be preferred to political virtue? Is facility in changing one's attitude to be applauded, as we would laugh at and approve of the antics of the clown in a circus? It has been Dr. Montague's good fortune to escape by his suave manner and exceeding good-fellowship the criticism of people who neither believe in him as a statesman nor approve of him as anything but a county heeler. It is quite possible that he may reach the highest niche in Canadian politics, for he has certainly proved himself able and willing to adopt any device necessary to hoodwink, mislead or betray those who prize the capacity of the mouth rather than loyalty and goodness of heart. That a man can be elected who is such a political hanger-on, while the issue was one of supreme importance to Canada, marks an epoch in our history which thoughtful men should pause and consider.

I think when the hon. gentleman reads that, he will ponder well before he again reads extracts from the scrap book he possesses. I think that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and the hon. gentleman invited me to read from his own newspapers. I sometimes read Conservative papers. I read the "Mail" the other day, which has been printing figures to show that there was some prosperity, and it recommended the people to go to the races to see that prosperity. I thought it was a very peculiar place to have to go in order to see prosperity, but the "Mail" made the discovery. I suppose this is one of the languishing industries that the National Policy has built up. I believe, however, that people raced horses even before the Secretary of State entered the Government and before the Conservatives were in power, but the "Mail" had not been able to see evidence of prosperity it saw that prosperity at the races. In regard to the tariff, there was no substantial relief given at the last revision made. The tariff is as oppressive now as it was then. The tariff makers have endeavoured to frame the tariff so that it will assist in perpetuating classes in this country. The protective tariff in England was the greatest obstacle to her progress; one tariff war cost 83 millions and another 33 millions,

and it has cost more treasure and involved more loss to the people of Great Britain than almost any other cause in its history. It will be necessary to look at the tariff makers. We cannot get a tariff framed that will be in the best interests of the people of this country, unless we have men in power who believe that freedom is better than restriction. The Liberal party have as sound a platform on their fiscal policy as it is possible for any party to have. I shall read just one clause of the platform of the Liberal party, in order that the Government may have an opportunity of knowing our policy. It is this:

We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare:

1.—FREER TRADE—REDUCED TAXATION.

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remain in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Does that not explain our platform? Is not that clear to the comprehension of any person who understands the language in which it is printed. Does it not state exactly what we want to arrive at? We want to have a tariff arranged that will yield only revenue, and we do not want a tariff like the present one which gives one man an advantage over his fellow man. The Liberal party are contending for the policy I have read, and we know that we are right in our contention, and we know that the principle of protection is unjust and unfair. We will battle against it until we get a tariff purely for revenue only. That is the watchword of the Liberal party. Now, with reference to this Government, I think the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke about the shibboleths and shams that existed in it. Well, if it had not been for those shibboleths a good many of the hon. gentlemen opposite would not be on the treasury benches to-day.

I remember that our present Premier has been a gentleman of shibboleths ever since he entered the House. His shibboleth was the Protestant shibboleth. When I came to Parliament in 1872 the Government of Sir John Macdonald was in power, and I could not ascertain from anything the present Premier did or said, whether he was a Protestant or not. He was as dumb as an oyster about it then, but as soon as the Government was changed, he mounted the Protestant horse, and he rode that as lively as he could until the Mackenzie Government went out. He has put the horse away now. The other day, when he became Premier, he adopted another shibboleth, and became attached to another Order which was known as the Remedial Order, and there he left it. The leader of the House was also a gentleman of shibboleths. He was a prohibitionist when he came here, and I remember he lectured on temperance one evening in Parliament, and after the lecture his desk was covered with flowers. But I have never seen his desk covered with flowers since. He was then taken into the Government, and he suddenly discovered that prohibition did not prohibit, and so he laid his shibboleth on a royal commission. That royal commission of his has spent $120,000 trying to find out if whisky does intoxicate, and I do not think they have arrived at a conclusion as to whether or not prohibition does prohibit. They have published seven volumes, which taking the number printed, weigh about a ton more or less, and I do not believe there is a man, woman or child in Canada that will ever read a word of them.

Mr. CASEY. The proof-reader.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not know whether he read it or not, but at all events it will probably cost the country $150,000 to defer a question which the Minister of Finance wanted to avoid. Why, that royal

commission has cost the country all the profits that the farmers have made. Now, the leader of the House has another shibboleth. He stood well behind the manufacturers. He held their brief, and they say he did just as they wanted him. Let him listen to what the Manufacturers' Association said about him at their last meeting :

It is gratifying to know that under the newly organized Government the interests of Canadian manufacturers will receive the very best consideration. * * * It was under these circumstances that the tariff committee entered upon their labours, having the counsel and assistance of many of the most experienced members of the association, the result of which was the embodiment of their views in a communication to the Finance Minister (a copy of which is here before you), which elicited from him a kindly letter, in which he alluded to it as a well prepared brief in which all the matters therein discussed had been done full justice. Perhaps it might be going too far to even surmise the effect these recommendations of your tariff committee to the Minister may have had in the final arrangement of the tariff ; but it is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes that were made in the tariff along the lines suggested in the recommendations, and that in many instances the language used in both are substantially identical. This is particularly noticeable as regards the iron schedule, the duties upon textiles, the duties upon drugs, chemicals, alcoholic preparations, &c., as well as upon an extended list of miscellaneous articles, and large and most important additions to the list of non-dutiable articles. It is also to be noticed that in many instances where the recommendations suggested that no changes be made in the duties upon articles therein enumerated, no changes were made.

A matter upon which your committee laid strong stress was that relating to drawbacks of duties on exports. It was shown that if Canadian manufacturers were to become exporters of their products, in competition with American manufacturers, the tariff conditions of Canada as affecting the importation of raw materials for manufacture into products for export, must as nearly as possible approach the tariff conditions of the United States. In frequent interviews with the Finance Minister your secretary urged that this policy be embodied in that of the Government, and this was finally done by an Order in Council, as a necessary supplement to the efforts of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to extend the export trade of the country. It is unfortunate, however, that the operation of this Order in Council has not proved as acceptable to some of our manufacturers as was hoped for and intended by the Government. In fact, in some industries it is working much harm, while in others it is calculated to nullify, and does nullify the benefit bestowed by the Government in the recently enacted tariff. It has always been the policy of the Conservative Government to encourage the manufacture of iron in Canada, and in addition to the inducements offered in previous legislation, the new tariff makes considerable and important extensions of such encouragement. It is contended by many manufacturers engaged in producing different forms of iron goods, that the Order in Council encourages the sending abroad for certain lines of such products which were previously made in this country. This is a matter that demands the immediate attention of the Government.

The association has just reason for congratulating itself upon the influence it possess in assisting to mould public opinion in the matter of affording tariff protection to our manufacturing industries, and in shaping the laws of the country in conformity thereto.

You see he had a brief from the manufacturers, and they say he filled the bill very well. It is said that there was a little conflict at the time of the formation of the Government ; but he had a shibboleth. He was not supposed to be such a giant as some other members of the Cabinet, and he was not likely to take upon himself the first position in the House. The old war horse of Cumberland had a son here, who was supposed to be a giant. The leader of the House is a reader of history and of fables, and he remembers well how Galapas was slain by Arthur. Galapas was a giant and Arthur was small : but Arthur got the better of Galapas by cutting off Galapas's legs, and when he got him down on his stumps, he smote off his head. It appears that the shibboleth of the Minister of Finance had somewhat the same effect on the political destinies of the Minister of Justice ; and when he got him on his stumps, he despatched him with his shibboleths and his interviews with the manufacturers, who apparently had not much confidence in the Minister of Justice, and they agreed to the arrangement. I am very glad to see that the broil is settled, and that hon. gentlemen are united in harmony again, because if there ever was a time when this country required a united Government, it is now. I hope they will give up all broils and unite harmoniously and strive to conduct the affairs of this country in an honest and economical manner. I do not expect they will ; I am sure they will not. Why, Sir, a Government with a record like theirs cannot be expected to give us anything better. They did not dissolve Parliament. I do not know whether it was remorse for the past or fear for the future that prevented them ; probably it was both. But they did not dissolve. They made an attempt to dissolve. They travelled through the country, and the people went out to see them ; but I do not remember any places breaking down with the great numbers who went to see them. I believe they had brass bands, but the combines paid for them. The people were not very spontaneous ; I fancy that is the reason we have had a session, and have had the opportunity of listening to speeches from the hon. gentlemen. Now, I would like to call attention to a little of their past record. The Government have thrown away

On Tupper's "Dear Onderdonk".....	$ 1,118,000
On the Tay Canal, familiarly known as "Haggart's Ditch".....	476,000
On the Caraquet Railway.....	240,000

On Little Rapids Lock—a useless work, which has no traffic and yields no revenue	$ 125,000
On the Galops Rapids Channel, which shipping men will not use on account of its danger	600,000
Dredging West Basin—contrary to terms of contract	22,500
Allowed to be stolen in connection with the Quebec Harbour Commission, over	1,000,000
In connection with the Lévis Graving Dock	139,000
The Cross Wall contract	92,000
Esquimalt Graving Dock (this being more than the amount of the tender)	207,000
In connection with Curran Bridge, over	270,000
Paid to the "Hard Pan" claimants, to which they had no legal right	272,000
Harris land job at St. John's	100,000
Sheik's Island Dam	125,000
St. Mary's Bridge, Fredericton	372,000
Langevin Block (cost less than $500,000, and for which over $781,000 was paid—$281,000; and there is an outstanding claim of $250,000)	531,000
Wasted, stolen or boodled on the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial Railway	1,500,000

These items, not adding up standing claim on the Langevin Block, amount to over $7,000,000. Then there was the Liquor Commission, $125,000, for the purpose of shirking and putting to one side the prohibition question. But I will stop here. I am getting tired, and I think the country is getting tired of these scandals, and I will not read any more of them. The hon. Secretary of State said something about sugar. He spoke of the sugar of Germany being sent into England. The Germans pay a bounty to the sugar refiners, which enables them to sell sugar abroad at a very low rate. When Lord Salisbury was Premier of England, the English importers brought from Germany into England some cheap sugar, and the refiners went to Lord Salisbury and told him that this was going to ruin their industry, and asked him to put a duty on sugar. They said to him, "The Germans can sell sugar cheaper than we can make it." Lord Salisbury asked: "Who is going to be hurt by that? If the people get cheaper sugar, they will have more money to spend on other things." And he would not put a duty on sugar. What did the English sugar manufacturers do? They manufactured goods into which sugar entered, and they shipped those goods to Germany and made more money by doing that than they would have made under any policy of protection. The Conservative Premier of England had sufficient backbone to stand up against any combine. When the Colonial Conference sat in this city, and one of the delegates suggested that sugar might be admitted free into Canada, the Minister of Finance appeared to be greatly shocked, he thought it would be a terrible thing if our people were to get cheap sugar. Now, when the times have been hard and the prices low, what have our Government done? They have tried to delude the people with the idea that they were developing trade with other countries. They subsidized a line of steamers to the West Indies, they have paid the subsidy for a number of years; and yet I believe, in spite of all this the trade is diminishing. They subsidized a line of steamers to Australia to the tune of $125,000 a year, for what purpose? To bring to Canada Australian products to enter in to competition with the products of the farmers of this country. The Australians can supply frozen mutton at 2 cents a pound to an unlimited extent; and the Government are taking the farmers' own money and using it for the purpose of promoting competition with their own productions. Now, I do not believe in that. I believe in freedom, but I do not believe in using the money of the people to bring in goods in competition with their own productions. I remember that when the Premier went to Australia with the view of establishing trade relations, the first inquiry the Australians made was about the condition of our tariff. They told him that it was impossible, with our tariff to get up a trade with this country. That is the obstacle hon. gentlemen meet wherever they go. Let them vote as many subsidies as they like, until they take down the tariff, and make it a reasonable tariff, they cannot possibly increase our trade with foreign countries.

If we had a lower tariff people could live more easily and employers could afford to pay higher wages. The protective tariff has lowered wages in the United States. As soon as the Wilson Bill came into force, the Carnegie works started up, and they have raised the wages of their employees 10 per cent. The lower tariff gives the people a chance, and that is the very thing that will help Canada. You may tinker at the tariff and reform it as much as you please; but as long as you maintain the protective principle, you prevent the welfare and prosperity of Canada. There is no use of the Secretary of State saying that he is in favour of Britain, while he supports a policy such as this. Our policy is a revenue tariff policy. We believe we shall live to see the same policy in Canada that they have in England, and when that is the case a prosperity will be assured to Canada such as no other land enjoys. We will have a future such as our great resources entitle us to expect. The only way to achieve that is by extending our commerce and not by striving to bribe people with us. Let us make it their interests to trade with us, and then that trade will develop. I will not take up any more of your time. I am anxious to see the policy of this Government changed. Look at the policy of England. Formerly it was protective. By whom was it changed? It was changed by Sir Robert Peel. If the present Government would follow his example and change their policy, they would do some-

thing that would endear them to Canada, that would contribute to the growth of Canada, and give our railways employment. What is the use of impeding the traffic of our railways and causing their revenues to fall off, from year to year, when they should be increasing. Give the railways a chance, give every industry a chance, and then hon. gentlemen opposite will be worthy of their high position. What are the names that adorn the commercial pages of English history to-day? They are Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, and John Bright. Those names stand forth as the greatest in the commercial history of England and deservedly so, and England to-day is, in consequence of the policy these men advocated, greater than any nation in the world. People may carp, her colonies may growl, the Ministers in the Dominion Government may decry her resources and speak of her condition as one of decline and decay, but she is to-day the proud mistress of the world. She has more trade and commerce than any two countries in the world together; and so long as British intelligence and British spirit and British fair-play and justice continue, so long will Great Britain hold her present pre-eminence.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) The House need not fear lest, at such a late hour, I should intend to make a speech. No, Mr. Speaker, I have only a few observations to make and they will not be lengthy. The hon. member who has just sat down deemed it his duty to cause the House to laugh, and he succeeded in this. In fact, the Opposition were in need of being cheered up, for it was plain that anything but a feeling of liveliness was stamped on their features, after the hard, and so well directed, blows dealt them by the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Montague.) The hon. Minister had spread terror amongst them, and they were in need of being brightened up. They could not find a better man for such a task than the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I will just say a few words in reply to the speech we have just heard, and I will next refer to the tariff question. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) made a quotation which was found very humorous with respect to the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Montague.) He stated that if the quotation should be offensive to the hon. Minister, it was no fault of his. The hon. gentleman could have dispensed with it, for if we were willing to follow him in that line, we could quote the newspaper "Le Canadien," and I rather think the hon. leader of the Opposition would not find such quotations very humorous. So it is just as well to leave such things alone. The hon. gentleman stated he was quoting from a Conservative paper. Should this be the case, what would it amount to? There is no intelligent man in this country who does not believe that the hon. Secretary of State is popular. There is no important paper having anything like a circulation in Ontario that would dare to write such things after the election which has just taken place in the county of Haldimand. Any kind of national and religious prejudices were stirred up during that contest, and yet the hon. Minister was returned by a majority such as he never received in that county. All they could find was a little paper with no importance whatever, edited in a remote part of Ontario, a paper such as we call in our province a cabbage leaf, to abuse the hon. Secretary of State, and think it was very witty when it was only silly. The hon. member for South Grey thought he was playing a good trick by reading that extract to the House. The hon. gentleman also said: I am anxious to see the Government change their policy. He was wrong there. He is rather "anxious to see the Government unwilling to change their policy," for, in his opinion, should the Government decline to change their policy, he hopes his party will come into power at the next election. The gentlemen opposite are in hopes that the Conservative policy will be put aside at the next election and that they will cross to this side of the House. The hon. gentleman did not speak out his mind. Now, a few words in reference to the general discussion. For three weeks we have been discussing this protective tariff question, and although I have been following the debate very closely, I have not been able yet to make up what the fiscal policy of the Liberal party is; in other words, I could not understand what they mean by a tariff for revenue. After waiting weeks and weeks for explanations, likely to satisfy me and satisfy the country and this House, we had at last the good fortune to hear the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who told us what a tariff for revenue was. He explained it in eloquent words. However, he was less clear-sighted than the other members of his party who have spoken so far, for he made statements to which they would not commit themselves. There is no common sense man who does not understand that a tariff for revenue is nothing else than a free-trade tariff, or free trade, pure and simple, that is to say, it means the doing away with customs and any custom barriers between our country and foreign countries. But all this is said and done for one single purpose, that of luring the voters. The Liberal party talk about the adoption of a tariff for revenue, and they keep that plank on their platform not only in order to win popular favours, but also to cause the people to believe that should this party come into power, we would have reciprocity with the United States. There is no one in the whole Dominion who is not in favour of more extended trade relations with the United States, providing fair, reasonable and honourable terms might be arranged for both countries. But, say the Liberals: We will let the Ameri-

cans in with their goods and perhaps they will then grant us some concessions. But before allowing the Americans to come and sell their goods here, I would like to know whether the United States would grant us commercial advantages equal to those we would give her. During these last years, our Ministers went on several occasions to Washington for the purpose of negotiating with the American Government a reciprocity treaty on a fair basis. The Americans would never agree to it. These attempts were made by Conservative as well as Liberal Ministers, and they all came back without obtaining anything. I think the people in the United States would not give their consent to the repeal of their tariff in order to enlarge their trade with Canada or merely to please the Liberal party. Was the greatest President the United States ever had, one of the most distinguished men who ever occupied the position of President in the neighbouring Republic, Mr. Cleveland, the leader of the Democratic party, when he laid down his policy—oh! not a free-trade policy, but only a slight decrease in the duties on some goods —was he followed by his party? Although the President's platform was only partially agreed to, what has happened? In the election that followed, were not the Democratic party crushed to the ground wherever they had to come before the people? And we may say without any fear of being mistaken, that at the next general election, the Republican party will sweep the country from one end to the other, as never it did before. And they would have us believe that the Republican party, protectionist as it is, will remove the customs barriers and allow the gentlemen opposite, if we would let them into power, to make a reciprocity treaty to the whole advantage of Canada! When we had duties amounting to 17½ per cent, what amount of duty did the United States levy on goods imported from Canada? No less than 35 per cent, and even 100 per cent in some cases; we could not sell them the least quantity of almost all the goods they were selling us. Now, since nearly three years, that is to say since the beginning of the commercial depression, without the protective tariff made and kept up by the Conservatives, in spite of the Liberals, in what condition would our business stand to-day? Who will deny that all our cities, even our humblest villages in Canada, would have been overloaded with American goods of all kinds, grains, animals, carriages, agricultural implements of all kinds, offered for sale at low prices, in order to secure our money and take it away across the line, leaving us with our manufactures shut down, our industries ruined, our trade bankrupt, our banks if not bankrupt, at least doing no business whatever, our farmers unable to sell their goods, blue ruin in our towns as well as in our country-places, as was the case under the Mackenzie Administration? Who will deny this? Yes, Mr. Speaker, if Canada, without being too much affected, was able to get over the financial depression which caused such ruin in the country to the south of us, it was solely due to the wisdom, prudence and foresight of our Conservative statesmen. Even now, with a protective tariff, do not the American goods come to our markets? Have we not in Montreal big stores of carriages and furniture of American make? They pay the duties and sell at low prices their surplus goods, so as to compete with our own goods. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Because there prevails in the United States a commercial and industrial depression, because the banks there are bankrupt and the manufacturers close their doors. They must sell their goods at any price, in order to have money and lay hold on our market. You can buy at half price goods which cost $1 in the United States, and which our manufacturers can sell at 90 cents, because the Americans are in this position that they have to sell in any case. They are in the position of the debtor who, seeing himself greatly embarrassed, sells his stock at any price and tries to make some money. When he has succeeded, he pockets the money and says to his creditors: Do what you like with the rest, I keep what I have. Now, they say, and it is the strongest argument of the Liberals on the hustings: It is you, the people, who pay all these taxes and if you had no protective tariff, you would pay no taxes. The tariff is the cause of all this, and the Conservative party are leading you to ruin. The hon. member for Richelieu stated here, some days ago, that there had been last winter in Quebec and Montreal, meetings of labourers dying with hunger. And he added: Yet, they have the protective tariff which was to give them bread. Well, such a state of affairs is easily understood, and I am going to explain it at once. In the first place, a meeting was advertised in Montreal, and the party who advertised it has just been called a defaulter by the Liberals of the Montreal city council, for all the dirty little business of the Liberal party was done by him for a few dollars.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) To whom do you refer?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I will give you his name in a little while; but if you want to know his name, just ask it of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel) who thus qualified him, the other evening, at the city council. So they gave him a few dollars; he called a meeting at the corner of Ontario and Amherst streets; two persons went there, he himself and another. A fortnight later, after he had made much ado about the first meeting, saying it was

too cold and people were too poor to get conveniently dressed to attend it, another meeting was called; it was attended by about fifteen persons. Fifteen persons he had picked up, from one hotel to another, bringing them with him. They did not consider themselves beaten, for the Liberals said: This is the time, we will soon have a general election, let us stir up the people. So a third meeting was held and the watchword having been given, this particular individual, who is not a labourer but merely a collector, having gone from house to house, he succeeded in bringing in a large number of people; they loudly cried that there was no work. But Providence, which always favours honest people, lent its aid to the Conservatives. Two days later, a big snow-storm, which lasted forty-eight hours, fell upon the city. The corporation made a call for all men of good will who were looking for work. How many came forward? About five hundred, the others being already at work were not willing to come and claim any other work. And yet it was said that the whole population of Montreal was without work or bread. Some time afterwards, it was advertised in the papers that the corporation was engaging some more people. How many came forward? About thirty-two. It is true there has been less work in Montreal this year, but the population was not with out bread. Who, however, does not remember that five or six years ago, the Hon. Mr. McShane came to the City Hall escorted by about two hundred persons provided with shovels and picks and asking for work? We were then again on the eve of a local election, it was a good time to go rabbling. I stated a moment ago that the Liberals were saying to the people from every husting: Do not trust the Conservatives, they deceive you; it is you who are paying the taxes, and the tariff they impose is enriching the manufacturers. But why should not the Liberals mention the goods on which farmers are paying taxes? I have often considered that question, and I have come to the conclusion that they are only paying such taxes as they are willing to pay. I will say why. What amount of taxes does the farmer pay on wheat, flour, cheese, butter, eggs, tea, coffee, in fact on anything which he uses on his table? None whatever. He does not pay a cent by way of taxes on the timber he uses in the building of his house or his vehicles, nor on his wood fuel. What amount of taxes does he pay on the leather with which he makes his boots and shoes and harness? Not a cent again. On what then does he pay taxes? The Liberals say he is paying some, it must be true, for they never lie. He does not pay any on wool or cloths such as are manufactured in the county of l'Assomption. On the clothes he wears from head to foot, he does not pay any duty to the Government; he can live twenty years without paying any duty to the state. The tariff now in force is therefore judicious and well conceived. It has made the fortune of Canada since the overthrow of the Liberals. Now, I will say when the farmer pays taxes: it is when he wants to drink whisky. It is proper that he should pay some then. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain)—perhaps he does not drink, perhaps he does belong to a society of teetotallers—has reproached the Government the other evening with having imposed an additional duty of from ten to twenty cents on whisky. Well, I believe the less whisky will the farmer, the workingman and ourselves drink, the better it will be for us all. The farmer who drinks whisky ruins his health, shortens his life and sometimes disgraces himself. If he wishes to wear fine clothes and a nice beaver-hat, let him pay taxes. But he is at liberty not to pay any. I will be told perhaps that he is paying duty on his sugar: it is true, but it only amounts to a dollar and a quarter a year, and he is satisfied with paying it, for he may now buy, for two cents and a half or three cents a pound, the common unrefined sugar that was selling at ten cents under the Liberal regime. And he may now buy for four cents a pound a superior grade of sugar which was then selling at twelve cents a pound. The farmer is satisfied with his condition. He well knows that if he should lose confidence in the Government and turn back to the Liberals, he would witness the recurrence of the hard times that occurred between 1874 and 1878. The manufactures would shut down and with a tariff for revenue, he would have to pay taxes to the extent of nine million dollars over what he now pays. Thirty-six millions are required to manage the public affairs. The Liberals acknowledge it. It is admitted by "Le Temps," their Ottawa mouthpiece. Here is what that paper said on the 20th May instant:

> In our opinion, should Mr. Laurier come into power to-morrow, he should continue to these industries a reasonable protection against outside competition.
>
> It is true the annual expenditure makes it an obligation for the Liberals to renounce for the present their free trade policy.

Further on, this paper adds the following significant words:—

> Besides our pledged word, which would be violated, any sudden change in the fiscal policy would cause a commercial disturbance, the effects of which would surely be disastrous.
>
> The legitimate industry has, therefore, nothing to fear from the coming of the Liberals into power, since in this respect they are one with the present Government.

The newspaper "Le Temps" continues in that strain, but I will read no more of it now.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Read, read.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) You have got time to read the whole editorial. I will send you the file of the paper and you may read as much of it as you like. Now, they say they wish to establish a tariff for revenue, because it is the only chance we have to ever obtain more advantageous trade relations with the United States, and what are they telling us in connection with this? Just think of a people of five million souls trading with a people of seventy millions, what a god-send, what a good fortune it should be for us! It would be very nice, indeed, if the Americans should allow our goods to come in free, but would they do it? We would be willing that they would not be. And even were we to throw our doors wide open, they would grant us no advantage in return; on the contrary, they would seek to sell us at higher prices, after ruining our own industry. But let us consider this further and see if we could buy at cheaper rates if we had more extended trade relations with the United States. I have here the market prices obtaining in the state of New York on the 18th May, 1895. Let us see if our agricultural produce, for instance, would reach higher prices in the United States than they do now in Canada. On the 18th May, at Albany, New York State, cattle were sold for $6 or $6.50 per hundred pounds. Butter and cheese—and we all know the Americans could never sell their cheese at as high a price as we sell our own, because they have yet to learn how to make it as good—were sold at cheaper prices than our own butter and cheese. But there can be no doubt that if we had the trade relations referred to by the Liberals, the Americans would send their cheese here to injure our own; there can be no doubt either that they would ship through our country the worst part of their cheese, so as to be able to sell it in England as Canadian cheese, for the Canadian cheese realizes on the British markets from one to one and a half cents more than American cheese. At Albany, a good milch-cow sells at from thirty-five to forty dollars, and we all know that a good milch-cow cannot be had in Canada for that price. Butter is sold at from 18 to 20 cents a pound, and so on. Oats, from 33 to 35 cents, while at Montreal it is worth $1.08, or 54 cents a bushel.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Oh! oh!

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Rouville ought to know that I was giving the price by the bag. I could quote the whole list of market prices, that is to say for such articles as are mentioned, but it would take too much time.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) How is it the Government sold their butter for 16 cents a pound?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I am coming to that, if you would only give me a chance. We are told by the Liberals on the hustings: But the protective tariff has caused an increase in the price of goods needed by the farmers. Thus the farmer is compelled to pay more for his agricultural implements. Such is the contention of the Liberals. They cannot bring any evidence in support of it, but they go repeating it so often that in the long run well-intended people are made by them to believe that there must be some truth in such statements. To make their statements appear true, they say to the farmers: Iron costs so much more, owing to the tariff of the Conservatives. It is iron that causes the increase in the price of your agricultural implements. All this is false. Manufactured iron is cheaper now than formerly, and you can have on the Montreal market nails for 2 cents, and manufactured iron for 2 cents a pound, or $2 a hundred pounds,—steel for 2½ cents, while under the Mackenzie tariff the cost of these same goods was larger than this. I took the trouble to consult one of our largest manufacturers, Mr. Moodey, of Terrebonne, in this respect. We all know that this gentleman manufactures agricultural implements and sells his goods all over Ontario, and in almost every city in Canada. Now, in 1877, a mower cost $80, and in 1895 the very same mower costs $45. An harvester, in 1877, cost $120, while in 1895, you can have it for $65. A horse rake cost, in 1878, $38, while in 1894 you could have it for $21. In 1878, a binder cost $275, while in 1894-95 you can buy one for $117. The same difference is to be found in the price of any implement used by the farmer in the cultivation of his land. Notwithstanding that, you will find Liberals who will say that the protective tariff of the Conservatives has caused an increase in the price of these goods. In 1877-78, these agricultural implements cost much more than now, and please observe, Mr. Speaker, that you had to buy them from the Americans. Our money went to the United States while now it remains in Canada, and is given to our Canadian labourers and mechanics. Notwithstanding the important fact for the farmers that these same agricultural implements are much cheaper than under the Liberal rule, thanks to protection, we keep our money in this country and we now supply the farming community with implements much cheaper than formerly. It was said in the county of L'Assomption that the tariff now in force had much increased the prices. In order to show the contrary, I beg to give a list of articles in use among the farmers. Let us begin by the tools and building material:

Articles.	1878.	1894.
Steel shovels	$ 1 56	$ 0 55
do spades	1 56	0 55
Pick, with handle	1 88	0 75
Hoe	0 75	0 25
Gardening rake	0 88	0 25

Hay scythe	1 13	0 50
Grain scythe	1 63	0 60
Three-pronged fork	0 81	0 40
Two-pronged fork	0 56	0 30
D.H. four-pronged dung forks	1 25	0 60
S.H. do do	1 13	0 50
Earth-borer	2 18	1 00
Steel grain shovel	1 63	0 75
Hay cutters	1 38	0 75
Axes	1 25	0 65
Door-locks and handles (doz.)	5 00	2 15
White lead	0 11¼	0 08
Putty	0 05	0 02¼
Hammers	1 13	0 25
Horse-shoes (barrel)	5 00	3 75
Horse-shoe nails (box)	0 31 lb	0 09½

Let us now take articles of home consumption. We will find, to say the least, as large a decrease in the prices:

Articles.	1878.	1894.
Granulated sugar	$ 0 11⅞	$0 04¾
Green tea	0 50	0 20
Black tea	0 56	0 20
Japan tea	0 44	0 20
Rice	0 05½	0 04
Molasses	0 35	0 40
Grapes	0 08	0 08
Soap	0 04¾	0 04
Starch	0 06¾	0 06
Java coffee	0 37½	0 25
Cod (lb.)	0 06¼	0 05
Tapioca	0 11½	0 08
Sago	0 08	0 07½
Candles	0 14½	0 12½
Chewing tobacco	0 54	0 55

I may point out that a duty of 6 cents a pound on tea had been imposed by the Mackenzie Government, and was repealed by the present Government. The same decrease is noticeable in the prices of cloth, stuffs, cotton goods, wearing apparel and underwear, as shown by the following figures:

Articles.	1878.	1894.
Gray cottons	$ 0 08¾	$ 0 05
Coarse sheeting	0 18	0 12½
Cotton goods	*	0 15
Gray flannel	0 37½	0 20
English cotton prints	0 14¾	0 10
Canadian cotton prints	*	0 09¾
All wool Canadian tweeds	0 74	0 25 @ 0 50
Canadian union tweeds	0 50	0 20 @ 0 30
Canadian cloth tweeds	0 69	0 35 @ 0 40
Cloth pants	2 19	0 90 upw'ds.
Complete suit of clothes	9 38	5 00 "
Complete suit of tweed	12 50	3 00 "
Union wool shirts and drawers	0 39	0 25
Common gray wool	0 78	0 50
Coarse gray wool	0 94	0 60

* Not manufactured in Canada.

I could go on giving figures such as these for a long while, but I think I have given enough.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I suppose it is for the same reason that the population of the county of l'Assomption has decreased in number?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) If the hon. member would wait a moment, I will come to that. Let us now see what the case is with shoes. The following table shows what the decrease was under a protective tariff:

Articles.	1878.	1894.
Boots and shoes (buff leather)—		
Balmoral, for men	$2 28	$1 00 @ $1 25
do for ladies	1 25	0 75
do for children	1 10	0 50

I see that this enumeration causes some hon. gentlemen opposite to laugh, more especially those who are married. I must say I would not know these prices, had they not been given me by a merchant. And the married people among the hon. members ought to rejoice at the fact that the protective tariff has caused a decrease in the price of shoes, for I am told that women wear out a good deal of them. The hon. member for Richelieu, following the example of his leaders, rather made use of the great name of the Conservative leaders in order to excuse the policy of the Liberals. He stated Sir George Cartier was a free-trader. And in support of that contention, he quoted a few words from a speech delivered by this statesman on the 23rd December, 1871. If the hon. member for Richelieu had taken his quotation a few lines further, he would have found that the principles of the Conservative party are the same now as those professed by Cartier and the other Conservative leaders. Here is what Sir George Etienne Carter then said in Quebec:—

> You cannot establish any traffic with foreign nations if they do not want any. The Quebec manufacturers often ask to be protected to the utmost. It is a preposterous proposition, as much so as are extreme ideas in connection with free trade. This last system compels you to pay to the Government by way of a direct tax the same duties as before. With unlimited protection you strike a fatal blow at the foreign trade. We have decided to impose a revenue duty that will give at the same time a sufficient protection, reserving our right to change our fiscal policy according to circumstances. Mr. Stephens asked us to protect the home production against foreign competition, but we must not go too far in this direction. Should we give an excessive protection to manufacturers, they could only dispose of their goods in their own country.

Such was the policy of Sir G. Cartier, whose loss we are still mourning. Such was the policy of the late Sir John Macdonald, of Sir John Thompson and it is the very policy we have now. We do not change. We are for a protective tariff that shall protect the farmers, the manufacturers and any other class of the community. If I were to follow the example of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) some one might feel sorry for it, but I will only quote the words uttered by the hon. leader of the Opposition on the 9th November, 1871, in reply to the Speech from the Throne:

It is now, Sir, a good many years since the great patriot whom we recently lost, the Hon. L. J. Papineau, casting about for a remedy for the ills of the times, summed up his policy on the subject in this simple precept: "We should buy nothing from the metropolis." My opinion is that this policy is even more urgent to-day than it was when first formulated.

It is a duty, especially for us Canadians of French origin, to create a national industry. We are surrounded by a strong and vigorous race, who are endowed with a devouring activity, and have taken possesion of the entire universe as their field of labour.

I am not going to quote the considerations these words suggested to the hon. member for L'Islet, in "Le Canadien" of the 4th September, 1878: they are too offensive to the leader of the Opposition for me to repeat them. Very likely, had the member for Richelieu been aware of these offensive words of the hon. member for L'Islet, he would not have concluded his speech, the other day, by such a pompous praise of the leader of the Opposition. For my part, I am willing to admit that the hon. leader of the Opposition is worthy of compliments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Before saying "hear, hear," the hon. gentlemen opposite had better read the observations made by the hon. member for L'Islet, to which I have referred; they might possibly change their opinion as regards the leader of the Opposition. Has protection increased or decreased our sales in foreign countries? Has the protective tariff established by the Conservative party had the effect of causing our imports and exports to increase or decrease? If it resulted in a decrease in our imports, then I say protection is a benefit for our country. But if on the other hand it resulted in their increase, then I say it is a policy that is far from being satisfactory. Let us examine a few figures bearing on that point. In 1878, we imported for consumption 2,071,513 bushels of oats valued at $565,141. In 1893, owing to the protective tariff, we only bought 44,264 bushels, representing a value of $19,886, or a decrease of 2,027,249 bushels and $545,255, which money remained in this country to its whole advantage. Now, what about wheat? We imported, in 1878, 1,519,703 bushels of American wheat and 311,706 bushels of American flour, while in 1893, we only bought from the Americans 9,069 bushels of wheat and 34,507 bushels of flour, or a difference in favour of protection, of 1,510,634 bushels of wheat and 277,199 bushels of flour. I say that under such circumstances the protective tariff is a benefit for the country and I prove it by these figures. It is unquestionable, therefore, that through such a tariff we have been useful to the country. I will give some more figures, Mr. Speaker. In 1878, we bought 110,228 bushels of rye, and in 1893, we only imported 302 bushels. In 1878, we imported 227,572 bushels of Indian flour, and in 1893, 65,495 only. In 1878, we imported 2,345,807 pounds of lard and in 1893, 147,885. In 1878, we imported 10,248,020 pounds of pork and in 1893, 3,862,546 pounds only. Now, a few words with respect to the cheese industry. It is only a few years old, and I fancy the Liberals still remember with what eagerness at the outset, they ridiculed the Conservative candidates who declared themselves in favour of proper measures to develop and promote the dairy industry in this country. These were called the butter and cheese candidates and they were made a laughing stock by the Liberals. However, the dairy industry has prospered; in 1894, we sold 5,334,621 pounds of butter valued at $1,045,538; and we sold cheese to the amount of $15,450,000 in round figures. In spite of the Liberals, this industry has ever since been and is still existing and prospering. We find them now laughing at, and throwing ridicule upon, the endeavours made by the Quebec Government to establish this industry on a firm basis. They have now called the Conservative party an agricultural machine. Whenever they have to deliver a speech, they never fail to refer to the Quebec Government as the agricultural machine of the province of Quebec. They even go to the length of dissuading the farmers from attending the agricultural conferences held through the efforts of that government, and listening to the good advice that may be given them by an honest government, such as the Quebec Government is, a government working in the interest of the province. The Liberals advise their friends not to attend these meetings which are so beneficial to the farming community. But the people who always clearly perceive the difference there is between the Liberals, who merely work for their party, and the Conservatives who have only in view the general interests of the country, are almost unanimously siding with the Conservatives. But, in spite of the propagandism made by my hon. friends the Liberals among the farmers to prevent them from attending these agricultural conferences, the farmers go there and are attentive to the knowledge which is imparted to them. They thus learn how studiously the Conservative party are exerting themselves to cause to be profitable to them the various farm industries. The hon. member for Richelieu himself tried, without succeeding, however, to throw ridicule upon the endeavours made by this Government to introduce our butter on the English market when he said: The Government has entered into the small butter business. Anything the Conservatives are doing in the interest of the farmers is ridiculed by the Liberals. It is their way of favouring the agricultural interests. I had the advantage on several occasions to attend these agricultural conferences and I had the pleasure to meet there good Liberals of the county

of L'Assomption, honest people surely, who are intent above all to remain Canadians without troubling themselves much about being Liberals or Conservatives, but who want to judge by themselves the worth of the principles of the political parties. I may say that there is a considerable change, and my hon. friends opposite will experience it at the next election. The Liberals are going to be greatly disappointed, for many country voters are now reasoning the public questions, and the Liberal party will experience thereby a decrease in the number of their friends. Moreover, they will not be supported this time by an organization which was very useful to them at the last general election, they will not have the financial support they got from the Quebec tolls under the Mercier Government. This party is ruined and bankrupt, and the Liberal party will have no such funds at the next election as they had at the last general election. As several hon. members, more especially among the hon. gentlemen opposite, wish to address the House and have lengthy speeches to deliver, I will shorten my remarks. In 1890, the farmers who devoted themselves to the raising of hogs complained to the Government that the Americans were shipping pork here in too large quantities, to their great detriment. The Government increased the duties from 1 cent to 1½ cents on barrelled pork, and from 2 to 3 cents on bacon and ham. The following change has occurred. In 1890, we imported

	Quantity.	Value.
Pork	$17,185,794	$ 832,353
Hams and bacon	4,353,653	324,926
Lard	4,881,786	301,007
Total	26,421,233	1,458,286

In 1893, we imported the same goods to the following extent :

	Quantity.	Value.
Pork	$ 3,862,546	$ 272,460
Bacon and hams	670,155	76,008
Lard	146,885	12,620
Total	4,679,486	361,088

Or a decrease in the imports for these three years, of 21,741,747 pounds and $1,097,198. We were told by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in an eloquent speech, that the population had much decreased since the last census. According to his statement, all the manufactures in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were closed. I am willing to believe it ; but it must be observed that since that time the Liberals have been ruling all these provinces. To induce the people to stay in the country, the Liberal Government of Prince Edward Island has passed a charming Act intituled "An Act respecting Taxes." In Nova Scotia the Liberals came into power in 1884 ; in 1883, the expenditure of the province amounted to $541,099 ; in 1892, it had reached $822,462. In 1884, the province had a debt amounting to $1,014,744. In 1893, it amounted to $3,142,922. In New Brunswick the Liberals came into power in 1883. In 1882, the expenditure was $614,236 ; in 1893, it was $696,000. In 1883, the debt amounted to $1,268,272 ; in 1893, it had reached $2,752,297. In Manitoba, the Liberals took the reins of office in January, 1888. In 1887, the expenditure was $520,190 ; in 1894, it had reached $632,000. In 1887, the debt was $2,229,106 ; in 1893, it had increased to $4,398,259. It is quite easy to understand why the people leave these provinces. The province of Prince Edward Island, which has suffered the longest Liberal rule, was, after making colossal and useless expenditures, after allowing boodling, compelled last year to pass an Act to impose land taxes. Does the hon. member for Queen's think that a land tax is a good way to retain the population in the province ? Does he think the Liberals are welcome to complain that the people of Prince Edward Island are leaving the province ? Following is the tax imposed in 1894 by the legislature of Prince Edward Island :—1. On any land not exceeding on an average a value of five dollars an acre, one cent per acre ; 2. On lands valued at from $5 to $10 an acre, two cents per acre ; 3. On lands valued at from $10 to $15 an acre, three cents per acre ; 4. On lands valued at from $15 to $20 an acre, four cents per acre ; 5. On lands valued at from $20 to $25 an acre, five cents per acre ; 6. And lastly, on any land valued at more than $25 an acre, six cents per acre. And that under penalty of imprisonment. This tax also affects the lots not valued by the acre. Thus, any lot of the value of $250 pays a tax of fifty cents, and under an ascending progression, a lot worth from $500 to $1,000 pays two dollars, and a lot the value of which exceeds $2,500 pays a tax of $6. This Act goes further still ; it imposes a tax on revenue of one cent in the dollar on any yearly revenue exceeding $300. Should the official collector have any doubts as to the valuation made by the owner, he is empowered to put him under oath and he can have the land valued by an appraiser selected by himself. This is how the Liberals treat the people and they next come here and bewail their fate, contending that the people are over-burdened with taxes by the Conservatives. It is true taxes were imposed in the province of Quebec, but is it not equally true it was the result of the bad administration of the Liberal party during the time they ruled that province ? I hope no one will deny that. The hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) referred to corruption which, he said, the Conservative party had indulged into on a large scale. He referred to the scandal of the Curran bridge and some other things. If there is a party who should not talk about corruption and scandals, it is truly the Liberal party. I do not say the Conservative party are

quite faultless in this respect. Unhappily some such errors always creep in, but is it to be wondered at? Take the least of our municipal corporations, do not reprehensible things happen sometimes within them? On the other hand, the public are somewhat used to utter cries of scandal! for the least thing. You will find people crying out: Thieves! plunder! for the expenditure of one dollar or a dollar and a half they think excessive. In the least of our parishes where public affairs are nevertheless well managed, you will not fail to find people who, in connection with an expenditure of one hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars, made by the municipal council with the most scrupulous honesty, will cry out: Thieves! plunder! and boodling! Is it to be wondered at that the Conservatives, who have held power for at least 25 years, should be charged in the same way by their opponents? It will be found perhaps that some mistakes have occurred. Well, the Ministers are not made impeccable by the fact that they are Ministers; they belong to humanity just as they did before, notwithstanding their title of Ministers of the Crown. When we set ourselves to the bringing out afresh of the scandals that occurred under the Mackenzie Government, so as to compare them with those charged to the Conservative party, we were told by the hon. gentlemen opposite that it was ancient history, that it went back to years gone by. But we cannot charge the Liberals with anything else, for the simple reason that they are connected with past times, that their party belongs to ancient history. The Liberal party has been so long in opposition and the present Government so long into power, that we are compelled to go back to ancient history, in order to find out what happened at the time our hon. friends opposite were into power. The Liberal party through its wrong principles has stayed so long in Opposition that its administrative faults belong to ancient history. When the Liberal speakers are addressing public meetings, they try to have it believed by the voters that they are anxious for the public good, while in their inner souls they only wish to put their hands in the public treasury, and we all know what use they make of the public money when unfortunately it is put under their control. They promise to decrease the taxes, to decrease the expenditure and they know that such a cry may perhaps win some people over to their side, for there are hard times now and then and lands do not yield as much as one would like. But there is no political platform in all this. When we ask them what their policy is, they reply that their policy is that of Lafontaine, of Cartier, but they never mention that of their own leaders. I presume they never refer to it because it belongs to ancient history. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who speaks so well, who is delivering such fine speeches, stated when addressing a meeting in the county of L'Assomption, which I have the honour to represent, that he was following the policy of Sir Louis Hypolite Lafontaine, the great Liberal leader. In support of his statement, he said that the Liberal party it was who had abolished the seigniorial rights. Now, what is the truth? Papineau, the true Liberal leader, who was opposing Lafontaine, delivered a speech in the course of which he stated that those who were working for the abolition of seigniorial rights were mere seekers of popularity. As you see, there are many among the Liberals who resort to ancient history, notwithstanding the reproach they proffer against us. Examine the actions of this party, from year to year, and you will be satisfied they are always acting contrary to the promises made by them before their coming into power. They are always opposed to the people's rights when it comes to protecting the farmers and promoting national industries and they oppose any measure that may tend to that end. It is so in small things as well as in important matters. At L'Assomption, the hon. leader of the Opposition, referring to the past, qualified Lafontaine, "our great leader," while in Quebec he stated that when opposing confederation as he did, he was following his leaders, Messrs. Dorion and others, for he believed that they were right, but now that confederation has been established since 1867, owing to the Conservatives, Sir George Cartier is a great statesman. Whatever the Liberals may be doing, we are confronted with the names of the Conservative leaders. They know that our leaders are honourable men and that we, Conservatives, respect them not only after their death, but during their life-time. If they are worthy of such respect, if they deserve to be pointed out to the voters, to the farmers, to the habitant—it is a title I like to assume, for I have been and I am still a habitant—it is because, after all, the Conservative party and its leaders have worked for the progress of the country, although some of them may have been wanting in their duty. Who is it that has carried out all the great public works that are the admiration of foreigners, and even the Liberals, if not the Conservatives? When hardly a few years ago, they set to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Liberals went on saying: The Pacific, what a folly! It will not even pay the grease required to lubricate the wheels of their cars! It was hardly built that it gave a large revenue, and the Liberals then exclaimed: The Pacific, why! we knew ourselves it would be a fire affair, and when the Conservatives came into power, they took over our work half done. Yet, what had they done? A section by canoe, another by boat and the rest——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) On foot.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation. And the rest on foot. Now, I have done.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) What is the population of the county of L'Assomption, you have not told that yet ?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) If you will only wait a moment, I will say a word about that. I am now going to quote a few lines from a writing due to the pen of one of your good friends, one of the best bosom friends of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He will just tell us what the Liberal party is. It is quoted from "Le Canadien," under date 14th November, 1877. He was at that time opposed to the corruption. He called the Liberal party, the hypocrisy party. Perhaps he was mistaken :

> The Liberal party has been termed the organized hypocrisy party. Never was a more exact word uttered ; never was a stigma of shame more deserved. The Liberals have shown themselves to be hypocrites in anything. They cried out, "Corruption !" against their opponents, and the courts of justice have revealed to the country the incredible venality of these so-called pure people. They cried out : "Waste of public money !" and when in power they wantonly increased the expenditure.

I could quote much more ; I have a whole collection of this kind.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Who wrote that ?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) It is quoted from "Le Canadien" of 1877, then the property of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Are the Liberals protectionists ? Some are. It was shown by them last year. When the tariff was discussed in this House, we found the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), a free-trader, asking that coal oil be protected. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) claimed protection for the manufacturers of biscuits and jellies. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) claimed the same thing for pork. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wished the vegetables to be protected. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) claimed protection for beet-root sugar ; the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) claimed it for the farm produce. And, what was the most surprising, even the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) had become a protectionist, so far as sheep were concerned. Perhaps it was something after his kind. The Liberals in this House and upon the hustings are incessantly repeating that protection has no other effect than causing the manufacturers to pocket hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars, and that it is contrary to the interests of the consumer, of the poor people. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has given a contradiction to his friends in the course of his speech. In the maritime provinces, he said, almost all the manufactures are closed. And do you know why ? He, himself, has given us the information : It is because competition is too keen, prices are too low and manufacturers are compelled to sell under cost. It is the National Policy that brings about so much good to every class of the community. In fact, since the establishment of protection, the price of manufactured goods has decreased by at least 50 to 200 per cent. It is truly surprising to find the Liberals still opposing the good and advantageous National Policy for petty party purposes. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have expressed this evening, not only my own opinion, but that of the voters of the county of L'Assomption, the great majority of whom are in favour of protection. At the beginning of this session, Liberal leaders of L'Assomption came up and met me here, urging me to call upon the Government to protect agricultural produce, such as butter, cheese, tobacco and beet-root sugar. It must not be presumed that they are protectionists only as far as one article goes. They are protectionists any way, because they read good papers ; they closely watch politics, the growth of trade and industry, and they have come to the conclusion that without protection and with a simple tariff for revenue and free trade with the United States, Canada would be in a condition of great destitution. Hay, it is true, did not sell here at as high a price as in the United States, yet good hay sells at $8.50 in Montreal, and common hay at from $7 to $7.50, the same price as in the United States. They say our country places are in want, that destitution prevails therein. Yet, just go on Sundays at our church doors and you will soon feel that our people are not in want. The farmers come to the divine service in closed carriages, I could even say in rich carriages. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, how many closed carriages, fat horses and white harnesses were there in our country places ? Now our farmers have very good closed carriages, although in my time—and I am not old yet, and I have been brought up in as easy circumstances as those I now see—there were very few carriages of this kind. In the parish of Mascouche there were hardly three or four closed carriages, but, on the other hand, every farmer had money in his pocket. The secret of such savings lied in that the farmers were expending very little. If the farmer nowadays, with the earnings he gets, did likewise, the situation would be quite different and most of them would have savings in hand. The farmers nowadays live and feed better than did the farmer in my youth. I wish to be well understood, and I say that if, in our country places, they lived with the same

economy as thirty years ago, our people, without being rich, would be in easier circumstances than they are, for just think, that with the dairy industry alone the farmers in my county realized, in the course of last summer only, $101,995. In olden times our farmers had no such means of making money. Could the Liberals, who contend our country places are in want, explain how it is that formerly we borrowed money at a rate of interest of 8 or 10 per cent —and even then we could not always find some at such a rate—while now it is very easy to have some at 5 and 5½ per cent, at least in the county of L'Assomption ? In that county money to loan is plentiful, and I may say I know farmers who could not place their money at such a rate, and who had to deposit in Montreal banks. I know something of it. Not so, by far, thirty years ago. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the kind attention with which this House listened to me, and I will now conclude.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) You forgot to explain how it is that the population of L'Assomption has decreased.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) You can do it, if you are only willing to take the floor after me. To sum up, I say that a protective tariff is a very good thing, and that it is making the fortune of this country. The farmers approve of it because it promotes the industries, and I think the public sentiment is in favour of such a tariff. The people declared themselves in favour of such a tariff at the general elections of 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891. After 1891, several Liberal elections were protested, for many friends of the Opposition had unfortunately carried their elections through corruption. Their returns having been quashed, the people have pronounced anew, freely this time, and have sent them home and replaced them by Conservatives. The voters understood they were wrong when taking the money of the Liberals. I hope we shall have another session before a general election takes place. I hope so in order to utterly discourage the Liberal party. At the next election we will not have to meet the Liberal speakers holding in their hand a copy of the American tariff and reading it on the hustings, as they did in 1891, saying that it was the tariff established by the Conservative party. That was done in many counties, amongst others in L'Assomption, Montcalm and Joliette. The Liberal speakers said to the people : See the enormous duties the Conservative party imposes on you, and, if you pay such high prices for your goods, it is due to the Conservative party, which imposes such duties upon you. At the next election they will have no such means to lead away the voters. The people have their eyes opened and they follow the affairs of the country, and I feel satisfied the Liberals will have to stay in opposition for a long time yet.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) who has just taken his seat, has made a very fine speech, as one might say, in consultation, and a speech with which the hon. gentleman seems to be perfectly well satisfied. He has told us a great deal about the county of L'Assomption, but he forgot one thing. He forgot to tell us that the population of that county was reduced by 1,600 souls between 1881 and 1891. And as these were mostly young men who left to earn their living somewhere else, and the majority of whom were probably electors, it is possibly due to the loss of these intelligent men that the hon. gentleman was able to defeat Mr. Gauthier at the last election.

Passing from this speech to the remarks of the Secretary of State, I am compelled to refer with a feeling of considerable sadness to a fact which has been cited more than once in the course of this debate, and that is that the death of the last three Premiers has been a sad loss to this House and country. We were never more convinced of the sadness and the irreparable nature of that loss to hon. gentlemen opposite than while listening to the speech of the hon. Secretary of State. We all remember when on that side of the House they had good debaters. We all remember when their leader, whoever he might be, was able to make a speech which would command the attention, at all events, of his own supporters and had colleagues able to back him up. But now, when the leader of the House made his Budget speech, the benches behind him were scarcely more than half filled, while, on the other hand, when the leader of the Opposition made his statement, the House was thronged, and when the Secretary of State takes the floor, the seats behind him are filled with an enthusiastic audience.

What does this mean ? It means that hon. gentlemen opposite have only one speaker amongst them—only one man who is able to enchain the attention of his own supporters —I was going to say followers, because they seemed to be rather his followers than those of the hon. gentleman who is supposed to lead the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in the position in which the Germans were nearly a hundred years ago when their country had been overrun by Napoleon for a term of years, and when, after they won the battle of Aspern, a patriotic poet of the day was able to say that the people were :

> Shouting with lips all victory drunken,
> No ! Our Germany has not yet sunken—
> She has yet one day, and yet one man.

That was the first victory in the long course of years over which the Germans were able to rejoice. In like manner the speech of the Secretary of State has been the first thing approaching a success on which gentlemen on the other side have been able to congratulate themselves, and with regard to which they have been able to shout with

lips, not with victory drunken, perhaps, but at all events excited with the pleasure of being able for once to cheer one of their own speakers.

That was the first thing approaching oratorical success which we have had from the other side. And what kind of a success was it? Was it the kind of speech we have been accustomed to hear from hon. Ministers opposite? Far from it. The decadence in the style of that speech has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). It has been something most painful to the House. It was a speech that might do for the stump or a tea meeting or even for a camp meeting; but it was not one to be expected from that member of the Government who was to make the great oratorical effort of the debate on behalf of the administration.

It was a speech of the kind which the hon. gentleman's great predecessor, Cicero, once prepared in defence of a client. He was ill-advised enough to let his client see this speech after he had written it out, and before it was delivered. The client took it home and read it over and liked it very well. He liked it so well that he read it a second, a third and a fourth time, and then brought it back to the Montague—I mean the Cicero—of the day, and said: That speech is no good. I liked it the first time, but each time that I have read it over I like it less, and now I am disgusted with it. Such will be the fate of the speech of the hon. member for Haldimand to-day. But Cicero said to him: You fool, that speech will only be heard once by the court, and it will not be able to read it over again. The Cicero of that day was better off in this respect than the Cicero of to-day, because the speech of the latter will appear in cold print and be read by the people; and though it might do very well at a political pic-nic, it will not go down after a calm and deliberate reading. I should have thought that the hon. gentleman's experience on the platform and in the pulpit and elsewhere would have sufficiently educated his taste to prevent his making the mistake he did to-night. However well that speech might have done under these circumstances, it will not do here.

Yet it must be answered and gone into in some particulars. I had not the pleasure of hearing it all, but was able to cull a few gems, which may be taken as samples of the remainder and which show on what a slender base of argument, or rather on what an absence of argument it all rests. He repeated here, as he has repeated on the platform throughout the country, that the party to which I belong has had five policies in five years. Now, Sir, even the hon. gentleman himself knows better than that. Certainly the country knows better. Let me tell him that I remember the policy of this party for the last twenty-three years as a member of this House, and I can say with absolute certainty that during the whole of that twenty-three years the policy of the Liberal party has been what it is now, a policy of tariff for revenue only, combined with readiness to make a reciprocity treaty with our nearest neighbours. That has been during the time I speak of, and I believe, for years previous, the policy of this party. How many times has the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite been changed in that time? To say that we have had five policies in five years, because, according as circumstances changed one part or another of the policy has been brought into special prominence, is to use that suppression of truth which is equivalent to the suggestion of a lie which should be brought to the notice of the Minister of Justice, whom I see smiling at my attempt to use legal terms. The policy of the Liberal party has been the same as it is to-day for years before the Secretary of State was dreamed of as a factor in politics.

The hon. gentleman told us that the Democrats in the United States had not done what we prophesied they would do when they came into power; that they had not carried out the far-reaching tariff reforms in the fiscal policy of the United States which they had promised to carry out. And he said that this party would also fail to carry out the far-reaching tariff reforms which we now propose. Why was it that the Democrats failed to carry out their policy? Was it that they did not honestly try? By no means. The Representative House in the United States passed a measure of reform carrying out very fully the promises made by Cleveland and his allies on the hustings. But, Sir, those reforms were burked in the Senate, the house which is not responsible directly to the people. And burked by what influence? By the sugar trust, which bought a sufficient number of senators in that house in which the Democrats majority was small, to defeat the policy of the party. Sir, if it were possible to imagine for a moment that the great sugar trust of Canada, a trust as oppressive, as rich and as influential in proportion to the population of Canada as is the great sugar trust of the United States in that country—if it were possible to imagine that that trust could find a number of senators in Canada open to the same influence, then perhaps this party which is coming into power in Canada at the next election might find many of their reforms burked in the same manner as tariff reform was burked in the United States. But, unless that can be done—and I do not for a moment insinuate that such senators could be found, though I have no doubt that such a sugar trust could be found in Canada—there could be no prospect of failure on this side.

What has been the result of the failure of the Democratic party to carry out their policy? I say that that failure was not their

fault but their misfortune : it was caused by the expenditure of sugar trust money, which money was wrested from the people and put into the pockets of the sugar barons. But whether it was their fault or their misfortune, the result was their defeat at the last election. It was because they did not carry out their policy of reform that they were beaten, and not because of the tariff reform they attempted. And the inference I draw from that defeat of that party is that they lost power, not because they had gone too far in the direction of free trade, but because they had not gone far enough.

Then, Sir, the hon. Secretary of State told us that the National Policy was at last doing some good to the farmers of this country. Well, it would be almost a sufficient answer to such an assertion as that to invite gentlemen opposite to go and tell it to the farmers. It is a common, proverbial, piece of cynical advice, "Tell that to the marines." But as the marines could not understand this particular information, we may invite the hon. gentleman to "tell that to the farmers." He says he has been wiring all over the country and has found out that there is a great deal of wheat still in the farmer's hands. He gave statistics from various places as to the quantity held by the farmers and the quantity sold since the rise in price. But he did not give us the authority on which these assertions were made.

He said he had sent telegrams and had received answers, but he did not tell us who had sent those answers. It is very natural to suppose—it is a thing we cannot help believing—that he sent to friendly sources for this information, that he sent to the people who, he knew, would give him the kind of estimate he required for use in this debate. He got the information he needed, but not necessarily the information which is correct. But, even if it were as he stated, the quantity of wheat accounted for by his various telegrams from Seaforth, Dunnville, Brampton and other places would be only a drop in the bucket of the total production of Canada. And then the hon. gentleman telegraphed to the Ogilvies in Montreal to get their estimate, and their estimate is that they are from one and a half to two million bushels of wheat still unsold in Ontario. The hon. gentleman says, surely the Ogilvies know as much about it as anybody else. I do not know that the Ogilvies do. I do not know that the Ogilvies know much more about how much wheat is in the farmers' barns than anybody else. They can find out how much is held by speculators, how much is held in small warehouses, how much is ready for them to purchase on the market. But I do not know what special means they have of learning how much is secreted by the farmers throughout the country. I say the Ogilvies are not in a position to be well informed on that point, but it is clearly to their advantage to create the impression that there is a lot of farmers' wheat still held in the granary ; and I say that the telegram of the Ogilvies to the Secretary of State was sent with the intention, and that it was read by the Secretary of State with the effect, of tending to reduce the prices of wheat throughout Canada. The scarcity of wheat is caused by local demand—so the hon. Secretary of State says. If it is not caused by local demand for use in Canada, of course the hon. gentleman could not pretend that the duty on wheat had raised the price. If it is caused by a scarcity for local demand, or rather by the opinion that such scarcity exists, the assertion that there are two millions of bushels of wheat still held by the farmers of Ontario must bring down the price to us in Canada. I charge it against the Secretary of State that, for the sake of appearing to make a point in argument, he has made a statement to the House which will undoubtedly have the effect of creating the impression that there is plenty of wheat yet to be marketed in Ontario, and which will have the effect—perhaps it was meant to have the effect—of making it easier for the Ogilvies to buy that wheat at a cheaper rate than they have been paying hitherto.

We will leave the hon. gentleman to settle that with the farmers. But we will take his conclusion. Suppose that the Ogilvies are correct and that a million and a half bushels have been sold at the increased price, making a gain of 15 cents a bushel to the farmers. The total of $225,000 is what the hon. gentleman says the farmers have made out of the National Policy. Well, Sir, if they have, it is the first time in sixteen years they have made anything out of the National Policy. And if you divide the $225,000 among the sixteen years of that policy, it comes to about $14,000 a year, which the farmers have made out of it. He says some of the farmers have had to hold this wheat three years in order to get this advantage. Why, if the $225,000 were spread over the three years, even, during which the farmers have had to hold their wheat, and pay interest, and suffer loss by rats, &c., in their granaries, it would be a trifling affair ; but when you spread it over the whole sixteen years during which the farmer has been sweated by the National Policy for the benefit of the monopolist's combines and during which time he has got nothing out of the National Policy, you will find he has only made $14,000 a year during that time. And that is the argument produced by the Secretary of State to prove that the farmers ought to support that policy. That, Sir, is the strongest argument he has brought forward for the farmer's support, and I am willing to leave it there, without any attempt to refute it further. I have taken his own figures and drawn the logical conclusion from them.

Then he told us that we have not felt the depression as much as we did in 1878. And to whom does he appeal to prove that? Does he appeal to the recollection of people who know what was going on in 1878? He was not in a position to know much about it himself at that time. He was only a boy then, and does not know of his own recollections how the depression did feel. He was probably in that bouyant condition of youth when everything seemed to be going happily as long as he had plenty of money in his own pocket, and he did not know what was happening to anybody else. But he does not appeal to the memory of those of us who were men in 1878. To what authority does he appeal to prove that we felt the depression more in 1878? To the London "Economist." The London "Economist" knows more about it than do the people of Canada. Well, I am willing to leave that whole question to those who were in business in 1878. Let us ask them whether they have not felt the depression more of late than they did in 1878. Take any line of business you please, except half a dozen or so of the highly protected monopolists who are undoubtedly reaping a large harvest just now at other people's expense, in spite even of hard times. Take the farmer, the small manufacturer, the importer, the merchant, the professional man, and we all know they are having harder times now than they had in 1878. I know of my own personal recollection that manufactures with which I was connected myself, and which were then prosperous, are now utterly extinct.

We have been told about wagon factories. There was one such in my county, in which I was a shareholder, and of which I was even president, and which in 1878, exported buggies to Australia, making a profit on them. That does not exist to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. CASEY. On account of the National Policy. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) denies it; but he does not know anything about it, while I do from my personal knowledge of the affairs of the company; so we will let his interruption go for a freak of ill humour and not attribute it to any thing else. There were many small manufactories in the county of Elgin, and in every other county, which were flourishing in 1878, but which are now extinct as the dodo, and which will never come to life again. And why? Because the great manufacturers, those who were in a position to take advantage of the monopolies, sold to them by the so-called government of the day, have frozen out the others, have consolidated the business in a few hands, have monopolized it, and have been able to combine and keep up the prices. That is the reason the small manufactories have died and the large ones have grown larger. The big fish have eaten up the little ones, and this beautiful economist, the Secretary of State, looks upon that as a proof of the prosperity of the country.

Chatham was spoken of. I am informed by those who know, that there are foundries dead in that town that were in full operation in 1878. I know that foundries which were in operation in 1878, in St. Thomas, are dead now, and their vacant buildings are lying there as proof of the blasting effects of this National Policy on all manufactures except those which are supported by sufficient capital to enable them to become a monopoly. I was also connected with a woollen factory in my county, which is now extinct. My hon. friend the member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) has licked that up along with a lot of other morsels. These little fish taste sweet. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) gave the names of several manufacturing industries in London which had gone out since the establishment of the National Policy, and as a result of it. I have proof which I have laid before this House more than once, from a founder in my county which has managed to survive, to show that the National Policy is costing him thousands of dollars every year in the manufacturing of threshing machines in which he used to compete, before the National Policy, with the United States manufacturers in Michigan, and used to do it at a profit; but now they cannot do it because it costs them too much to make the machines. We have proof of it in the person of Mr. Frost, of Smith's Falls, an intelligent manufacturer of agricultural implements, who has presented himself as a candidate in support of a revenue tariff policy, and he will testify that he believes that the National Policy is not good for the class of manufactures in which he is engaged. A foundry there, as my hon. friend besides me points out, has also gone up.

We might go on multiplying instances all over. The London "Economist" said, according to the Secretary of State, that Canada stood up amongst other nations like a tall chimney amongst the ruins of a manufactory. Well, we might accept the simile in this sense—the monopolies of Canada stand up like tall chimneys amongst the ruins of all other factories, and that is the one sign of prosperity we have got out of the National Policy.

Now, the Secretary of State went on to say that the United States felt the late depression more than Canada did. Well, how did that happen? The United States is a much more highly protected country than Canada. If protection causes prosperity and lessens depression, why did not protection keep the United States free from this awful curse? It was because the United States had a higher protection than Canada that they felt it worse than we did. I believe they did in many respects feel it worse than we did, simply because they had gone

further in the policy of protection than we have.

Then again the Secretary of State grew very patriotic. He denounced the leader of the Opposition. Denounced him for what? Not for what the leader of the Opposition had said, but because some papers in the United States praised the leader of the Opposition for a speech he made at Winnipeg. He (the Secretary of State) said he did not want the applause of Yankee papers, he did not want to please the people in the States; that the policy of the Opposition always pleased the people of the United States, but he did not want their applause, he only wanted the applause of Canadians. Then what did the hon. gentleman say in the next breath? Why, he said: Look at what the Buffalo "Express" says about the member for South Oxford, and the leader of the Opposition. Why, said he, the Buffalo "Express" says that Canada prospers because she refused to listen to demagogues, and those demagogues, said the hon. gentleman, were the members for South Oxford and the leader of the Opposition. See the beautiful consistency of the hon. gentleman. In the first place, he did not care a bit for Yankee applause, he only wanted the applause of Canadians; and in the second place, he goes on to prove out of the mouth of a Yankee newspaper that our policy does not please the people of the United States, and that his policy does.

I charge, Sir, that the policy supported by the Secretary of State is a Yankee policy, root and branch. It was conceived in the United States and brought to birth here in Ottawa, with the assistance of a Yankee expert from Washington who framed the National Policy under the fostering care of Sir Leonard Tilley. It has been kept going since without the assistance of a Yankee expert. In what way? By the brains of the Government? Not in the least, Mr. Speaker. By the brains of such men as the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond), the junior member for the city of Halifax (Mr. Stairs) and other members of this House, and other gentlemen out of this House, who compose the manufacturers' combine and dictate the policy of the Minister of Finance, and who boast about it afterwards in the papers, and who send us copies to let us know how big they feel about the position they occupy. This statement was first made by me on this floor, it has been repeated a dozen or fifteen times since, repeated with proof, and the Minister of Finance has not had the audacity to deny one word of it, nor will he yet do so. For we have the proof under the hand of the combines that they prepared the brief, that the Finance Minister thanked them for giving it to him, and that he carried it out.

It is a Yankee policy, carried out in a Yankee manner, and the results are becoming rapidly the same as in the United States—corruption in all branches of Administration, the building up of classes at the expense of the masses, the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many, and, ultimately, such a state of political degradation throughout the country that it will be very hard to induce people to look upon matters from any other point of view except that of the almighty dollar in their pocket.

Then, again, the Secretary of State said that the leader of the Opposition had given out at Winnipeg that if the Liberal party came into power he would make up the deficit by levying a tax on raw material. The Secretary of State knew very well that the leader of the Opposition did not say that; he knew that even the incorrect report which appeared at the time did not make him say that. As the Secretary of State read it, it was that the leader of the Opposition said there would be a difference in the method of dealing with the taxes on raw material and the necessaries of life. That is a very different story—a difference does not necessarily mean an increase.

It has always been our declared policy, and it is the policy on which we are going to vote, to reduce or remove duties on raw material and the necessaries of life. But is that the policy on the other side of the House? The Secretary of State says it is; he declares that the National Policy is a policy of free raw materials. I wonder that even an hon. gentleman of his wide experience, of his tea-meeting experience and otherwise, was able to make such a statement. What is iron? Is iron a raw material or not? Is iron not the basis of more than half the manufactures of the country, and where is it more highly taxed than in Canada to-day? The tax on iron is a tax on raw material, imposed by Sir Charles Tupper in 1887 for the purpose of building up a large and prosperous iron smelting industry. That tax on iron has utterly and despicably failed in building up that industry, and the Secretary of State has been the man to prove to the House that it has been an utter failure in that regard.

For what has the hon. gentleman told the House on this subject? He has declared that the tax on this valuable raw material has not been sufficient to induce the establishment of huge smelting works in Canada. He said that a smelting industry is now being worked up in Kingston, and he stated how much the building would cost, how many hands would be employed, and the value of the output. But did he dare to tell the House that it was going to be built in consequence of the National Policy? He said "where did they expect to get the money to construct their plant? Largely from bonuses granted by Sir Oliver Mowat." Is that not a confession of the utter failure of the Tupper tax, and the utter failure of the tax imposed by the present Minister of Finance to start smelt-

ing works? It appears that capitalists could not be induced to think of establishing such an industry until they had been granted a bonus by the Ontario Government. Even so, I am informed on very good authority that the whole scheme has collapsed, that smelting works are not going to be erected at Kingston. Whether or not such be the case, the Secretary of State says that capitalists would not invest their money without the bonus granted by Sir Oliver Mowat, and thus the National Policy is not the author of the promised iron industry at Kingston.

Mr. DENISON. He did not give them enough.

Mr. CASEY. It is a pity that Sir Oliver Mowat did not take pity on the despicable failure of the National Policy and give iron industries double or treble the amount he did to enable them to start. Of course, he should have done that, and then have given all the glory to the National Policy.

As we are talking of bonuses, has it been noticed how many places visited by the Secretary of State were giving large bonuses in order to encourage manufacturing industries? No doubt the House noticed the little passage at arms between the Secretary of State and the member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) regarding industries at Wingham, where the industries were not very prosperous, whereupon the Secretary of State pointed him to the fact that he had voted for a bonus to some industries there to keep them going. I do not believe the Secretary of State saw the effect of that arugment on his case. He has been proving to the House by voluminous statistics, and enormous expenditure of lung power, that in a great many towns in Ontario, manufacturing industries already in existence could not have been continued except for the fact that the people of those places had put their hands into their pockets and enabled them to survive in spite of the National Policy. Bonuses are being given sufficient to make up the loss sustained by the National Policy, and the Secretary of State is childish enough to use that as an argument in favour of that policy. I do not know that anything stronger can be said in regard to the hon. gentleman's speech than that.

The Secretary of State asked "are we to give up all hope of establishing an iron industry." I do not think we need do so. On one condition we may hope to have such an industry established, and that is to abolish that policy under which we have been trying to start for sixteen years and have failed. We remember the time when an iron industry was flourishing within four miles of this spot, and when its products were being sold as far off as India, during 1878: and yet it is so dead to-day that very few people know that the industry existed. Do away with so-called National Policy, which has made it impossible for the iron industry to exist, and we may have such an industry again established, but not till then.

But I will not discuss the hon. gentleman's speech any further. He has given us a quotation which shows that however inexpert he may be in the marshalling of facts, he is an expert in the use of the boomerang, and as a man dealing largely with historical records in England, 400 years old, it was likely that he would use the weapon of the Australian savage rather than a modern arm of precision. He used a boomerang and the boomerang was this: "One smoke stack is worth more than a ten acre field full of men who can talk, and talk, and talk." I am glad he used that boomerang, because it is time, Sir, that we had less of these men who can talk, and talk, and talk, and more men who can do and act.

Mr. DENISON. Stop right now, then.

Mr. CASEY. My friend opposite thinks that I am throwing a boomerang also. I would point out that the long speeches have been very largely on the other side of the House. The speech of the Secretary of State, who has never done anything else but talk, occupied over three hours, I believe, and as I have not been speaking for more than half an hour I do not think that I need be afraid of the weapon in question.

When the Secretary of State was on his starring tour at St. Thomas, in a moment of weakness, he said something that was true and was sound political policy. He told us at St. Thomas frankly: that the system of collecting revenue in England was one which undoubtedly graded the burden of taxation according to the wealth of the persons who paid. True, he told us that it was not a scheme that was suited to Canada, but he admitted that the English system graduated the payment according to the wealth of the individual, and that I submit, Sir, is a very fair way of raising a revenue.

On that trip to which I have referred, he and his present leader, whom he bids fair to supplant very rapidly if he goes on doing all the talking for the other side of the House, tried to make us believe that they were the farmer's friends. They asserted that under their Administration, natural products of all kinds were being exported more largely and at greater profit than they used to be. I can show that the contrary is the case, and in order to do so I may have to refer to the Year-Book, which is looked upon as a campaign sheet of the Government; but if I can prove points against hon. gentlemen opposite out of their own campaign documents, I have no objection to doing so, and I will give the figures for what they are worth.

The Year-Book tells us that in the years of revenue tariff during the Mackenzie re-

gime, the exports of agriculturaal products for these five years were as follows in round numbers :—

1874	$ 19,590,000
1875	17,258,000
1876	21,139,000
1877	14,688,000
1878	18,008,000
Total	90,683,000

Average, $18,136,000.

In five representative years of the National Policy they were :

1887	$ 18,826,000
1888	15,436,000
1889	13,414,000
1890	11,908,000
1891	13,666,000
Total	73,250,000

Average, $14,650,000.

Or $5,486,000 a year less during the five years of high and mature protection than they were during those so-called hard years of revenue tariff when the Liberal Government was in power. Notwithstanding, that the farming population of the country had increased in that time about 500,000, yet the export of agricultural products had decreased by about three millions and a half a year as compared with the years of a Liberal Administration in Canada.

Let us take the products of the forest and compare them in the same way. The products of the forest from 1873 to 1877 inclusive, averaged $7,700,000 a year, and during the five years, from 1885 to 1889, when high protection was in force, these products of the forest averaged $4,742,000 a year, or $2,958,000 less than they had been under a revenue tariff. The particulars are as follows :—

1873	$ 8,583,000
1874	7,417,000
1875	8,073,000
1876	6,030,000
1877	8,242,000
Total	38,345,000

Average, $7,669,000.

1885	$ 4,927,000
1886	4,926,000
1887	3,574,000
1888	5,091,000
1889	5,189,000
Total	23,767,000

Average, $4,742,000.

Let us look at the position of the farmer from another point of view. Let us consider the diversion of population from the farms to the cities. In 1871, the rural population was 2,949,000, and the city population 686,000. In 1881, the rural population was 3,312,000, and the city population was 912,000. The rural population had increased in these ten years 363,000, and the city population 226,000. In 1891, the country population had only grown to 3,443,000, while the city population had grown to 1,390,000. In other words, the country population had only increased 131,000, while the city population has increased 478,000. This is the state of things which the Minister of Finance declares to be good for the farmer. He says that every man who leaves a farm and goes to the city increases the home market, and thereby makes prices better, and the demand larger for the products of those who are left behind. He says the desolation and depopulation of the farms in the interest of the cities is a sign of prosperity for the farmer. Now, we will ask him whether he considers in the same way that the death of the small manufactories for the advantage of the large ones is a sign of prosperity ? If he will maintain that, he may, perhaps, maintain the other ; but if the matter is left to the average farmer, I think he will agree with me that depopulation is a sign of distress and ruin—that people would not leave the farms and go into the cities if it had not ceased to pay to be a farmer. We find that while the farming population has only increased 131,000 in the last ten years, the acreage has very largely increased, showing that the farms are being depopulated for the benefit of the cities. I know it is so in the district where I live. Many farms which, in 1878, were owned by prosperous farmers are now held by loan companies or other mortagees, who are waiting for an opportunity to sell them at some figure which will satisfy the mortgage.

I have spoken of the exports of agricultural produce. I did not refer to the exports of animals and their products. These have, undoubtedly, increased largely during this time, but I do not think the most blinded friend of protection will pretend that a policy which increases the cost of feeding cattle will increase the profit of the farmer who feeds and exports them—that a policy which taxes some kinds of grain which are grown more cheaply in the States than here, will assist the farmer who wants to feed cattle for the British market, or that there is anything at all in the National Policy which tends to increase the exports of animals and their products, or to cheapen their production.

Even the exports of manufactures do not flourish under the National Policy. You would think that here, if anywhere, the beauties of the National Policy would show forth ; but if we go back to 1873, I find that in that year we exported $24,460,000 ; in 1874, $22,816,000 : and in 1875, $20,025,000, an average of $22,700,000 worth of manufactures for the three years under the revenue tariff, while in 1885, 1886, and 1887, under the National Policy we exported only $19,256,000, $18,959,000, and $19,999,000, respectively, an average of $19,403,000, something over

$3,000,000 a year less in those three years of protection than we did in the three years under a revenue tariff. I must admit that these amounts include what would not, legitimately be called manufactures, such as sawn lumber; but as these are included in both periods, the comparison is fair, and the fault of classification is with the Government campaign sheet and not mine.

Let us look at some other statistics in this wonderful Year-Book. We find that the average protection afforded to the farmer on food and animals, which includes breadstuffs, and animals and their products, in the years 1877-78, was 27½ per cent, while in the year 1892-93 the protection afforded by the National Policy, which is said to be so good for the farmer, was only 21½ per cent. These are startling figures, but they are from the Year-Book, and, therefore, the Government must admit their truth. As a matter of fact, in the last two years, the farmer has had 6 per cent less protection on breadstuffs and animals than he had in 1878. Now, hon. gentlemen tell us from day to day that if we had the tariff of 1878, we would be swamped with Yankee products, such as Yankee beef, Yankee pigs, and that sort of thing. Sir, the tariff hog is the worst import we have ever had from the United States, and it would take something more than a duty to keep him out.

Taking the whole course of the duties since that time, as classified in the Year-Book, the duty on crude articles, that is, on raw materials, has grown 9 per cent since 1878. Yet the hon. Secretary of State said to-day that the National Policy is a policy of free raw materials. Partly manufactured articles, which enter into the production of other manufactures, are taxed 10 per cent more than they were under Liberal Administration. Articles manufactured ready for use are also taxed 10 per cent higher; and luxuries are taxed only 13 per cent higher. That is not all, Sir. The percentage of dutiable goods has increased by a very considerable figure.

I find also in the same Year-Book some figures about imports from Great Britain and the United States which may be useful here as showing that the present tariff is hostile to trade with the mother country, and favourable to trade with the United States. The figures are for periods of five years each:

IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

1868-72	$ 223,399,000
1873-77	272,222,000
1878-82	197,017,000
1883-87	222,440,000
1888-92	208,402,000

So that in the last five years they were $15,000,000 less than they were in the first five years of confederation. Now, turn to the other side, and look at our imports from the United States:

IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

1868-72	$ 141,295,000
1873-77	250,207,000
1878-82	206,597,000
1883-87	243,641,000
1888-92	258,134,000

So that they were $117,000,000 more in the last five years than they were in the first decade after confederation, while our imports from Great Britain were $15,000,000 less. This tariff in its actual operation is hostile to trade with England, and favourable to trade with the United States.

I want to call your attention to another comparative view of our export and import trade. I contend, and I think it cannot be successfully combated, that the measure of our profits on foreign trade is the excess of our exports over our imports. For many years the protectionists used to say that the measure of our prosperity was the excess of exports over imports, but I think no intelligent man now will pretend to adhere to that exploded theory. It is quite clear that what we export buys what we import. All trade is ultimately barter. The only means we have of obtaining imports is by the sale of our exports. Therefore, we buy what we import with what we export, and if our imports are of greater value, the difference represents our profit. And so I hold that the increase of imports over exports in any year shows what we have made in that year's trade. I will give the exports, in the first place, per head of the population, for that is the proper way to look at it. Our exports may be larger now to a certain extent than they were in some series of years—larger in the gross, and yet much less per head, and I will give you some tables to show what they have been per head. Our total trade per head was as follows:—

In—	
1872	$53 74
1873	59 87
1874	56 88
1875	51 70
1876	44 10

Take next the figures per head, beginning with 1885, ten years after the close of the revenue tariff period:

In—	
1885	$43 68
1886	41 35
1887	43 67
1888	42 92
1889	43 16

In other words, the average export per head in the five years of a low revenue tariff was $53.25, while in the five years of high tariff it was only $42.94 per head. The beneficent operation of the National Policy has reduced our total trade by something over $10 a head in that time: and yet the Minister of Finance has been going all over Ontario comparing individual years—1879 with 1893, for example—and saying that because

our total trade in 1893 was greater than it was in 1879, we are therefore more prosperous.

I have shown that in the later years of the National Policy the profits on our local trade was $10 per head less, or in the neighbourhood of $50,000,000 a year less for the whole of Canada than it would have been if the rate under a low tariff had been maintained. Now let us take the exports and imports separately and see what our profits were :

In—	Imports.	Exports.
1873	$ 34 89	$ 24 48
1874	33 52	23 36
1875	31 66	20 04
1876	23 60	20 50
1877	24 75	18 90
1878	22 82	19 44
	$771 24	$126 74

Showing a difference of $44.52, or an average per year of $7.42. For the first three years the average gain per head was $10, and the average profit, therefore, to the whole population of Canada was over $40,000,000. For the whole of that period, the average profit per head on our foreign trade was $7.42. For the years from 1879 to 1893, the corresponding period under protection we find that the average profit per head was only $3.93. So that, comparing the years from 1879 to 1893, under protection, with 1873 to 1878, under a revenue tariff, you find a difference of about $4 per head, in our national profit on our foreign trade, or $20,000,000 on our present population, to the debit of the National Policy.

Next, instead of taking figures per head, let me give you a few lump sums. From 1872 to 1875 we exported to the extent of $288,719,000, and imported to the value of $482,245,000, making a profit during those three years of $193,526,000 on our foreign trade. In 1880 to 1883, the earlier years of protection, we exported $338,682,000 worth, and imported to the value of $389,178,000, showing only a profit of $50,496,000. So that we lost by the National Policy, in those three years the enormous sum of over $140,000,000. Now, the absolute volume of our total trade, without regard to population, was much larger in some years under a revenue tariff than it has been for many years under the National Policy. In the three years from 1872 to 1874, our total trade was $635,366,000, or an average of $212,183,000 per year. From 1885 to 1887, inclusive, our total trade was only $590,262,000, or an average of $196,754,000. In other words, it was 15½ millions less each year from 1885 to 1887 than in the early years from 1872 to 1874, and yet the Finance Minister has been boasting on platforms all over Ontario that the National Policy has increased the volume of our total trade. This is a statement at variance with the facts, and which we may attribute to his ignorance, since we cannot attribute it to any intention to deceive.

Let us come to the question of farm products, which was referred to by the hon. member for L'Assomption a little while ago. Let us take up what are known as hog products—bacon, hams, pork and lard. We find that we exported more of these articles in 1874—twenty-one years ago—than we have any year since. We exported $2,120,770 worth in 1874, and the highest year since was 1893, when the export amounted to about $1,000 less. The total for the years 1874 to 1877 was $5,904,848, and from 1888 to 1893, $2,381,709. In other words, with an interval of nearly twenty years between, there was a reduction of 3½ million dollars in three years export of hog products. Yet the Minister of Finance, the Secretary of State and the hon. member for L'Assomption, and the gentlemen who collaborated with him in making his speech, all tell us that the National Policy is doing great things for the Canadian hog. Yet, the loss in that period, after fourteen years of the National Policy, was $3,500,000 for the whole period, or $861,000 a year.

The census figures have been so fully dealt with that I will spare the Houses that subject.

Now, my hon. friend the Finance Minister began his speech by attempting to show how the deficit occurred. I am only going to deal with the beginning of his speech, not to go all through it. He said the deficit occurred owing to lack of money. That is a statement that we could accept. I think somebody must have told him that. But when he began to inquire how this lack of money occurred he wandered into statements and arguments that were more doubtful. He said :

> It will be noted that the decrease was pretty generally spread over the list of imported articles, the increases being not nearly so extensive in their scope.

Now, as a matter of fact, the important decreases in the customs revenue were in a few lines as the hon. gentleman gave them himself. Here are his own figures showing items of loss of revenue on imports :

Iron and steel and manufactures thereof	$421,683
Woollen manufactures	432,515
Cotton	156,775
Coal and coke	147,860
Total	$1,158,833

Out of a total of $1,793,915, which he said was the decrease in the customs revenue for the year. In other words, two-thirds of the total loss in revenue occurred in these four articles, the production of which in Canada is of the nature of a monopoly. This shows a reduction in revenue, but it does not show a reduction in taxation upon these articles by any means. It shows that the monopoly sought to be enforced under the protective system was taking effect more extensively from year to year ; in other words that the people of Canada, instead of being taxed on

these articles to supply the treasury as they used to be when they imported them, were taxed for the benefit of the monopolists. It was not a reduction but a diversion of taxation.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to argue that if the sugar tax as it stood in 1890-91 had been kept on, we should have received $4,900,000 on that account on the 310,000,000 pounds imported, and that we should not have had any deficit. But, Sir, in the first place, the treasury did not lose the total amount of taxation taken off sugar, because the hon. gentleman put on other taxes which he said at the time he anticipated would nearly counterbalance his loss on sugar, and they did counterbalance that loss to a great extent. But, though they were not getting any revenue from sugar the people were paying about $1,800,000 yearly to the sugar barons—to the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who is connected with this industry, and to the Redpaths and Drummonds, of Montreal, and a few other sugar barons. This was paid really as taxation, but the revenue arising from that taxation, did not go into the treasury. But what is the Government now doing? When the deficit has gone beyond their control they have to return to the tax on raw sugar which they took off in 1890, and they have levied the tax in such a way that while it will cost the people over $3,500,000, only $1,550,000 will go into the treasury. They have been compelled to adopt the policy of a revenue tariff, but they have done it in such a way as not to diminish but rather to increase the tribute paid by the country to the manufacturers; for, the increased tax on sugar being about $1.14 a hundred as against 64 cents a hundred, which it has been, will utterly exclude foreign sugar and leave the sugar monopoly very much firmer than it was before.

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman's theory was sound, to the effect that we lose nothing on account of the deficit, because we have $4,900,000 in pocket, which we have saved on the sugar taxes, the interest on which amount would pay the interest on the deficit, why does he not carry it further? Why not knock off a few more taxes? Let us have a chronic deficit of $10,000,000 a year and tell the people: "Never mind; you have a deficit of $10,000,000, but you have the money in your pockets, and the interest on that will pay the interest on the deficit. Let us have a deficit of the whole amount of the necessary revenue. The money will be in the people's pockets. For every dollar that the people do not pay in they will have a dollar left with them." But this is not the policy the hon. gentleman has been pursuing. He is levying duties which take the money from the people without putting it into the public treasury, and then, to meet the absolute necessities of the revenue he is putting on revenue taxes such as this tax on raw sugar. Then again, Sir, there is a fallacy in the hon. gentleman's argument which he has not thought of. He imagines that the people would have gone on importing as much sugar even though these duties had not been taken off. This is not a fact, but it is a sample of the hon. gentleman's reasoning.

I wish to call attention also to the mistakes in a table which the hon. gentleman read to the House, and I will ask the House to inquire whether the other statements he made may not be as delusive as this one. He stated that the exports from 1874 to 1879 fell off $18,000,000. Now, the hon. gentleman may possibly be right, but the Year-Book, which he will not deny is an authority, said that the exports fell off only $14,000,000 So that the hon. gentleman and the Year-Book are at variance to the extent of $4,000,000. I confess that I am rather surprised that the hon. gentleman should be so moderate in his error. Then he says that the imports during the same time fell off $46,000,000. But the Year-Book says that they fell off only $36,000,000. In this particular he has gone $10,000,000 beyond the Year-Book. I hope he will be able to settle this with the Year-Book and with his conscience.

Again, the fact has been alluded to by more than one speaker, that gentlemen on the other side are anti-English in all their speeches, and in all their arguments they have been trying to prove that England has gone to the dogs. They have been shouting, "Look at England; she is the only free trade country in the world. Why has she not had the sense to fall into line with every other country, and be protectionist?" I say, because it has paid England not to be protectionist. It has paid England to be a free trade country, to become the entrepot, the storehouse, the warehouse, the workshop, the great market of all the world. Whoever has anything to export, sends it to England. Whoever wants to buy anything goes to England to get it, and that is purely in consequence of the fact that England is a free trade country.

The Secretary of State has been going around the country telling us that it was because England for four hundred years was a protectionist country. Tell that to the marines, but not to the marine service of England, not to the marine service of the world. They know why England has gone on by leaps and bounds in prosperity. They know why the United States, in its foreign trade, has fallen behind; they know why Canada is falling behind.

Let us compare the general result. Free trade England has a Minister of Finance. He may not be as able as the Minister of Finance we have here. Sir William Harcourt may not be able to rank with the Minister of Finance of Canada, but he has one advantage over him at all events, he has been able to produce a surplus this year, while the Minister of Finance of

Canada has been able to produce already a highly creditable deficit. Why is that? For the simple reason that protective taxes do not yield revenue, and it has required this severe lesson to drum that fact into the head of the Minister of Finance and compel him to resort to a revenue tax again when money was absolutely required. Revenue taxes do yield a large revenue year after year, which you can build upon, and direct your expenditure accordingly. Protective taxes do not yield a revenue, they are not meant to. They are only meant to yield a revenue to the monopolists, not to the country, and they carry out their purpose admirably. Therefore, while free trade England has a surpulus, protectionist Canada has a deficit, protectionist France has a deficit, protectionist Germany has a deficit and in the protectionist United States, things are looking extremely blue indeed, in regard to their finances, although I have not at hand the figures to show how their usual surplus is decreasing from year to year.

Now, Sir, I will ask the House, late as it is, to listen to a few comparative figures as to the growth and prosperity of England while she has been under free trade. They say: Look at that free trade country. I, too, say: Look at her, and I am willing to allow the principle of free trade to be judged by the result. Of course I am speaking of England. Nobody is proposing to introduce into Canada free trade in the full English sense. Let me give some figures from Mulhall, the well known statistician. The population in England, in 50 years, has grown 42 per cent, but her wealth has grown 124 per cent, three times as fast as her population. Her trade has grown 472 per cent, ten times as fast as her population. Her shipping has grown 583 per cent, more than eleven times as fast as her population. Her manufacturers of woven things of all kinds, have grown 206 per cent, or five times as fast as her population. Her hardware trade has grown 412 per cent, ten times as fast as her population. Her mining has increased 276 per cent, more than six times as fast as her population. Her use of steam power has grown 1,040 per cent, as against 42 per cent of increase of population. Her banking has grown 572 per cent, and her revenue 73 per cent.

Agriculture alone, of all the interests in England, although it prospered for many years after free trade, has for the last few years, been slack; and this is one of the points that is most relied upon by our opponents as showing that free trade is not always good for the agriculturist. Now, Sir, I say it is not free trade that has reduced the position of the agriculturists of England for the last two years. It is the vast development of agricultural production all the world over, a cause that has operated in Canada, and the States, and Germany, and France, and everywhere else as well as in England. But in addition to that, there is a special cause that has been operating in England to keep down the agriculturist, and that is the monopoly in land enjoyed by the landlords. Rents have been fixed in England in the days when farm produce was high; those same rents are being paid to-day when farm produce is low, and the result is that until those rents have been modified to suit the changed condition of the agriculturist in England, that interest cannot be prosperous. It will startle Canadian farmers to know that in 1873, as shown by the report of a commission, the average rental of land in England was £3 per acre, 19s. in Scotland, and 13s. in Ireland; in other words, from $3 to about $15 per acre in the three Kingdoms, $15 in England, nearly $5 in Scotland, and over $3 in Ireland. Many of those leases are still existing. It would startle the Canadian farmer, who complains of low prices, to know how his English competitor is held down by that land charge, and that land charge has produced a monopoly in land, which, however, is no more galling than the monopoly of manufactured produce under which the Canadian farmer suffers.

Now, to show that England is not shut out of foreign markets, as is claimed by people on the other side, and is not compelled to force her trade at the point of the bayonet on unwilling savages, I will call your attention to the fact that she does not force it on her own colonies. During the last fifty years England's trade with her colonies only grew five times; her trade with the United States grew over five times; her trade with France over nine times; her trade with Germany over ten times, and her miscellaneous trade grew more than five and a half times. The aggregate trade of Britain with the world was $90 per head in the last year of which we have statistics; the trade of France was $45 per head; the trade of Germany, $35 per head; and the trade of the United States only $25 per head. The whole trade of Great Britain and her colonies is about one-third of the total trade of the world. That does not look as if England's trade was being seriously menaced or much injured by the competition of protected countries. The shipping trade of England has gone on increasing largely in comparison with that of other countries. In 1840, the proportion of British shipping entered in British ports was 68 per cent of the whole; in 1885, it was 73 per cent of the whole.

I will pass over the figures of the different kinds of textiles, but I wish to give you the figures of bank capital and deposits, which are a fair subject of comparison, because the savings banks in England are really for the working people, and their progress really shows the increased prosperity of that class. There were 10,000,000 depositors in England in 1887, who had $800,000,000 at their credit, or $80 per head. That shows that the ordinary depositor there is the workingman. The

savings bank deposits have grown fourteen times faster than the population, under free trade in Great Britain, which shows that the average depositor has grown fourteen times richer than he was fifty years ago. How does that compare with the United States and with other protected countries?

The bank capital and deposits in England, in fifty years, have grown over 300 per cent; on the continent they have grown 312 per cent, and in the United States, only 250 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite have boasted of the progress of the United States in many directions. Mulhall, from whom I quote all these figures and whose accuracy has never been questioned, says "the only point on which the United States has surpassed England is in regard to the increment of wealth, caused in a great measure by the enhanced value of western lands." The wealth of the United States grew in thirty years 89 per cent, as against 38 per cent in Great Britain. The trade of Great Britain, however, increased 200, as against 50 per cent in the United States; steam power increased in England 144 per cent as compared with 33 per cent in the United States; banking increased 130 per cent in Great Britain, compared with a decrease of nearly 5 per cent in the United States. That does not look as if the old country was going to the dogs very badly.

I have a large number of other figures, which would be useful and instructive though perhaps not interesting at this hour of the morning, and I pass them over; but I want to urge on the House in conclusion some words of wisdom from an hon. member to whom we always listen with amusement and interest. I refer to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), an hon. gentleman who is gradually making for himself a name in poetry as well as in romance, and who is rapidly earning for himself the title of the Walt Whitman of the Prairies. That hon. gentleman, though a loyal supporter of the Government, has sometimes in a moment of frankness spoken of the Administration and its methods, both on the floor of this House and elsewhere, the last occasion being at the late meeting of the Royal Society in Ottawa, and I extract a gem or two from a poem read by the hon. gentleman before that distinguished society. He cries:

> Let the wolf howl,
> Look to the west,
> And note the giant's strides;

We have looked to the west and have even watched the strides of the giant. We have taken his advice in this respect. We have heard the wolf of national and individual poverty howling at our doors, and when we hear him howl again, we will look to the giant of Assiniboia and take courage and mark his stride. Also note what he further said about the political management of Canada:

> Then turn from feasts of hell,
> From mumbling bones of faction,
> And sweep back to obscure night
> The bat-like lives,
> Whose wings are made in dark corruption's loom.
> Bestial mediocrities,
> Whose eyes blear at the light,
> And through the sacred edifice of our hopes,
> Wherein they snugly build,
> Hold erring flight,
> And mock the spirit of the mighty fane,
> And stain with ordure
> The altar-cloth of Liberty.

It is a great shame to allow bestial mediocrities to stain the alter cloth of liberty in that way. I agree with the giant of Assiniboia that it is time for us to scare them away. He proceeds:

> O, Canada! My country!
> What is there thou mightst not do
> If truth and honour guide thy steps?

I admit it. If truth and honour guided our steps, what a country this would be? No one would have to speak of blue ruin then. He continues:

> Arise! To-day, thy need is men,
> Men full of all lore,
> And master of that too,
> Men of brain, and heart, and will,
> Men who scorn base lucre's lures;

Men who will not look at boodle or touch it with a ten foot pole, who will not listen to the suggestion of the slightest bribe—these are the men we want. He goes on:

> Men of such breed, where are they?
> Factions which keep thy pocket lean,
> And torture fact——

This was prophetic of the speech of the Secretary of State:

> And blind thine eyes to truth,
> Repress the wise,
> But many a one, true as the great of old,
> Is thine.

We thank him for the information. We thank him for the assurance, but we want to ask him one question—who are the other men?

> Awake! Thou drowsing child of destiny,
> Awake! Escape from clinging phantasms,
> Soar free from shams and shibboleths,
> To find thy kingly men—thy greatest need,
> Thy first of duties;
> To hear, and harken to the voice of truth.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that the House and the country will re-echo these wild warblings of the Walt Whitman of the prairies.

House divided on amendment (p. 655):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Bain (Wentworth),	Innes,
Beausoleil,	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,

Boston,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Calvin,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Dawson,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Vaillancourt,
Welsh, and
Yeo.—71.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Leclair,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonnell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGreevey,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Pridham,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guillet,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westm'd).—117.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Weldon,	Borden,
Macdowall,	Fauvel,
Stevenson,	Scriver,
Hazen,	Gillmor,
Patterson (Huron),	Bowers,
Smith (Sir Donald),	Delisle,
McLean (P.E.I.).	Perry.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) has not voted.

Mr. STEVENSON. I was paired with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver).

Motion agreed to ; and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 2.35 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Dominion Trusts Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Taylor.)

SUPERANNUATION ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) to amend the Superannuation Act. He said : The Bill is a short one.

It proposes to amend the Superannuation Act in two or three particulars, the principal of which I will give. The first section will give power to the Governor General in Council, at any time, on the recommendation of the Treasury Board, to declare that the Act shall not apply to any class of officers, clerks, employees or servants herein above designated, and thereafter the Act shall not apply to any appointments from that date. This gives the Governor General in Council, on the report of the Treasury Board, power to decrease the classes to which it may be applied but not to increase. Then the next principal amendment is in the third section. The limit in that section is ten years. After a person has served ten years, superannuation may apply. It is proposed to raise the limit from ten to fifteen years. Under the law as it now is, if a clerk has not been in service ten years, he may be given a retiring gratuity in proportion to the years of his service. The law is not changed in regard to that, except that the number of years will be raised from ten to fifteen. The next principal amendment is in the matter of abatement. So far as all who belong to the Civil Service are concerned, from and after the time of the passing of this measure, the abatement will be made equivalent to the abatement in the Civil Service Superannuation Act, number two, so called, which was passed two or three years ago, thus putting all civil servants upon the same basis, so far as abatements are concerned. The House will remember that in discussing the Superannuation Act, number two, the abatement which was then adopted for all who entered after that date was considered sufficient to carry the burden of superannuation, with the arrangement which was made that the sums of money remaining from time to time in the hands of the Government should be added to by a rate of interest at 6 per cent.

Mr. LAURIER. While I do not desire at this moment to enter upon any discussion of this Bill, I must at once say to the hon gentleman that the main feature of the Bill is one which I think ought not to commend itself in any way to the approval of this House. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, the main feature of the Bill is to give the Governor in Council the power to apply the Act or to prevent it from applying to a certain class of civil servants, a class which he has not defined at all or even mentioned. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I view this departure from the existing law with all the more suspicion because I hold that, as a rule, the Governor in Council should not be clothed with any power that at present appertains to Parliament, unless very grave reasons are shown for the change; and in this particular instance the hon. gentleman has abstained altogether from giving any reason whatever why there should be such a departure from the existing law. The hon. gentleman failed to give one single reason, even the shadow of a reason, why the existing law should be amended or the present system departed from in this particular. He stated simply that this was the wish of the Government but no more. I look upon the principle of this Bill as unsound, and I at once challenge the opinion of hon. members that the Bill cannot be looked upon with favour unless better reasons shall be given on the second reading than have been given to-day.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the Finance Minister has come to the conclusion that, owing to the agitation which has been kept up on this side of the House in opposition to the objectionable manner in which the superannuation system has been managed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and owing to the strong expressions of public opinion throughout the country as to the abuses of that Act, something must be done if possible. He has introduced the Bill he has now brought before the House so as, if possible, to forestall the measure I already have on the Order paper affecting the superannuation Act. Had it not been for the manner in which the Government have abused the superannuation system as originally established, the public feeling of bitterness and opposition to the Act which has arisen would not have existed in the country to-day. The Act has been made to apply in many instances to people who are now travelling around the cities and towns of this Dominion and drawing large sums of public money and who have been removed from the Civil Service not because of incapacity or inability to perform their duties or because of age, but because their positions were wanted for other parties, possibly the relatives of Ministers. The people have become indignant at these abuses. The hon. gentleman wants to lengthen the minimum period of service, before superannuation can take place, from ten to fifteen years. I would like to know if he has eliminated the provision that enables the Governor in Council to add years to the time of service, a principle in the Act which has already been so flagrantly abused. Under the Act, as the hon. gentleman proposes, a man cannot be superannuated until he has served fifteen years. But under the old Act one could not be superannuated unless he had served ten years. But the hon. gentleman knows that there are dozens of men who have been superannuated who never served ten years, who, in some cases only served seven years. The Government took advantage of the provision giving them power to add years to the time of service, in order to bring some of these parties under the operation of the Act. We will take the opportunity to point out the weak features and objectionable peculiarities of the Bill the Finance Minister has introduced. And I want to tell the hon. gentleman here and

now that no half-way measures in dealing with this question will meet the public sentiment as it is at this moment. The people of this country have set their teeth in determination that the system of superannuation shall be wiped out utterly ; they are not going any longer to permit the existence of a system under which 551 men are now on the superannuated list drawing $263,000 a year, a clear annual loss to the people of $200,000. And the Finance Minister might as well recognize that at once and agree to the absolute abandonment of the system, leaving the civil servants to provide for themselves. Now, Sir, the Finance Minister overloaded a return I asked for on this question in order, I have no doubt, to delay the second reading of my Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want now to intimate to the Finance Minister that if he wants to keep faith with the House on that question he will hasten the submission of that return, so that we may proceed intelligently to the discussion of the whole matter, when we reach the second reading of that Bill. I want him therefore to see that that return is laid upon the Table of the House before he moves the second reading of his own Bill, for we shall not be in a position to deal intelligently with the superannuation system unless we have the operations of the Act laid before us in such shape that we can judge how it has been applied during the twenty years it has been in force. Had the Government, in the first place permitted the continuation of the deductions from the salaries of civil servants for the benefit of the superannuation fund, there would have been a very respectable sum to he credit of the system. But, Sir Leonard Tilley, in his desire, no doubt, to favour the Civil Service, reduced these deductions by one-half in 1873. And the result is that abuses have been multiplied down to the present time and the fund has run behind, until the people of this Dominion have been called upon to submit to a clear loss of $240,000, which sum has been sacrificed under the operation of this system. The facts, no doubt, will be shown when the return comes down, and I again would say to the Finance Minister that, in justice to the House, it is right and proper that that return should be laid upon the Table before he moves the second reading of his Bill, in order to enable every member of the House to form a clear, intelligent opinion with regard to the application of the Act in the past and with regard to the propriety of this House giving its sanction to the Bill the hon. gentleman has introduced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be as well if the Minister of Finance should explain to us what he means by this remarkable clause giving the Governor in Council power to exempt certain classes. There is no doubt, as my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) pointed out, that it is an invidious power, and a power that the House should not place in the hands of any other body. Nor is this a case in which by any possibility there can be urgency. I cannot understand, therefore, why the hon. gentleman proposes this course. If the Government want to make a rigid rule in this matter, I can see very good reasons indeed for doing what I have many a time and oft contended was the proper course to be pursued with respect to the Civil Service ; namely, divide them into two classes, one composed of men of superior qualifications and ability as to whom it should be a question whether superannuation or pension should be granted, and the other composed of writers, copyists and others making up the larger portion of those employed by us who do merely clerical work. No bank I have heard of would pay for the work done in our departments anything the amounts the Government of Canada are now paying. Within the last fourteen or fifteen years the expenditure for civil government has been as nearly as possible doubled—quite doubled, if you take into account the increase in superannuation allowance. But the point I would like to hear discussed by the Finance Minister—and it is one that can well be stated on the first reading of the Bill so that we might have full opportunity to consider it—is his reason, if he has any, for proposing to give power to the Governor in Council to select a certain class, and what possible reason there can be for not coming down to the House and the Parliament generally with a well defined scheme under which this class should be exempted from the provisions of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that the principle involved in that clause is already, to a certain extent, embodied in the Act now on the statute-book, giving certain powers to the Governor General in Council in the way of interpreting it, and deciding to what classes it belongs. The idea cannot be expressed any more simply and plainly than it was, I think, when I introduced the Bill. The object is that if, at any time, upon examination of the services, there be any classes of employees to which it is thought the superannuation system thereafter should not be applied, the Government shall have power to diminish the extent of the application of the superannuation so far as that class is concerned. I shall be prepared, when we come to the second reading, to give to the House, probably much more definitely than I can now, the information on this and all other questions which my hon. friends so much desire. With reference to the return spoken of by my hon. friend opposite, I do not suppose he meant to threaten us with dire penalties if the return is not down. All I can say is that

I have two clerks at it all the time, and it is being pushed forward with all possible speed, except on Sundays and the darkest part of the night. It will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no doubt the Government is putting on all their speed, but their speed is very slow.

Mr. FOSTER. We have gone all very well the last fifteen years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONFERRING IMPERIAL HONOURS ON CANADIANS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether His Excellency the Governor in Council makes any recommendations to the Imperial Government with respect to the conferring of Imperial honours on Canadians? If not, do such recommendations emanate from His Excellency, personally?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that some years ago Parliament anticipated some such request as this for information, and made provision for it in that it supplied members of Parliament with copies of Parliamentary Government in the Colonies, on pages 314 and 315 of which will be found Lord Elgin's despatch to the Colonial Secretary, then the Duke of Newcastle, which will give to the hon. gentleman full information. I hope it will be very helpful to him in the question which he has entered.

Mr. LAURIER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that Lord Elgin laid down many rules which have been discarded by this Government many times over.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that, however, has not been discarded. I imagine the Imperial Government stands by the constitutional usage in the bestowal of its honours.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Government has not answered my question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no discussion upon a question after it has been put. The Government may answer it or not, as they choose.

Mr. CASEY. Do you rule that a question can be answered or not, just as the Government choose?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is the rule, the Government may refuse to answer if they choose. At all events, I am quite clear upon the point that there can be no discussion upon the question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to ask your ruling upon one point: Whether it is within the province of a member of this Parliament, as it is of the Imperial Parliament, to ask supplementary questions directly involved in, or arising out of, the main question submitted on the paper? That is the usual practice, and it is carried on very extensively in England, and is necessary to the proper discharge of their duties by members of Parliament; and if you rule in my favour, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman the supplementary question as to whether there was a despatch or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Those questions are excluded out by the rules; they are supplementary questions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The practice is constant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is entirely a matter of consent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will invite the Speaker's ruling on the point, and if he decides in my favour, I will put the supplementary question as to whether there is or is not a despatch emanating from the Home Office?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a matter that comes under the point of order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I propose to ask the supplementary question.

Mr. SPEAKER. What I think the hon. member ought first to do is to ascertain whether it would be in order to put that question or not. The question ought first to be determined by the Chair as to whether a supplementary question can be put.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I place myself entirely in your hands on that question, and I ask your ruling upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule in our House is this:

> Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs, and to other members relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned; but in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same. And, in answering any such question, a member is not to debate the matter to which the same refers.

On the same point, Mr. Bourinot lays down this rule:

> The answer to a question should be brief and distinct, and limited to such explanations as are absolutely necessary to make the reply intelligible, but some latitude is allowed the Ministers of the Crown, whenever they may find it necessary to extend their remarks with the view of clearly explaining the matter in question. When the answer to a question has been given, it is irregular to comment upon it, or upon the subject thereby introduced to the House; the necessary consequence of which would be to engage the House in a debate when there was no question before it at all.

I may say with reference to the ruling asked for by the hon. member for Queen's, that I think when a question has been put and the Government has either answered or declined to answer it, that should end the whole matter with reference to that particular question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to place this presentation of the case before you with reference to the point of order. The Government have neither given an answer to the question nor declined to give an answer. It is the custom in England, if a question is asked, for the Government to answer that question or decline to answer it. On grounds of public policy, or because the answer of the Government is likely to embarrass it in any way, or to disclose facts that it is necessary to conceal, the Government is warranted in declining on that ground to answer the question. But in this case the Government have treated the question with contempt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the hon. gentleman as an old parliamentarian is aware that he cannot go on discussing the question when a point of order has been raised.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was not permitted to finish my statement. I wish to speak to the point of order. My point of order is this: A question has been put to the Government by the hon. member for East Grey; that question has not been answered by the Government; the Government have not declined to answer it; the statement made by the Government was an evasion of the question. That is my point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course there may be two opinions as to whether a question has been answered or not. It may be that the answer is not a satisfactory one to the hon. member who asked it; other hon. members may think it is a satisfactory answer. Thus there may be a difference of opinion, but it is not the part of the hon. member who asks the question to say that the answer given is not a sufficient one. What was the question asked:

Whether His Excellency the Governor in Council makes any recommendations to the Imperial Government with respect to the conferring of Imperial honours on Canadians? If not, do such recommendations emanate from His Excellency personally?

I venture to say that my hon. friend has not read the citation which I gave, and if he will read that citation he will find it is an explicit answer to the question.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I read that before you were born.

Mr. SPEAKER. Whether the Finance Minister has given a satisfactory or an explicit answer to the question it is not for me to determine. Under our rules the Chair has no power to go further than the rules indicate, that is to say, when a question is put the Government answers as it seems to them fit, and, as I have already stated, under our rules no debate can take place.

CUSTOMS VALUATIONS.

Mr. CASEY asked, (a.) What are the names of all persons, not members of the Civil Service, appointed as agents by the Government, or the Department of Customs, to collect information as to the classification, or value for duty of various classes of merchandise, or consulted by the Government or department, as experts in regard to such classification or value? (b.) What class, or classes, of merchandise does each deal with? (c.) In what country, or countries, does each act? (d.) What pay, or allowance, does each receive? (e.) What was the occupation of each at the time of appointment or consultation? (f.) Which, if any, continue to do business as manufacturers of the same classes of merchandise in regard to which they collect information, or are consulted, or of similar merchandise, or as the agents of such manufacturers? (g.) Are all collectors notified of the classifications and valuations fixed by the Government on the basis of such information or advice, as soon as they are decided on, so that such valuations may be uniform throughout the Dominion?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know that any individual is so employed at the present time who is not a member of the Civil Service. It is only when an important question arises at a time when our regular staff is fully occupied, or when a question is so technical in its nature as to render advisable the employment of one technically qualified to make the investigation, that individual might be employed temporarily in this connection. Questions b, c, d, e, and f, I presume require no answer, as no such individuals are employed. All collectors are notified by departmental memorandum of the valuations fixed on the basis of information, as soon as such values are decided upon on receipt of report of investigation, and thus uniform action is ensured throughout the Dominion in respect of entries of goods so referred to.

Mr. CASEY asked, Is the Government aware that a Board of Experts has been for some years in operation in the United States for the purpose of dealing with questions and disputes between collectors of customs and importers as to rates of duty, classification and value for duty, &c., and of acting as a Board of Reference in matters of seizures; and that it appears to have well fulfilled its purpose of insuring to the Government the full customs revenue intended

by the Customs Act, of securing uniformity in valuation for duty, and of affording satisfaction to importers as is alleged in the petition of certain merchants, importers and manufacturers of Montreal, lately presented to this House? Is it the intention of the Government to grant the prayer of that petition for the appointment of a similar board?

Mr. WALLACE. As to the Board of United States Appraisers, the Government is aware that a Board of Customs has been for some years in operation for the purpose of hearing and considering questions as to duty where difference of opinion arises between the customs officers and importers. The latter part of the hon. member's query on this subject is a question of fact which is not strictly within the purview of the Government. As to the intention of the Government to institute such a Board of Customs, the Government have come to no decision on the subject.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works, who has charge of this Chamber, to a matter of some consequence to the health of members. The ventilation, as the weather becomes hot, grows worse and worse. It was very bad last night, although it may be accounted for by various causes; but if the thermometer keeps at its present range we will all be put to unnecessary convenience unless the Minister of Public Works can devise some means of giving better ventilation to the Chamber. A year or more ago I asked the hon. gentleman to see if any means could be devised for improving the ventilation by the introduction of a system of ventilating fans, which would more or less purify the air and keep it in motion during the hot weather. By the expenditure of a few hundred dollars much comfort might be given to hon. members who have to spend many hours here.

Mr. OUIMET. There is no objection to trying the plan suggested by my hon. friend, but I can tell him that during these hot days, and especially when as last night 3,000 or 4,000 people were assembled to listen to the Secretary of State, it is quite impossible to keep the Chamber cool. Nothing can be devised to improve the present system of ventilation. This is carried on by a system of pipes placed at different points, the foul air there being drawn down from underneath and fresh air introduced through the walls or from the roof. Another difficulty arises from the fact that the temperature that will suit one hon. member will not suit another. All necessary means are provided for bringing in fresh and cool air, but ventilation which is felt to be a benefit by one hon. member is considered to be a nuisance by another, and of course those who are sick or in feeble health must be first considered. I suggest that there should be certain hours during the day when it would be understood the Chamber would be unoccupied, so that the employees might be able to open every door and the full volume of fresh air sent into the Chamber. This rule ought to be observed especially between 6 and 8 o'clock in the evening.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the Minister of Public Works has tried the experiment of ventilating fans.

Mr. OUIMET. We can do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak with knowledge that they have been very effective in smaller chambers. I am aware that when the House is crowded the viciousness of the original construction is so great that it is utterly impossible to ventilate this cockpit here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I agree with the Minister of Public Works that it is difficult to ventilate the Chamber from windows, because some members may object to the draft. I remember some years ago being in a large hall in London, and after the audience had been there for some time, part of the roof was taken off to ventilate the room. I do not suppose that could be done here, but we could do the next best thing and raise the artificial glass roof overhead.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You have been raising the roof for a fortnight.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After we sit here for some hours the foul air arises, but cannot get beyond the artificial roof, and if an arrangement could be made that a portion of the glass would be open from time to time, it would allow the foul air to escape.

Mr. OUIMET. The theory is that the foul air is the heaviest and comes down to the floor, and has to escape from underneath. If it is as hot as it is to-day outside, there will be very little good from introducing hot air from the exterior, as far as the coolness of the atmosphere is concerned.

Mr. CHARLTON. Last session the Minister of Public Works promised that he would have some of his officers inspect the ventilation system of the Ontario House of Assembly, which has been newly built and which is furnished with all modern appliances for ventilation. Has the hon. gentleman kept that promise?

Mr. OUIMET. I think my chief architect looked into the question and I will let the hon. gentleman know later on.

P.E.I. RAILWAY TIME TABLE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have received a couple of telegrams stating that the time

table on the Intercolonial Railway, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, has been entirely changed within the last few days. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if that is so, and what the changes are?

Mr. HAGGART. There has been no change in the time table as yet, and no change will be made until it is submitted to me. I believe that a new time table is to be submitted to me next Tuesday, but what it is I do not know at present. I will send it to the hon. gentleman as soon as possible.

REPORTS.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

Abstract of Statements of Insurance Companies in Canada, for the year ending 31st December, 1894.—(Mr. Foster.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the irregularity of the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee, which is probably the most important committee of the House of Commons. As a matter of fact it was not organized until some three or four weeks after the House had been in session, and there have been only three or four meetings since. The work is of a very important character and unless we have more frequent meetings, it will be utterly impossible for us to get through any substantial portion of our business. The effect of the delay, whether intentional or not, is to burk inquiry before that committee. I do not charge the Government with intentional delay, but so far as the effect is concerned, they might just as well intend to do it. I trust the chairman of that committee, and the Minister who attends the meetings, will see that it is called at least twice a week. We have only two short hours a day in the committee, and unless more frequent meetings are held, it will be impossible to accomplish anything.

Mr. FOSTER. The Public Accounts Committee did not meet recently because of the holidays that were taken by the House. It might have met to-day, but there was an important meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee. I believe it has been called for Tuesday next. I am not disposed to say that two meetings a week are too frequent.

Mr. LISTER. We will have a month after that; and that will be about eight hours' work.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. When may I expect the return ordered on the 26th of April regarding allowances made to Hayter Reed? It should have been here before this time.

Mr. DALY. The return requires information running over a great number of years, and it is being prepared. Clerks were put to work on it immediately after the motion passed the House, and the hon. gentleman may expect it at the end of the week.

Mr. MULOCK. When will the Order of the House passed on the 26th of March last, with reference to the correspondence between the Canadian and Imperial Governments respecting the cattle embargo, be complied with? I have more than once asked the Government the reason of the non-production of that report. I also, at an early stage of the session, called attention that an Order of the House of a previous session had not been complied with. In 1892 or 1893, I forget which for the moment, a return was ordered as to industries in the county of York. It has been frequently promised, but never has been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Secretary of State comes into the Chamber I will call his attention to the matter.

THE DOMINION CENSUS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Clerk calls the Orders of the Day, I desire to call the attention of the Government and of the House to what seems to me to be a contempt of the rules and rights of the House; and, if it is necessary to a discussion of this subject that I should move the adjournment of the House, I make that motion. More than two years ago, I moved, in this House, for a return, and I stated that my reason for that motion was to show the gross inaccuracy of the census which had been made, and upon which hon. gentlemen were relying for the discussion and settlement of many questions of great public interest and importance. The whole of that session went by without that return being brought down. Last session I again called the attention of the Government to the subject, and a promise was given that the return should be brought down; but, although the Government's attention was frequently called to the subject, and the promise to bring down the return was frequently made, no return was brought down. When we met again in this the third session from the time the return was ordered, I again called the attention of the Government to the fact that no such return was brought down, that the order of the House was disregarded, in fact, that the Government were guilty of a contempt of an order made by this House. Now, Sir, this matter has become one of so grave importance, that it has become a question whether this House has any rights that the Government are bound to respect. I hold, Sir, to the ancient views of our constitution in that respect. As a member of this

House, as a citizen of a free country and a free people, I stand up as an advocate of the rights of those people; and, if they are to be taken away, they shall not be taken away by a silent pretense at acquiescence on the part of the Government, or by a silent determination not to comply with the order of the House. If that course is to be adopted, Sir, I intend that hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Government and support them shall make themselves a party to the destruction of this right which belongs to us as a free people. Sir, the Government, as trustees of the people under the Census Act, employed friends all over the country for the purpose of taking the census in accordance with the law. That work was not properly done. Whether the officers of the Government in the departments here were the parties to that inaccurate discharge of that important work, which has rendered the whole of the expense involved unnecessary and improper, it will be a matter for us hereafter to inquire. Large sums of money have been taken from the treasury by the Government, with the consent of Parliament, for the discharge of that work. Now, Sir, when we know, and when it has been brought to the attention of the Government over and over again by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), by myself on one or two occasions, and by other members of this House, that this work has not been properly done——

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I understand that we had your ruling the other day that the motion to adjourn the House had been abused, and that no hon. member of the House could make a motion to adjourn except in a case of urgency. The hon. gentleman is now discussing the census. I do not know that it is a matter of urgency that the hon. gentleman should take up the time of the House discussing something that occurred some years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the question of order raised by the hon. gentleman, I can conceive nothing more urgent than the fact that an order of this House passed two years ago has been deliberately disregarded by the Government, and nothing more requiring the immediate attention of the House or meriting a motion for adjournment.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be very true if the hon. gentleman had confined himself to what he calls a deprivation of the rights of the House; but the hon. gentleman, under cover of that, went into a discussion of the question whether the census were properly taken, and attacked the Government on that ground.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I deny that any statement I made——

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I would like your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the point raised by the hon. Minister of the Interior, I am afraid that I was not fully understood when I spoke the other day. I first drew the attention of the House to the practice that prevailed in England, and to the fact that a standing order had been adopted in 1882, if I rightly remember the time at the moment, in consequence of the abuse of the privilege of moving the adjournment of the House. What I stated then, and I have to repeat it again to-day, was that under our rules a member might move the adjournment of the House, if he is so disposed, and bring up any question he chooses. Of course, I have my own idea as to the propriety of adopting that method of bringing a question before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, what I say now is in perfect accord with what you ruled a few days ago; I desire to pay every respect to your ruling, and I acquiesce in the rule you laid down. But I submit that there could not be a matter of greater importance than the one I am now bringing to the attention of the House. If there ever was an occasion when this privilege might be invoked for the purpose of discussing an abuse, it is on an occasion like this. I have pointed out that the accurate taking of the census is a matter of great importance, upon which this House ought to have an opportunity of being fully informed, that I moved for a return with the view of furthering that object, and that the Government have deliberately withheld from the House the information for which I asked and which the House ordered on that occasion; and I say, Sir, that the Government are guilty of a contempt of the rules and rights of this House in the course they have taken. What I asked for was a return that would have shown that the census was grossly inaccurate, that it was used for the purpose of supporting a series of propositions which it would not support, and that it was, to all appearances, made inaccurate in order that it might be employed for the purpose for which it is now being used. Well, Sir, I think this House has a right to insist upon the orders which it makes being strictly obeyed, and obeyed within a reasonable time; and if the Government are not disposed to bring down the information for which I asked, after nearly three sessions have gone by, I give notice that I shall submit to this House a motion censuring the Administration, and in that way shift from their shoulders to the shoulders of their supporters in this House the responsibility for the gross and improper manner in which the rights and liberties of the people have been violated. If the Ministers had said, "We will not obey the order of the House; we will not give the information for which you ask; we know

the purpose for which that information is asked, and we will take care that it is not obtained so as to be used for that purpose;" that would have been a bold and courageous course. The rights and privileges of this House would have been boldly set aside, but the Government, without having the courage to take that course, do precisely the same thing by their dilatory proceedings. I submit that we are entitled to the information which I have asked for, which the Government have again and again promised, but which promise they persist failing to carry out. This is a matter of the very first importance, and, therefore, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friend has grown, perhaps, much warmer than he expected to when he began, and I shall show the House, before I am through, that my hon. friend from Bothwell has, perhaps, not been quite so fair this last couple of weeks with regard to the Agriculture Department as he has been in the past. I promised, a couple of weeks ago that these returns would be hastened as quickly as possible, and I took it in my hands to see that that promise was carried out. In most of the departments there are no returns standing out at present, and that all returns are being expedited is evidenced by the fact that in the last three or four days, no less than fifteen have been laid upon the Table in answer to motions on the other side. As to the returns from the Agriculture Department, I have to say that I have urged the very greatest possible speed, and they will be brought down at the earliest possible day. To show the great importance of these returns, and the great anxiety which hon. gentlemen opposite exhibit to have them, I may state, as an evidence of their anxiety, the fact that a return, concerning the non-delivery of which my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has complained this afternoon, was laid on the Table yesterday, and he can see it at any moment on application to the Clerk. It was a return moved for on the 26th March, and laid on the Table yesterday. I say again that we are expediting these returns as quickly as possible, and I give my word that no time shall be lost in presenting them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Considering that these returns were moved for three years ago, it is no answer to the hon. gentleman to tell us that he is now hastening their preparation. It is disgraceful conduct on the part of the Administration to delay the returns in this manner, and the House is very forgetful of its rights if hon. members allow themselves to be insulted in this way by the Government. The Government ought to be made aware of the fact that they are the servants of the House, and if they are not prepared to act as such, they should quit their places. It is the plain duty of every member of this Parliament to insist that when a return is ordered by this House, the Government should bring it down in reasonable time, or give some better excuse than has been given by the Secretary of State for the non-production of returns ordered three years ago.

Mr. MARTIN. There are two returns that I moved for last session and which this House ordered, and which are not yet brought down. If the Government do not intend to give the information asked for, they should say so at the time when the motion is made. The matters which I brought before the House were matters which I have no doubt the Government desire to hide from the people. In the first place, I asked for a return showing the expenses to the country of the Ministers who had perambulated the country in search of information with regard to the tariff. That motion was passed without any opposition. After waiting a reasonable time, I asked the cause of the delay and was informed that the return was in course of preparation, and would be brought down in a few days. After a month or two I was told at length that the Government had decided not to give the information. I also moved for another return showing the expenses of Canada at the Chicago Exposition. That motion equally passed without objection; but although, in answer to repeated inquiries. I was always assured that it was in course of preparation and would be brought down in a few days, it has not been brought down, so far as I know, unless it is among the batch of returns to which the hon. Secretary of State refers as having been laid on the Table within the last day or two. I understand that the Government do not desire to have any discussion as to the expenses at Chicago. It is well known that they were grossly extravagant in their expenses. The returns we have had as to the expenses of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) have thrown some light on that question; but if the Government are ashamed of their expenses and were not prepared to give full disclosures, why did they not tell the House at once that they would not give this information? They took, instead, the other course which is neither straightforward nor honest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MARTIN. I certainly do not intend to use unparliamentary language.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the word "dishonest."

Mr. MARTIN. I did not say dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman said the Government were not honest.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw the word if it is not parliamentary; but I charge the Government with not having met the Opposition in a manly and straightforward manner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to have their conduct in this matter criticised? In fact, it will not bear criticism. This is not a party question at all. It seems to me that when the House passed a motion, without any objection on the part of the Government, the refusal to carry out the order of the House is something for which every member of the House, irrespective of party, should bring the Government to account. The Government have agreed, on the order of the House, to give certain information, they keep promising that the return is being prepared, but fail to bring it down. It is very difficult to get the parliamentary word to apply to that course of action, especially when it transpires afterwards there has not been even the commencement of an effort to prepare the same. A Minister gravely informs the House that the return is being prepared, and will be brought down, and all the time the Government never intended to bring it down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly rule that the language is entirely unparliamentary, but I think the hon. gentleman might omit the statement that the Government did not intend to bring the returns down. He cannot possibly know that the Government did not intend to bring it down.

Mr. MARTIN. I can only judge, Mr. Speaker, by what occurred; and, if I find a motion passed here early last session, and, after asking on a number of occasions for that return and being told that it is in course of preparation, and if I find the second session long advanced and the return not yet before us, I have a right, I think, to come to some conclusion with regard to the matter, and the only conclusion I can come to is the one I have stated. I must support the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell, as a member of this House—not as a Liberal or a party man; and it does seem to me that hon. members on the other side of the House should take as much interest in this matter as we on this side do. If the information asked for ought not to be brought down, let the motion calling for it be contested, and let us understand the position we occupy. But once the resolution is passed, it is the duty of the Government to bring the return down as soon as it is possible, under the circumstances, to get it ready.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a word in reply to the hon. the Secretary of State as to what he said with regard to the number of returns laid on the Table of the House yesterday. If the Secretary of State would distinctly intimate the returns he was laying on the Table, so that members who are interested would understand what they are, it would save a great deal of trouble. The hon. gentleman, when he has anything peculiarly pleasing to himself to announce to the House, has lung power enough to make himself heard. He certainly could afford to throw a little effort into the announcement of the returns he brings down, so that hon. members might understand what the papers are that he is laying on the Table. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) would not have been under the necessity of calling attention to the delay in bringing down the order he had moved for, if the Secretary of State had done as I now suggest. I have noticed that since the hon. gentleman assumed the position he now occupies his voice is sometimes almost inaudible, but if he would accept the suggestion I make, much trouble and annoyance would be saved.

Mr. FRASER. I made a suggestion which I think ought to meet with the approval of members on both sides. Very often a member is not present when the return in which he is interested is brought down. I think the officials are not so overworked but that, when a return is brought down, they could notify the member who moved for it of that fact.

Mr. OUIMET. I may be able to assist the hon. gentleman by referring him to the Votes and Proceedings, which are published every day, in which, if he gives himself the trouble to read them, he will find mentioned every report as it is laid upon the Table. For instance, take No. 27, being the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday, and the hon. gentleman will find:

> Sir Adolphe Caron laid before the House, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—The Report of the Postmaster General, for the year ended 30th June, 1894.

And so with the others.

An hon. MEMBER. These are reports, returns are not mentioned.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes; they are all there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). During the last few years, I have obtained the order of the House for the return of papers in several instances, but I have never been so fortunate as to have a single one of those returns brought down, unless the return I asked for the other day has been laid upon the Table very lately. The information that we ask for one year, may not be of equal importance for the transaction of the public business for the next year. The hon. gentleman has not explained the bringing down

of returns two or three years late. For my own part, as I say, I have never yet received a single return I moved for. That indicates negligence or carelessness on the part of the persons having these matters in charge.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. Secretary of State told the House with regard to a return of the census of the city of London, moved by the hon. member for Bothwell three years ago, that it was being pushed, and he hoped it would soon be ready. If that is so, the statement itself shows that for three years it has not been pushed, or it would have been ready before now. The action of the hon. gentleman may be very proper; but if it is, in the absence of any explanation or excuse for what has passed, his action is the most complete condemnation of the course of the Government for the last three years. Does not the hon. gentleman see that? He has not offered the House the slightest explanation or excuse for the delay that has occurred.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have already informed the hon. gentleman that the preparation of these returns sometimes involve a great deal of work. The return asked for by my hon. friend from Bothwell is one of these.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would the return take more than two hours' work of a couple of clerks?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rose for the purpose of explaining——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask the hon. gentleman that question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The selection of these figures from the census returns, I was going to say, involves a great deal of labour. Let me give an example of the work necessary in preparing these returns. There is in preparation now a return which was moved for by a member of the Opposition in the Senate, which involves the selection of material covering 300 pages of foolscap and the copying of two ledgers each covering 600 pages of accounts. The preparation of such returns involves a great deal of work, which cannot be done in a day; and I say that the department is expediting this work as much as possible.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think I can give the explanation which the hon. gentleman has not been able to give of the long delay that has taken place in the preparation of this return. It is being prepared in a department presided over by a Minister who boasted that when the constitution was in his way he was quite ready to jump over it, if the purposes of his party demanded it. The preparation of this return was not in the interests of his party, I suppose, and finding the constitution which lays upon him the duty of preparing it, to be in his way, he simply jumped over it.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not understand that this is a party question in any way. We are all, as members of the House interested in this, and if there were any instances in which unreasonable delay had occurred in bringing down returns ordered by this House, of course it would be a gross delinquency in the department by which the work should have been performed. We cannot have any feeling as supporters of the Government in favour of unreasonable delay. I must say, as a member of the printing committee, that I have known cases of returns moved for, sometimes no doubt by members on the Ministerial side of the House, which, when the question of printing them came up, were found to be so voluminous that they must have involved a great deal of labour. Again and again it has been decided in such cases not to print the return, and, sometimes, we discovered that even the member who moved for it did not require even a copy. However, Sir, the principle is one which goes to the root of parliamentary efficiency. I quite agree with the general statements of the hon. member for Bothwell. I know nothing of the merits of the particular case involved, but undoubtedly the hon. gentleman is correct in his statements as to the absolute right of this House to call for returns, and as to the gross disrespect that would be involved in refusing to bring down such returns or delaying them unreasonably. It would be a fatal blow at the efficiency of Parliament that would be dealt by a policy of that kind. There can be no doubt that the general principle stated by the hon. gentleman is sound, and it is one that the Conservatives of this House, as well as the Liberals are deeply interested in. It is not to be supposed for one moment that only members on the Liberal side of the House will move for returns which there might be some indisposition on the part of the Government to bring down, or in regard to which there might be some misapprehension, or some worse motive, for refusing to bring them down. It is a weapon for the good of the public that hon. gentlemen in this House should not surrender for one minute, and when a member of the House moves for returns and they are ordered, they must be brought down within a reasonable time. I know nothing whatever of the merits of the case referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell, but the general principle he has laid down is one that every member of the House who cares for the efficiency of the business of the House, or for his own standing or self-respect in it, must entirely endorse.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to the returns laid upon the Table of the House yesterday by the Secretary of State, I may say that while urging its production, I have been in the habit of examining the Votes and Proceedings to see if it had been produced.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was produced late last night.

Mr. MULOCK. I was in the House about the time the Secretary of State was speaking, and did not call his attention to it because I knew he was otherwise engaged, and I did not wish to disturb him. I desire to call his attention to the fact that the return iteslf is almost entirely composed of printed documents from the Imperial Government, and since the whole work devolving upon his department does not involve more than a couple of hours' work by a typewriter, it does seem to me that the month taken up in the preparation of that return, was rather spinning it out. There are nineteen letters of about a folio apiece, making about twenty folios altogether. Of course, the Government have an army of clerks and sessional writers who have really had but very little to do since the House met. Now, if the Secretary of State claims such credit to himself for complying with this branch of my request, would he be good enough to explain why he did not at the same time produce the other return ordered some three years ago, and which has been promised several times. Remember that it is about as bad to tell an untruth as to break a promise, and the Minister covers one branch of the subject by a pledge ; now don't let him endanger the other side of it by breaking the promise. He has promised me and promised the House to bring it down, and the return in respect of which he is in default, is a very trifling one in volume, namely, the number of industries in certain districts. There are said to be only a very few of them at best ; so, whilst I am willing to express my gratitude on receiving this small contribution, I will reserve a portion of it until he has fully complied with the order of the House and carried out his own pledge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend has been so grateful, and has smiled so seductively, that I will bring down the other one as quickly as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no question of gratitude here at all, it is a question of debt. When an order of this House has been passed, the Government is entitled to no gratitude at all when they bring down that return as speedily as possible. If they see any objections why a return should not be given, let them say so, and the return will not be ordered ; but the moment it is ordered, it is their bounden duty to bring it down to the House as quickly as possible. The Secretary of State said a moment ago that these orders were discharged as promptly as possible.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I said, recently. I do not know anything about it previous to the time I took charge of the department.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says that since he has taken charge of the department he has been complying with this duty, but he cannot say that previously the Government complied with their duty so far as his department is concerned. I am willing to give this credit to the Government, that on many occasions returns ordered by this House have been promptly brought down ; but there are other occasions, and other subject matters, where it is almost impossible ever to obtain returns which are ordered by this House. One of these subjects is that mentioned by my hon. friend from Bothwell. It appears that whenever a return is asked for concerning the census, it is almost impossible to get it complied with. Now, with regard to a subject of this class, we were told some weeks ago that, upon a return being ordered, the Minister had correspondence with the department and he was told that the return would not be complied with, that the papers could not be copied because there was no money in the treasury for such a purpose. Sir, what conclusion must we draw from that but the conclusion which was drawn by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), that in such cases the delays are intentional ? It cannot be otherwise. Will any one tell us seriously that when an order of the House has been made and has stood for three years, that it was not possible for the Government of Canada to comply with the order on the ground that there was no money in the treasury for that purpose ? The conclusion is irresistible that the Government did not want, for reasons of their own, to bring down the papers. The hon. gentleman a moment ago objected to this inference being drawn , but he knows that there is such a thing as circumstantial evidence, that circumstantial evidence has convicted many a man upon grounds not more forcible than those now urged against the Government. It is a breach of duty on the part of the Government ; and though my hon. friend from Bothwell took an extreme course in bringing this matter before the House by moving the adjournment, still he was within his right. Let me quote the opinion of Dr. Bourinot on this subject :

> Every care should be taken by the department or officer whose duty it is to furnish the return, to have it strictly in accord with the terms of the address or order. If a person neglects to furnish a return or frames it so as to mislead the House, it will be considered a breach of privilege, and he will be reprimanded or more severely punished, according to the circumstances of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before putting this question, I desire again to express my opinion with regard to the inconvenience of this mode of bringing up a discussion. I am, of course, in the judgment of the House in dealing with this matter, but I may point out that there are other ways in which a question of this kind might be raised without moving the adjournment of the House.

In the first place, a motion might be put upon the paper censuring the Government. Then there is another way in which the matter might be brought up without any notice at all, that is, on going into Committee of Supply. On this point Sir Erskine May says :

> The ancient constitutional doctrine, that redress of grievances should be considered before the grant of Supply, is maintained by the usage which sets aside the rule of relevancy when the question is proposed that the Speaker do leave the Chair for those committees.

That, to my mind, is conclusive that a question of this kind for the redress of a grievance, should more properly be discussed on moving the House into Committee of Supply.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill, when under consideration in Committee of the Whole a few nights ago was dropped from the Order paper by the committee rising without reporting progress. The committee was thin, the majority was a small one. I did not consider the decision arrived at at that time indicated a decision of the whole House, and I accordingly moved that the Bill be reinstated on the Order paper. That motion gave an opportunity to the House to express its decision, if it chose to do so, and have a decision taken, and if a majority of the House voted against the reinstatement of the Bill on the Order paper, that, of course, would settle its fate. I have noticed, in the course of the discussion on this Bill, in sessions past, that there is a proneness on the part of hon. members to kill the Bill when their names do not appear on the division list, and there is reluctance on the part of some hon. members to appear on the records of the House as opposed to the measure. I regret that this is the case. I should much prefer to have members, when hostile to the Bill, express that hostility in a way at once, frank, and one which would give the country to understand what position they occupy. I have been actuated by the reasons I have mentioned in moving for the reinstatement of the Bill on the Order paper. I now ask permission very briefly to present some remarks with respect to the features of this Bill, and to allude to some objections made with respect to its terms and provisions as it is now submitted to the committee. It has been asked, why the Bill was not introduced on this occasion in the form that it left the House last session when it was sent to the Senate. The circumstances of the case connected with the discussion of this Bill and its provisions are briefly these : The Bill, although it occupied on the Order paper the same position as it does now, was shut off by a motion made by an hon. member with respect to the Manitoba question, which was debated for several successive days, and when the Bill was finally reached and the House went into committee, it was the last occasion on which it could have been considered in committee. The opposition took the form of numerous, and, in many cases, absurd amendments ; it was so shorn of its provisions and so mutilated that it had very little to commend it to the friends of the measure except the fact that the House of Commons had recognized the principle of the Bill. The first clause, that with respect to the publication of newspapers, was cut down to a bald provision prohibiting the sale of Sunday newspapers. There was no prohibition of publication, or punishment of proprietors or those engaged in issuing Sunday newspapers, and the section would only reach the newsboys who sold the paper. The Bill, so mutilated, was refused consideration by the Senate, and the courtesy was not extended to it of referring its consideration to a committee. It would not be reasonable to ask me, as promoter of the Bill, to confine myself to the shorn provisions as it left the committee, and I claim that the provisions of the Bill now under consideration are proper and just provisions, and such as will commend themselves to any actual friend of the principle of Lord's Day observance. I ask permission briefly to review these provisions. The first section is with regard to the publication of Sunday newspapers. That section might be lightly amended with advantage It might be well to make exception in favour of the circulation or distribution of religious papers distributed in churches, Sunday schools and religious meetings. Any provision of that character which would improve the character of the measure I would most gladly accede to, but I would not accede to an amendment to cut out of this section everything it contains except the one bald provision which was retained in the Bill of last session, that merely with respect to the sale of newspapers. With regard to the second section, that applying to the closing of the canals, if it is done at all, it must be done under the authority of the Dominion Government. Abstinence from work on the canal on the Lord's Day can be secured in no other way. This section rests on the assumption that legislation must emanate from this House and that legislation for that purpose is proper. These two sections received the approval of the leader of the House and

Premier last session, Sir John Thompson, who was willing they should pass. He gave them his support and his vote, and they did pass under the circumstances I have mentioned, and in the mutilated condition to which I have referred.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What sections ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The sections with respect to Sunday newspapers and the closing of the canals.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But not as in your Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, as in my Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not as in the Bill that went to the Senate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not as in the Bill before the committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not, perhaps, in the same phraseology, but practically the same. The third section is with respect to railway traffic. It is not attempted to go far in that direction ; it was felt it was not possible to go very far. It does not attempt to regulate through passenger or freight traffic, because it was held by the special committee by whom the Bill was considered that nearly all the Canadian lines had American connections, and depended upon the American roads for a large part of their passenger and freight business, and so it was impossible to make any arrangement with them as regards through freight and through passenger traffic, unless concurrent action was taken by American roads. The Bill, therefore, provides that local freight and local passenger traffic and mail trains shall not run on the Lord's Day, and it contains a proviso that through freight business shall not be prohibited until such time as the American Congress make concurrent regulations and provisions so that similar provisions may be enforced in both the United States and Canada. The interests of the railway companies were carefully guarded in the special committee to which the Bill was referred three or four years ago. As regards this third section, no objection was taken on the part of any railway man in Canada, but it was substantially approved by the railway men. Sir Joseph Hickson did make some suggestions, and they received the attention of the committee, and were embodied in the Bill. With respect to the fourth section relating to excursions on the Lord's Day, I do not consider that a matter of so much importance as the subjects covered by the other sections. This is the section which arouses most opposition from my fellow-members from the province of Quebec, and it is a section I would not particularly insist upon. I think it is important that the first three sections should pass, and I would be perfectly willing to waive the fourth section for the purpose of removing objections that exist as regards the Bill. I would be perfectly willing to accept, during this session, the arrangement arrived at with the leader of the House and Premier last session, and take the two first sections from the others. I consider the third section of this Bill entirely unobjectionable, and there never has been an objection raised to it by the parties interested. With the statement, that I would be glad to receive the recognition of the House as to the principle embodied in this measure, by the sanctioning of the first two clauses of this Bill, with regard to the Sunday newspapers and the closing of the canals, I submit the Bill to the committee, soliciting fair and impartial consideration of the measure.

Mr. MASSON. When this matter was before the committee last session, several amendments were suggested to the first clause, which I think it would be well for the promoter to adopt now. If these amendments were accepted, the clause would read as follows :—

Whoever shall, in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the publication or issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical, for the purpose of sale or distribution, either by carrier or through the mails, upon the Lord's Day ; and whoever shall engage in the sale of any newspaper on that day, shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence ; but nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the distribution of religious publications at churches, Sunday schools or at religious meetings.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am perfectly willing to accept the proposal made by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson), and I think they would improve the clause. I would suggest to retain the word "Lord's Day," in the 16th line of the clause of the Bill.

Mr. MASSON. I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. FRASER. While approving of the principle of the Bill, I think, perhaps, that the punishment provided is just a little too harsh. If a boy sells a newspaper, I do not think that he should be subject to an indictable offence. I think it should be summary conviction for the first or second offence.

Mr. MASSON. In all towns and cities where these papers would be printed or published, there is generally a police magistrate who could deal summarily.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not see what object can be served by the passing of this clause of the Bill. I remember that, last year, the promoter of the Bill (Mr. Charlton) said a good deal against what he called Sunday newspapers, and which he considered as the cause of grave immorality. I do not know that there are any such papers in the province

of Quebec. At all events, if there is any harm in those papers, it would not be prevented by this Bill, for the simple reason that these so-called Sunday newspapers are not prepared or edited on Sunday. Some of them from New York reach Quebec on Friday or Saturday, so that this Bill would not prevent them coming into the province of Quebec and doing the harm which the promoter of the Bill pretends they are calculated to do. There are newspapers sold very largely in the city of Quebec on Sunday, but they are not published on Sunday. The Saturday editions of "La Presse" and the "Star," of Montreal, reach Quebec by the Saturday night mail, and are distributed and sold on Sunday, but they are not Sunday newspapers. There is another objection to this clause of the Bill. It would punish, I suppose, the sale of newspapers on board trains on Sunday. We have in the province of Quebec several trains that run on Sundays, and of which no one has ever complained, and it would be a revolution if the promoter of the Bill intended to stop those trains. There has been for fifteen years a train running from Quebec to Montreal, and another from Montreal to Quebec, on Sunday afternoons. I do not know that there is any railway train in the province which gives better and more suitable accommodation to the public, and especially to the working classes of Quebec and Montreal, than that Sunday train. At this very time of the year that train is crowded by respectable workingmen from the city of Quebec, who, with their families, go to spend a few pleasant hours in the country. They have not the means of those people who are so strict about Sabbath observance, to hire carriages, and they have no other mode of enjoying the fresh air and the beauties of nature than by availing of the running of this train. In my view of the observance of the Sabbath, you cannot find it anywhere better observed. I do not believe that Sunday should be a day of sadness for the people. It was not originally a day of sorrow, but a day of joy and peaceful and quiet rest. These people who leave the city of Quebec for the country do not drink, nor do they cause any trouble. They go quietly into the country with their families, whereas if they remained in the city, they would be deprived of the advantage of fresh air, and might be subjected to other temptation. You will find every one in Quebec and Montreal say that nothing is more conducive to the morality and good health of the working classes than these Sunday trains. There is a train on the Intercolonial leaving Halifax on Saturday afternoon, which runs through to Montreal without stopping. That train passes Quebec about twelve o'clock on Sunday, and if this Bill were passed in its present shape, the newsboy who sold papers on that train for the accommodation of passengers, would be liable to a criminal indictable offence. Would the passengers on board that train be better, morally and religiously, if they are left idle, because the newsboy who wants to sell a newspaper to them is not permitted to do so, on pain of being brought before the Court of Queen's Bench for an indictable offence, and being fined? I think this clause, so far as it prevents the selling of a newspaper on Sunday, should be struck out. Every Sunday one can see small boys, some of them supporting their mothers who are widows, by the little money they make selling the Montreal "Star." I am not interested in pushing the sale of the Montreal "Star," which is a Tory paper; but I cannot see any justice in preventing newsboys selling papers, when they do no harm religiously or morally, thereby assisting their families and accommodating a good many people who do not think there is any crime in reading a paper on Sunday. I have no objection to prohibiting the publication of newspapers on Sunday; I do not think that would injure anybody, because I do not think that any paper in the province of Quebec is published on Sunday. I do not see any objection, either, to the second clause, providing for the closing of our canals on Sunday. They belong to the Government, and the Government are at liberty to stop the use of the canals on Sunday or on any other day. That would not interfere with the observance of Sunday as it is understood in the province of Quebec. But I would oppose most strenuously any Bill calculated to compel the citizens of the province of Quebec to observe Sunday as it is observed in Ontario. The people of Ontario may think their way of observing Sunday is the best; we may think our way is the best. We have as much right to our way as they have to theirs. I think this matter should be left to the legislature of each province, which understands the wishes and even the caprices of its own people. You will not find two countries in the world where Sunday is observed in the same way. The promoter of this Bill stated some time ago that Sunday observance Bills had been passed in France, Belgium and Germany. If he has visited those countries, he must have seen that the observance of Sunday in them is not the same as he provides for in this Bill. I have been in some of those countries, and I know that the people there would be very much surprised if they were told that their Sunday laws had been quoted to justify preventing the selling of a newspaper on a railway train on Sunday, because their laws have no such intention. The strict observance of Sunday has been greatly departed from even in the country which has been 'par excellence' the home of strict Sabbath observance. I spent two Sundays in London when you could not see a vehicle running on Sunday afternoon; but if you go to London to-day, you will see as much

activity on the streets on Sunday afternoon as on a week day. The people have come to believe that there is no harm in using cabs and omnibuses on Sundays, and you will find these crowded with people going into the country on Sunday afternoon. I observed the same thing in Scotland. Every Sunday there are some twenty railway trains running between London and Brighton, and nobody seems to think that there is any violation of the laws of morality or religion in allowing them to run. Between London and Glasgow there are about a dozen railway trains running on Sunday. I do not think we should go back to the kind of Sunday observance which has been departed from in the countries where Sunday has always been most strictly observed. This Bill goes much too far. I do not see any objection to its preventing the use of our public works on Sunday: that is done by the Sunday laws of France, Belgium and Italy: but they do not prevent individuals observing Sunday as they choose. I do not think any man has a right to impose upon me his social habits or his method of observing Sunday or any other day of the week.

Mr. MARA. Whilst the committee are, I believe, almost unanimous in their desire to see the Lord's Day observed as a day of rest, I believe the large majority are opposed to this Bill, because they believe that the matter can be best dealt with by the provinces, and that the Bill is an interference with provincial rights. In British Columbia the leading daily papers are published six days in the week; but they elect to publish on Sunday instead of on Monday, the object being to enable the employees on the papers to observe the Sabbath as a day of rest. Every member of the House knows that the work involved in bringing out a daily paper is done on the day previous to the day of publication; that is, the work of a paper published on Monday has to be done on Sunday, whereas the work of a paper published on Sunday is done on Saturday, and the employees have Sunday to themselves. The Methodist Conference in British Columbia met two weeks ago, and took up the question of Sabbath observance, and adopted a very strong report upon it, and I will show what they considered should be contained in a proper Lord's Day Bill. The report states:

> One of the last acts of the session was the adoption of a strong report urging special legislation to enforce Sabbath observance by making it illegal to conduct Sunday excursions by rail or boat, to participate in fishing, boating, bicycling, or hunting on the Sabbath, to ride in public conveyances, such as hacks, buggies or sleighs, for purposes of pleasure, or to operate or patronize Sunday street cars.

Here is a report from the British Columbia Methodist Conference, held in a city where papers are published on Sunday, where in all probability those clergymen read the Sunday papers, and yet they make no mention in their protest of those papers. If a body that takes so much interest in the observance of the Sabbath does not think it necessary to protest against the publication of papers on Sunday, why should this House do so and thus interfere with the rights of the people of British Columbia? British Columbia has the power to suppress these papers if it likes; and when I state that for twenty-five years the leading papers are published there on Sunday, this House may well take the ground that the people of that province are in favour of Sunday papers. Our people will certainly think it an interference if we say, you shall not publish your papers on Sunday but on Monday. For these reasons, I move that the first clause of the Bill as amended last year, and which better meets the views of the people than the present one, be substituted for one clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment before the committee is that of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson), and that amendment must be disposed of before any other can be made.

Mr. CHARLTON. The section which the hon. member for British Columbia has moved in amendment is entirely inadequate to meet the great evil of Sunday newspapers. The Sunday paper nuisance is something about which my hon. friend knows nothing. In the case of the Victoria "Colonist" and other papers published in British Columbia on Sunday, the work is done on Saturday night, and there is a degree of order about the issue of the papers, and the character of the papers is such that the evil is minimized there. But that was once the case in the United States. The first Sunday newspapers issued paid a certain degree of deference to religious opinion. At first they contained some columns of religious homily, a sermon or two, and were in a sense unobjectionable. But they speedily deteriorated. The class of people who demanded Sunday literature did not want that kind of literature, and you will not find one Sunday paper published in the United States which has the desirable characteristics of those published in British Columbia. It is freely admitted that they have the very worst influence on society. They are filled with a class of reading matter that is utterly pernicious. And they destroy not only the sanctity of the day, but completely neutralize the religious sentiment of the country. Nearly every public man in the United States recognizes that the Sunday newspaper is the most potent engine for evil that exists in that country. Thirty years ago the United States was a Sabbath respecting country, to-day it is fast becoming a semi-infidel country. No sooner is a question raised between morality and the observance of God's law on Sunday then every one of these papers will be on the side of the wrong. The great bulwark

of the opening of the Chicago Fair on Sunday was the Sunday newspaper. It is the enemy of every religious movement in the United States. I do not look on this as a religious question. I do not propose to say that any man shall entertain any religious views of any kind or shall go to any church, but I propose to ask that laws be enacted which will prevent the sanctioning of such influences as are detrimental to the nation's good. This is avowedly a Christian nation. Our Queen is styled the Defender of the Faith, and Great Britain has Sabbath observance laws, thirty or forty in number, on her statute-books, so that we have precedents to warrant this action. If a man wants to observe the Sabbath, I want to secure to him the right to observe it. I do not want to compel him to do so, but to secure to him a right of the utmost importance. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), travelled through the whole of the Bill, and made a speech with regard to Sunday excursions which had no bearing on this clause at all. I am willing to drop that portion of the Bill. I admit that there may be circumstances in Quebec which have caused me to modify my preconceived views with regard to Sunday trains, and perhaps I am willing to say they are not strictly correct, but as regards Sunday newspapers, not as they exist now in British Columbia, but as they will exist when the process of evolution makes them like their American brothers, I say they are a crying curse and instrument of evil.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the name of one of the worst of their Sunday newspapers ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume the "Police Gazette" is a pretty bad one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that a Sunday paper ?

Mr. CHARLTON. It is published on Sunday and other days.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not know—I never read it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Chicago "Sunday Times."

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Do you read those newspapers ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I once in a while examine them to see what their character is, but I never read them as an ordinary reader.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. You never read them ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I take such a newspaper, go through its table of contents and try to learn the character of its articles. I want to find out if that newspaper contains healthy reading for my family and the public, or not. Before I denounce a paper I want to know what its character is, and I can only ascertain its character by examining it.

Mr. BERGIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly.

Mr. BERGIN. If I am asked what is the character of the New York "Sunday Herald" and the New York "Sunday World," what answer am I to give to my questioner ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Semi-respectable.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the "Tribune" the same ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps hardly as bad as the others. I wish to quote a few words bearing on this question which, I am sure, will have some weight with my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) and perhaps of some other hon. gentlemen. A paper was furnished by Cardinal Gibbons at the meeting of the Sunday Rest Congress in Chicago two years ago. I would be glad to give you the whole paper, for it is most admirable. I propose also to quote from the deliverance of the Plenary Council in Baltimore :

A close observer cannot fail to note the dangerous inroads that have been made on the Lord's Day in our country within the last quarter of a century. If these encroachments are not checked in time, the day may come when the religious quiet, now happily reigning in our well-ordered cities, will be turned into noise and turbulence ; when the sound of the church-bell will be drowned by the echo of the hammer and the dray ; when the Bible and the prayer-book will be supplanted by the newspaper and the magazine ; when the votaries of the theatre and the drinking saloon will outnumber the religious worshippers, and salutary thoughts of God, of eternity and of the soul will be choked by the cares of business and by the pleasures and dissipation of the world.

It is quite evident that the Cardinal is not in favour of Sunday newspapers. And the Plenary Council makes reference to the condition of things which my hon. friend from Quebec speaks of as existing in European countries, and which I infer from what he says, he thinks preferable to the condition of things here. I read from that portion of the deliverance of the Plenary Council relating to the Lord's Day :

In travelling through some European countries, a Christian's heart is pained by the almost unabated rush of toil and traffic on Sunday. First, grasping avarice thought it could not afford to spare the day to God ; then unwise governments, yielding to the pressure of mammon, relaxed the laws which for many centuries had guarded the day's sacredness—forgetting that there are certain fundamental principles which ought not to be sacrificed to popular caprice or greed. And when, as usually happens, neglect of religion had passed, by lapse of time, into hostility to religion, this growing neglect of the Lord's Day was easily made use of as a means to bring religion itself into contempt. The church mourned, protested, struggled, but was almost powerless

to resist the combined forces of popular avarice and Caesar's influence, arrayed on the side of irreligion. The result is the lamentable desecration which all Christians must deplore.

And Archbishop Ireland, in an address which I had the pleasure of hearing, and which was delivered at the last Session of the Sunday Congress at Chicago, said:

> Give Sunday to the labourer to make him feel that he is a man. He feels not his manhood while stooping beneath the weight of machinery. The hard labour by which modern industries are supported is slavery. Let there be one day in the week the sunrise of which says to the labourer, "Thou art a free man; thou art independent. To-day, at least, thou art the equal of thine employer, the equal of the highest and the richest in the land." Let there be a day in the week when he puts aside the habiliments of toil, and with a vesture which, if it tells of the struggles of poverty, is at least neat and tidy, he goes out into the fulness of God's sunshine, looks up to the skies, hears the birds sing, talks with his fellows as a free man, so that, when he returns to toil, he will take with him the memory of a joyous Sunday, and will in the midst of toil be a free man, owning his own soul, knowing that he is an independent child of God, and is entitled to the same immortal destiny as the highest and best of his fellows.

I commend these extracts from addresses by Cardinal Gibbons, and Archbishop Ireland and from the deliverance of the Plenary Council, to the consideration of my hon. friends. Of course I do not need to say that the prelates and ministers of Evangelical churches are of the same mind, and it is unnecessary to recount the names of eminent philanthropists, politicians and other public men who take the same view. The object of this Bill is not to compel certain religious observances, not to force upon the people one set of opinions, but to permit these observances, to permit liberty of conscience, and to prevent corporations and other employers who do not recognize the rights of men from forcing men to work upon the Lord's Day. The particular section which we now have under consideration is for the purpose of excluding from this country an influence which will prove most detrimental, most disastrous in its effects upon the future of Canada, if it is permitted to gain a foothold here. We do not need to speculate as to what the character of the Sunday press will be. We have an example in the country alongside of us, which started with very much the same conditions as we have to-day. What the outcome of the experiment there is shows us what would be the results here. This Sunday newspaper is a violation of the law of God. It is an insult to the fourth commandment. It has no excuse for existence if there is a moral law, and it must necessarily show itself in opposition to every religious influence. It has done so in the United States, and it is inevitable that it must do so. As it has been in the past in the United States, so it will be in the future in this country, if the Sunday newspaper is allowed to gain a foothold here. And, apart entirely from sentimental or religious considerations, the statesman, the citizen who desires the well-being of the state, must recognize that popular institutions rest most securely upon religion and public virtue; and it should be our care, as the chief legislature in this Dominion, to enact such legislation as will ensure, so far as lies in our power, the continuance and perpetuation of public virtue and of respect for the great Ruler of nations. For this reason, I believe this section is a necessary and salutary section, and the influence of it, if it is enacted, will be beneficial to this country.

Mr. BERGIN. I am quite in sympathy with the object proposed to be attained by the promoter of this Bill. I desire as much as any man in this House to see the Sunday properly observed in this country. And the hon. gentleman has shown that he is sincere, perfectly sincere in the object he has laid before the House, by consenting to withdraw all the sections but the first and the second. No man in this House has a greater objection to the Sunday newspaper than I have, but, the object being such as the hon. gentleman himself has said, to keep out of this country the Sunday newspapers of the United States, I at once ask myself: Is the first clause of the Bill likely to attain the object which the hon. gentleman says he has so much at heart. And when I read the section I find that it does not contain anything which will enable us to keep the Sunday newspapers of the United States out of this country; I find that, so far from attaining that object, this Bill permits that Sunday newspapers, newspapers issued on Sunday in New York, or some other American city, to come in here and be sold in Canada. If these are not fit papers to be read upon a Sunday they are not fit papers to be read upon a Monday. My hon. friend says that the New York "Sunday Herald" and "Sunday World" are semi-respectable. Well, if they are only semi-respectable they are not fit to be read by Canadians. The only way to make these newspapers fit to be read in this country is to make them entirely respectable. I believe that if, instead of passing a clause of this kind, we passed a law prohibiting the sale, upon any day of the week in this Canada of ours, of the "Sunday Herald" or "Sunday World," we would put an end to the evil effect that these papers have upon the youth of this country. I am quite willing to vote for a clause that will prohibit the importation and the sale upon any day of the week of the New York Sunday newspapers, and then I think we will reach the root of the evil. I unite with all that he has said in condemnation of these papers.

Mr. MASSON. It seems to be the desire on the part of some members of the committee to charge this Bill

with containing what it does not contain, and to ask that it should contain something entirely foreign from its object. Now, the amendment that I propose to the Bill will remove the objection taken to it by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara). It is not the work done in the newspaper office that is complained of, that is done out of sight of the public, and does not interfere with the manner in which the public desire to observe the Lord's Day. The Lord's Day is not made a day of traffic by the printing merely being done in a printing office on that day. I have striven to confine my amendment to that subject, and it will read : That whoever shall, as proprietor, publisher, &c., engage in the publishing of a newspaper for distribution on the Lord's Day. That is, that where the publisher or proprietor of the paper engages in issuing that paper with the deliberate intention of distributing it on the Lord's Day, he is brought within the terms of this Act, and then only. If it is to be distributed on a Monday, he is not brought within the terms of this Act, it is not intended that he should be. Now, I entirely agree with what my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) has just stated about newspapers of an immoral character published in the United States and coming into Canada. I agree that they should be prohibited ; and I think that steps should be taken to prohibit them. But that is not part of a Sunday observance Act, and, therefore, his objection is not well taken, when he says that this Bill which is attempting to deal with one subject, does not deal with an entirely different subject. The Customs Department has already authority to prevent immoral literature coming in, and that power might well be extended to stop a lot of Sunday newspapers that now come in, and coming in for the purpose of being distributed and being read upon the Lord's Day.

Mr. AMYOT. What paper is that ?

Mr. MASSON. I do not know what paper my hon. friend referred to. The papers arrive on Saturday night, and they are called Sunday papers. It is not because the paper is called a Sunday paper that it is objectionable. It may be called a Saturday paper, but if it is printed for the purpose of being distributed on Sunday, that is what we wish to stop by this Bill. Whether it is called a Sunday paper or a Saturday night paper, if it is printed for the purpose of being distributed on Sunday, the object of this clause is to prevent that. As to the other objection, that the penalties are large, it can be dealt with when we come to consider the penalties. I do not think the discussion of this clause should be encumbered with that point. Let those who are in favour of Sunday papers being published on the Lord's Day, vote against the Bill entirely, vote against my amendment, and vote against the clause as it was introduced ; but let those who proclaim that they are in favour of putting a stop to the distribution of Sunday papers on Sunday, vote in favour of the amendment and of the Bill.

Mr. AMYOT. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, if he considers that we have authority to deal with the religious observance of Sunday, or if we have the right to deal with the civil obligation of observing Sunday ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think we have that power. While not saying anything in regard to the wisdom of exercising that power under the circumstances, I think we have the power to constitute the non-observance of the Sabbath in this manner a crime. That is what the mover of the Bill proposes to do.

Mr. AMYOT. Then, if I am not mistaken, we are asked to use our power to enforce the keeping of Sunday in the way proposed by this Bill as a religious obligation, and, if a man does not so keep it, he is a criminal. We are asked to use the majority of the members of the confederation to say to one section of the confederation, You must keep the Sabbath, or the Lord's Day, in the way that another section of the confederation may desire. Mr. Chairman, I think this would make us regret that we came into confederation at all. We never thought that we would meet with such intolerance here. We in the province of Quebec have our habits, our customs, our way of interpreting the laws of God for the keeping of His day ; but we do not want Ontario, or any other part of the confederation, to impose their views upon us in that respect. We have got our civil and municipal authorities, we have our religious authorities, and to these we look to make laws for us on these subjects. We do not want Ottawa to go against our local authorities. I think it would be an abuse of power to make indiscriminately anything a crime which is not such in any one province. You might just as well say that if a man or a child picks up a piece of paper in the street on Sunday or Monday, it would be a crime. You might as well say that if a man eats an apple on Monday or Tuesday, it would be a crime. We have the power to create and punish a crime, but should we use that power in this case ? If we make it a civil obligation to keep Sunday, we might as well go on and compel the people to attend the Sunday school. But we have no such thing in the province of Quebec as Sunday schools in most of the counties. We have our schools in the homes, we have our schools in the parish, and the catechism is taught in the church on Sunday and other days of the week. But we settle these things

ourselves, and we don't admit the interference of the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If you begin by trenching upon our convictions by means of summary legislation, you take a very dangerous step towards depriving us of our liberties. The moral obligation of keeping Sunday is a matter of conscience, and I do not think the fathers of confederation ever intended that this Parliament should enforce that obligation. We come here as citizens, each one having his own convictions about religious matters, and we should not interfere with each other. If the hon. member for North Norfolk wishes to go on Sunday and preach in the Salvation Army Barracks, he is at liberty to do so, and I respect his convictions. If he likes to collect the people in a public park on Sunday, and then, by his fine voice and eloquence, create some pleasure, some amusement, and some fun for the boys, he is at liberty to do so, and we do not interfere with him. If we consider we are bound to go to mass on Sunday morning we are at present able to do so, and we do not want a law to prevent our attendance. If it is our right to prevent any one reading certain books or newspapers on Sunday it is our right to prevent a man going to mass, for the legislation is in the same direction. I deny in toto our right to interfere with the moral observance of Sunday by the people. This measure is an attempt to interfere with conscience and with religious belief, and Parliament would be abusing its power if it created crimes in this direction. Such legislation is pure intolerance. The hon. gentleman has been endeavouring to force his Bill on Parliament for many years. He knows exactly the sentiments and convictions of the people of the province of Quebec in regard to it, and he seeks to use the Protestant majority in this House to impose such legislation on the people. Such action is unfair, and, I repeat, intolerant, and it is improper that the hon. gentleman should introduce such a measure hoping thereby to secure a majority in his county, and this action is not such as we would expect from a man of his standing. I wish to put the position clearly before the committee. The hon. gentleman seeks to interfere with matters of conscience, and at the whim or caprice of the majority to impose certain views on religious matters on his fellow-citizens. This surely is not tolerance, and, in my opinion, such legislation would be unworthy of this Federal Parliament. If he is not seeking to interfere with the moral obligation, he must be dealing with a civil obligation. But have not the provinces the right to inquire into and deal with these subjects? If so, surely they are municipal matters, and, in that sense, come under the control of the local legislature. The hon. gentleman, if he will read the Confederation Act, clause 92, will find that municipal matters belong to the provinces. If such is the case, why does not the hon. gentleman leave these matters to be dealt with by the several provinces at their discretion? The hon. gentleman appears to consider himself wiser than the members of all the local legislatures. Does he believe that Providence has put all the brains into his head, and all the wisdom, intelligence, science and love of God necessary to preserve Sunday? If he does so, I am sure he would be convicted of committing one of the sins against which he preaches, namely, pride. Surely we must exercise some discretion and common sense in our legislation. What is the use of this Bill? If the hon. gentleman does not choose to drive on Sunday, let him stay at home, but let him not attempt to infringe on our liberty. If I desire, on Sunday afternoon to drive from Bellechasse, the county which I represent, into an adjoining county, I may do so. But if this Bill became law, I might be prevented. A friend might then ask me, Who prevents your driving? My answer would be, Mr. Charlton. Who is he? I would be asked. I would reply, He is the member for North Norfolk. I would then be asked, Is he charged by any religious body to enact the laws for the church throughout the Dominion, or who has entrusted him with that care? This committee should well understand the matter now under discussion. If we are to live together in this country we must not be intolerant, but respect the training and education of others, and not try to endeavour to force our views on others, and not bring into this Parliament delicate questions, expecting that the prejudices of others will give a chance for a certain Bill to pass, or hoping that, although the Bill has no chance to become law, it may give some personal popularity to its promoter. This measure represents bigotry, intolerance, fanaticism. It is unworthy of consideration by this Parliament, and I want its author to understand that if he goes any further it will become the duty of our fellow-members who are Protestants to stand up in our protection and vote down Bills which do not embody common sense. In the name of my province, I ask the protection of the Protestant members of this House against such proposed legislation.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is altogether mistaken as to the purpose of this Bill, and he has made a speech which has as much to do with the question before the committee as the storm raging outside has to do with legislation. This Bill has nothing to do with the prejudices or religious feelings of any section of the community. It does not say that the hon. member for Bellechasse cannot worship just as he sees

fit. The section under consideration simply covers the ground as to whether this House is in favour of selling papers on Sunday or not. I want the hon. gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. AYMOT. I want to settle the question for myself.

Mr. FRASER. Are there not public interests involved as well as the right of private judgment? The hon. gentleman himself assumes great power, for he seeks to decide a question affecting the whole community according to his individual judgment. The whole question is as to the publication of a newspaper, and whether it should be sold on the Sabbath, and whether such prohibition would be desirable in the public interest. The hon. gentleman has ascribed motives to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Is that a proper position for an opponent to take? Is that charity and toleration? I am bound in discussing this matter, to assume the honest intentions of the hon. member for Bellechasse, and not ascribe motives to him. Let hon. members discuss this Bill on its merits. I submit it is bad taste to declare that because an hon. member introduces a Bill he is dishonest in his intentions, and is acting from improper motives. Must it not be assumed that the hon. member is acting in the interest of the country, and not from selfish motives? I am not myself as strict a Sabbatarian as I might be, but I believe in the complete observance of that day, and I attempt, so far as possible, to observe it; but I do not say I would impose my views as regards the observance of that day on others. This Bill does not attempt to do so. It simply says, here is an evil which is not in the public interest, either religiously or socially, and we will endeavour to suppress it. He might go down to his county, and, on the Lord's Day he might go around and attempt to canvass. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman would do it, and he might be perfectly honest in doing it. The Bill does not attempt to deal with anything like that.

Mr. AMYOT. It does.

Mr. FRASER. No such thing. The hon. gentleman either misunderstands the Bill or he has not read it. There is no interference with the manner in which any subject of Her Majesty has heretofore observed the Sabbath. The Bill proceeds upon broader grounds, and while I am not fully in favour of the punishment prescribed, yet I am in favour of its principle. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the publication of a paper on the Sabbath is a good thing, let him say so. I do not think so myself, and, therefore, I am in favour of the Bill. There is no attempt to affect confederation, as the hon. gentleman says. The Bill does not force any man to learn his catechism if he wishes to attend a sabbath school, and what necessity was there for the hon. gentleman bringing that in?

Mr. AMYOT. The question is whether it belongs to this Parliament or not?

Mr. FRASER. Well, if the hon. gentleman argues that this is a good Bill, but that this is not a proper Parliament to bring it before, I can understand him. But how can he square his attack on the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) with that position? If it is all right for any citizen of Canada to start publishing a paper on the Lord's Day, and if the hon. gentleman thinks so, then he should say so.

Mr. AMYOT. Is it a provincial matter or not?

Mr. FRASER. That is another question, and if he has raised that point his argument would be legitimate. I think this Parliament has authority to pass this Bill, and thinking that, I shall vote for it as I would vote for it in a local parliament, if I thought it was within the jurisdiction of the local legislature.

Mr. BERGIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Masson) does not understand the position I take in regard to this Bill. But my hon. friend the promoter of the Bill thoroughly understands it. I am entirely in accord with him in the belief that we should put an end to these Sunday newspapers. The only difference of opinion between him and me is, as to whether the Bill will accomplish that object. If I cannot get an amendment that will carry out my view I will take this amendment. I want the principle of this Bill established, even though the method by which I would accomplish the object is different from his.

Mr. CURRAN. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson) in urging the mover of the Bill (Mr. Charlton) to go on with the Bill as it now stands, is advising him in a wrong direction towards arriving at the desired result. Last session we had a very long and serious discussion upon every interest affected by this Bill. We had the question of the printing of the newspaper on Sunday night for publication on Monday morning, and we also discussed the position of the British Columbia newspapers.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BECHARD. This Bill has been introduced into this House several times, and I have never been favourable to it. I do not think that such legislation is required for the public welfare, or even for the welfare of the soul of anybody. There exists in the different provinces of this confederation,

laws which provide for the keeping of good order and the prevention of all servile work upon the Lord's Day, and any one violating these laws, can, on the complaint of another person, be subjected to the punishment which is provided for. Now, Sir, as a citizen of the province of Quebec, for my part I am satisfied with the operation of the laws regarding the observance of the Lord's Day. My hon. friend wishes, I undestand, to prohibit the reading of immoral literature on the Lord's Day. Well, Sir, I think that a man who wishes to read immoral literature can do it as well on Monday as on the Lord's Day. this Bill will not prevent such reading ; and if he does not read it in newspapers, he can read it in books which have been published before. The observance of all virtues can be better inculcated in the hearts of people by persuasion than by force. I cannot believe that we can render men virtuous by act of Parliament. However, I want to draw the attention of the committee to this first clause. Last year this Bill was amended in several particulars and was then accepted by the House ; but I notice this year that those amendments have disappeared from the Bill. I myself moved an amendment. which was accepted and passed by the House. as in addition to this first clause. I read here :

But nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the gratuitous distribution of religious publications upon the Lord's Day.

The amendment which I moved last year went a little further ; it provided that nothing should prevent the ordinary distribution of newspapers and letters by postmasters on that day.

Mr. CHARLTON. This section will not prevent that.

Mr. BECHARD. I do not know whether it will prevent it or not, but the amendment is not here. My reason for proposing that amendment was that in the rural districts of the province of Quebec at least, many people who live four or five miles from their post office, and have not the opportunity to go to the post office every day, have been accustomed to get their papers and letters on Sunday. I hope this Bill will not prevent this.

Mr. CHARLTON. This clause refers only to Sunday newspapers. It does not bear on that practice at all.

Mr. BECHARD. If the practice of distributing letters and papers at the post offices on Sunday is not prevented by the Bill, I am satisfied with regard to that point.

Amendment (Mr. Masson) agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. The understanding was that the first two sections should be adopted, and that the rest of the Bill should be dropped.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman stated that the second clause would be qualified as it was in the Bill which was adopted by this House last session. Perhaps I may mention what the clause was, as I have it under my hand :

No canal belonging to the Government of Canada shall be operated for traffic on Sunday, except between the hours of midnight of Saturday and six o'clock in the morning of Sunday, and from and after the hour of nine o'clock at night on Sunday. In the case of urgent necessity arising from the pressure of business caused by an interruption of traffic or by the approach of the close of navigation, the foregoing provision may from time to time be suspended or varied by order of the Governor in Council ; but such Order in Council shall only continue in force for four weeks at most, from the making thereof, and may be made applicable to any one or more of the canals.

Mr. CHARLTON. That provision was suggested by the Premier last session and was accepted, and if the hon. Minister of Justice wishes it inserted, of course, I do not object. The responsibility of course rests with the Minister of Justice whether it shall be inserted or not.

Section 2 amended as proposed. and. as amended, agreed to.

Mr. CHARLTON. The tacit understanding, perhaps, was that no more of the Bill should be pressed this session ; but I would like the Minister of Justice to give his attention to the third clause, to see whether it should not be enacted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suggested to the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill. and it seemed to meet with his approval, that, as this House adopted the principle of the Bill last year, and passed two clauses, I think, with penalty clauses added, the committee, having practically re-adopted these clauses, should rise, with the understanding that the principle involved in these two clauses should be considered and carefully drafted—because, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, some careful revision of these clauses, even as amended, is required ; and then I would bring forward the revised draft as an amendment to the criminal code, a Bill in reference to which now stands upon the paper in my name. There are several reasons for this course ; and I am sure the committee will appreciate the one I have mentioned as a very important reason. The legislation which I am proposing relates to the criminal law, and as it certainly is advisable that the criminal law should as far as possible be found in the criminal code, any proposition in that direction should be in the nature of an amendment to that code. Another reason why this or any such amendment should appear in the code is that there is a section

of the code, the 12th section, relating to offences against religion. There is a section in our Criminal Code, section 103, of part 12, relating to offences against religion, morals and public convenience, which provides:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty not exceeding $50 in costs, and in default of payment to one month's imprisonment, who wilfully disturbs, interrupts or disquiets any assemblage of persons met for religious worship, or for any moral, social or benevolent purpose, by profane discourse, by rude or indecent behaviour, or by making any noise, either within the place of such meeting or so near it as to disturb the order or solemnity of the meeting.

That has been very carefully considered. We will avoid one great difficulty that presents itself in this Bill, and that is why the promoter, in the penal clauses of the Bill, has endeavoured to limit the offence and the penalty to something of the same nature as the penalty I have referred to. He makes by the first section this offence an indictable one; and under the general section of the code, there would be a possibility of five years' imprisonment attaching to it as a penalty. No doubt it is not the hon. gentleman's desire that this should be considered so serious an offence. There are one or two other suggestions that I have to offer to the committee to show that the principle being adopted, the Bill requires very serious consideration and draughting. I might mention in the first instance, that the section first starts out by referring to the publication and issue of any paper, journal or periodical; and in dealing with the offence only refers to a newspaper, leaving out publications, journals, and periodicals. There are some difficulties, I think, with regard to the expression "newspaper" itself. If the committee understand, as the promoter and I do, that after the revision of the two sections, so far adopted by this committee, is complete and the hon. gentleman's amendment is introduced, the House will, of course, be free to approve or condemn, add to or subtract, any phraseology used, and perhaps it would be the most expeditious course to move that the committee rise with that understanding.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course the second section of the Bill is one we have a perfect right to bring in. It relates to works that are under our own control and jurisdiction. We have the right to close the post office and everything under our jurisdiction just as any other proprietor has control of his own estate, but when you come to the first section, I am at a loss to see just upon what grounds you would make the sale of a newspaper—I am not now speaking of sealed literature, because that would be clearly within our jurisdiction as part of the criminal law—different from the sale of a yard of calico or any other article. That is a matter of police, which every city in the Dominion deals with under its municipal law, and when we propose to make it an indictable offence it seems to me you are confounding what a Christian community regard as a sin with what is really a crime. They are very different things. Whatever might be believed two or three centuries ago, everybody to-day acts upon that assumption. I rise to call the Minister's attention to the fact that if he undertakes to embrace the sale of a newspaper or any other article in the criminal law and make it an indictable offence, he is exceeding our jurisdiction. If you do not undertake to deal with it in the criminal law, you acknowledge at once that you have not jurisdiction. It seems to me a very serious matter to undertake to give yourself jurisdiction over any special subject by undertaking to embrace it in the criminal law. I sympathize with my hon. friend in his desire for a quiet Sunday. That is in the public interests, and so far as Ontario is concerned—I have not examined the statutes of the other provinces—that subject has been dealt with. The publication of Sunday papers would come within the provisions of our provincial statutes, but this is a proposal to give this House jurisdiction by making it a criminal offence—by putting it on the same footing as you would theft, or robbery, or any other crime.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In justice to myself and to be fully candid with the committee, I ought to state that there is a tacit agreement between the promoter of the Bill and myself. It is this: The promoter of the Bill referred to-day to members of this House taking the opportunity to vote against the Bill in committee where their names are not reported, and he supposed that they were afraid to vote when the Speaker was in the Chair on account of the odium that might attach to their conduct. I do not wish to conceal for a moment that I have always personally, when I had the opportunity, voted against the principle of the Bill. Not that I do not sympathize with the object of the hon. gentleman—we all do—but because I infinitely prefer to leave that matter to be dealt with by the local legislatures. I have never receded from that position. But seeing that this House last year adopted the principle of the Bill, notwithstanding the arguments used from the standpoint of the hon. member for Bothwell and myself, and again adopted the principle this session, it seemed to me right to wrestle, as far as I could, with the particular phraseology as an amendment to the criminal code. The House will then be free to consider the difficulty the hon. gentleman has just presented, but I do not wish to shut myself out from concurring in an opinion that may be adverse to the measure. This action of the committee is without pre-

judice to any action the House may take later on.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This Bill has been before the House a number of sessions, and I think it is rather surprising, to say the least, that the hon. gentleman who introduced it again does not seem to have taken means to meet the many objections which were urged against it in previous sessions, and urged, I think, very fairly on both sides of the House in some particulars. For instance, the difficulty has not been met in this Bill which arises with regard to British Columbia, where newspapers are printed on Saturday night and distributed Sunday morning. There is no newspaper set in that province on Sunday and distributed Monday morning, but all the work of making up the paper is done on Saturday. It appears to me it would be a very great hardship to the people of British Columbia to compel publishers there to abandon the practice they now follow. It seems to me to be somewhat of a hardship to compel these publishers in British Columbia to abandon the practice they have followed, as I understand it, ever since British Columbia was a province, and to compel them to publish their paper on Monday morning, thus causing the printers in that province to work on Sunday instead of working on Saturday night, as they do now in preparing the paper for Sunday morning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will not have that effect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Undoubtedly it will. If the hon. gentleman understood the question as those do who live in that province and know the circumstances under which these papers are published, he would know that it would have that effect. The type-setting of the Sunday newspapers is done on Saturday night and the printers do not work on Sunday there being no newspaper issued on Monday. But if this Bill is passed they will have to do their typesetting on Sunday night for Monday's paper. There is another objection to this Bill and that is, as it seems to me, it does not come within a long way of attaining the object its promoter has in view, that is of protecting the Canadian family from the harmful influence of the Sunday newspaper and its literature. Now, the Canadian Sunday newspaper, as far as I have been able to judge—the British Columbia Sunday newspaper, and the Ontario Sunday newspapers—is not an evil sheet in that sense of the term. But there is a class of Sunday newspapers imported into this country from the United States filled with the most villainous sensational articles, articles that are undoubtedly of a character to poison the mind of youth. And yet, under this Bill these papers may be brought in from the United States without let or hindrance to poison the mind of the youth of Canada. These newspapers are dated Sunday and are sold upon the streets on Saturday night. Yet my hon. friend provides by this Bill that while a decent, respectable, moral, even religious paper shall not be published on Sunday, yet the Canadian family shall be permitted to be supplied with the most evil class of literature from other countries, known as Sunday newspapers. I think my hon. friend should have very carefully considered this measure, to see if he could not meet the objections against it time and time again by hon. members on both sides of the House with regard to these two points at least. I am quite at one with the object of the promoter of the Bill. I regard the education of youth in morals as the safeguard of the nation, and I would go as far as my hon. friend or any one else in order to attain that object. But I have not the remotest belief that this Bill will attain this object, and I think the hon. genleman ought to consider it very carefully in order to find some means of meeting the objections.

Mr. CHARLTON. The first and second sections have passed the committee, and the discussion which is now taking place, is a little out of date. It would have been more opportune had it taken place before the committee took action upon these sections. There is no objection to the discussion taking place at a later stage, if the arrangement suggested by the Minister of Justice is carried out—that is for the committee to rise and report progress, these sections to become part of the Criminal Code, after being revised by the Minister, and to be considered again by the House without prejudice, as the hon. Minister says, to the provisions of the Bill. The House will have time to consider the matter fully, to correct any error and to put the clauses in such shape as to meet the objections raised, if possible to do so. I want to secure a workable Bill and one that will meet the wishes and expectations of the promoters. The suggestion of the Minister of Justice is an excellent one, and I was glad to concur in it, and with his assistance we will consider the suggestions that have been made on their merits.

Mr. CORBOULD. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) moved an amendment to clause 2, which is before the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Denison) Section 2 is carried.

Mr. CORBOULD. The hon. member's motion was an amendment to clause 2. That was after the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) had moved his amendment. The amendment of the hon. member for Yale was an exact copy of the clause as carried last year, which would allow the papers in British Columbia to be published as they are at present, coming out on Sunday and

again on Tuesday, but not on Monday. I have not heard the chairman put that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. (Mr. Denison). That is not before the Chair at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is in the exact language of the clause adopted last session. There is no objection to that?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have an objection to it, but the whole question can be considered later on.

Mr. CORBOULD. The member for Yale moved his amendment after that of the hon. member for Grey had been carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. But that amendment is not before the Chair, and the committee had passed the clause.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under the arrangement we have made, it can be considered just as well at another time.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the committee rises, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reply to the Secretary of State. The hon. gentleman admits that Sunday periodicals are published in United States and brought over and sold in Canada, and he states also that he is aware that there is great danger of the minds of Canadian youth being poisoned by literature of an immoral character being circulated in this way. But notwithstanding that fact neither the hon. gentleman nor any other member of the Cabinet has ever introduced legislation in this House to prevent a continuation of this evil. These hon. gentlemen are always ready to raise objections, to find fault, to offer objectionable criticisms to the Bill that has been introduced by the hon. member from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The Secretary of State pointed out at length the objections he had to the Bill, but he wound up by saying he was in favour of the principles of the measure. I am very much afraid that if the Bill was relegated to the care of the Cabinet and its supporters it would be in the house of its enemies. This is quite clear from the manner in which the Bill has been treated by hon. gentlemen opposite. So far as the treatment accorded it by the Minister of Justice is concerned, I must say that it bears some evidence of fairness. But the manner in which the Secretary of State has dealt with the measure is not at all creditable. While he has admitted that he has been quite cognizant of this literary poison being distributed in this country for years past, he has never made a move in the direction of preventing it. He was, I think, at one time, a preacher of righteousness himself. He has fallen from grace, I am afraid. It is to be hoped that when the Bill comes up for further consideration it will be treated in the spirit of fairness, without attempts being made to pour cold water upon the whole matter and thus prevent legislation of this kind, in the spirit shown by the Secretary of State.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In answer to the Secretary of State——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment. I beg to say to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I have no intention of replying to his little personal insinuations. I think this Parliament is above that kind of thing. But I may say that last session I moved a resolution in exactly the same direction as that I have presented this evening.

Mr. McMULLEN. You indulged in a little personal matter yourself last night.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was going to say that I see no objection in the world to the printing and the work of a newspaper being done on Saturday night. But so long as we lay down a rule with regard to the observance of Sunday, I see no reason why newspaper men should not observe that rule precisely in the same way as any other section of the community. The work that is done on Saturday night for a paper may be done for a Monday paper, and I do not see any essential necessity for calling it a Sunday paper for Sunday circulation. But I have always been opposed, and am still opposed, to any recognition of a right of a party on a newspaper to do in respect of that paper, whether it be a Monday morning paper or any other, what you do not concede to any other portion of the community; and I think that is a sound rule. Something has been said with regard to my hon. friend's Bill making no provision against obscene literature, but I would say that that is already provided for by statute, and there is no reason why newspapers of that class should circulate on Monday any more than on Sunday. The prohibition is a universal prohibition, and therefore there is no object in including it in a Sunday Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not say obscene literature, which is, of course, provided for in other statutes, but I said that no provision was made against sensational literature.

Mr. AMYOT. The question has now taken another direction. I was opposed to the Bill because, as was so well said by the hon. member for Bothwell, it was a Bill to define sins instead of offences against society. But now the question is as to immoral literature, and I am in favour of every criminal law to prevent immoral literature being brought into this country from the States or anywhere else. That is altogether another thing, and I would be very glad, if our laws are not stringent enough, which I doubt, that they should be amended. But that has nothing to do with a Sunday Bill. Immoral literature is

as immoral on any other day of the week as on Sunday, and I approve of prohibiting the introduction or sale of it under any circumstances. But what I object to is this Parliament infringing upon the rights of a local legislature to make municipal laws, infringing upon the conscience of citizens by telling them what they shall avoid doing on Sunday when the thing is prohibited is not bad per se. That is what I do not want this Parliament to do. As to immoral literature, the Post Office Department has already the right to prevent its importation, and I know that a long list of immoral publications from the United States is given to the customs officers and they are instructed to prevent their importation. We have already the necessary powers to prevent these immoral publications coming in, but this should not serve as a pretext to infringe upon the rights of the local legislature to settle Sunday observance, which is a part of the powers of municipal law.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Davin:

That in the opinion of this House, the privilege of voting for candidates for membership thereof should be extended to women possessing the qualifications which now entitle men to the electoral franchise, and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. I think when this resolution, with the amendment, was last before the House, I rose just before six o'clock to say a word or two about it. What I shall say now will be very brief indeed. The question is made up of two parts. There is the resolution of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), which resolution I intend to vote for. I do not know as the question of giving suffrage to women has ever been exhaustively debated in this House, but it is a subject which every member has thought about more or less, upon which he has his own opinions, and in regard to which he may be able to advance his own arguments. I do not propose to go into any argument for the position I hold on that question. I am in favour of the resolution as it has been moved by my hon. friend, and I intend to vote for it. As I was challenged by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to give the voice of the Government with regard to this question, I may say that we do not make this a Government question at all. It is a matter for the House to determine, and the members on our side are at perfect liberty to vote as they please, and to support or oppose this motion as they wish. But we cannot say so much for the amendment which was moved by the leader of the Opposition, and which shunts entirely aside the question as to whether, under any circumstances, women should have the right to vote. The hon. gentleman, under the guise of an amendment to this resolution, reopens the old and vexed question as to where the Dominion franchise resides. He brings up the old question of a Dominion franchise for Dominion purposes, or a provincial franchise for Dominion purposes, differing, of course, in every province, having no uniformity, and being, in many important particulars, as has been amply shown in this House, inadequate, as we think, to the necessities of a Dominion legislature. We say that the principle upon which a Dominion franchise ought to rest, is the principle of uniformity, so far as that can be attained; in other words, that it should be a franchise by itself. Therefore, as regards the amendment, there is a diametrical difference between my hon. friend and myself, and, of course, we cannot support the amendment. I do not think that at this stage, after the long sitting of last night, and in the extreme heat of this night, it is worth while to go into a lengthy discussion of this subject. I simply rose to state my own position upon the resolution, and the position of the Government upon the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the vote is taken, permit me very briefly to say a few words in respect of the arguments that were used against the position I took in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I put the question before the House in the coldest possible way, because I wished it to stand before the House in all its inherent practicability. I do not wish that my proposition should have any romantic advantages, if I may put it that way. My hon. friend here beside me, an excellent friend, declared that women differed from men, and that they were half angels. Well, if I may refer to an argument like that, I may say that the angelic intelligence is very much higher than the human. But I do not intend to make much reply to that kind of argument, except to say this, that when a woman has to pay taxes, when a woman fulfils the duties of a citizen, the tax-payer does not regard her in the light of an angel at all; he regards her in the light of a person having property, and having to pay taxes on that property. The aesthetic argument was made something of. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) took what might be called the married man's view of this question. He drew a touching picture of himself going back to his constituency in the heat of an election and finding a pair of handsome canvassers urging their political views on his wife. It was a touching picture. He seemed to think that we should have scattered over the country from Halifax to Vancouver a succession of these pictures, and every man who had a handsome wife would be in the same position, and I see from some digital

indications on the part of one of my leaders that a member of the party to which I belong, an hon. gentleman who might be described as handsome and fascinating would have special advantages. I will deal with that argument, too, subsequently. What I want now to do is to get rid of alarm on the part of married men who have handsome wives. One would suppose those handsome wives never held kettle drums, or receptions, or visits from handsome men while their husbands were at business engaged in their ordinary avocation. As the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) knows, if a lady, married or single, is anxious for or susceptible to flirtation such as would alarm a married man, she will have her flirtation in defiance of gods and men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know so much about this subject as my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Amyot); I do not profess to be as deeply versed as some hon. gentlemen, but still I have not passed through the world altogether with my eyes closed.

Mr. AMYOT. So far as my experience goes, I repudiate this attack on the ladies.

Mr. DAVIN. So this argument presented by the hon. member for East Durham does not strike me as being at all a strong one. Then he came out with the aesthetic argument, the argument which might weigh on the soul of the hon. member for Bothwell, who yet has sympathy with this question. Women already vote for school trustees; they vote in municipal elections.

Mr. MULOCK. Not married women.

Mr. DAVIN. No. This measure would give the vote to very few married women; it would only give votes to those who were fulfilling the duties of citizens.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a premium on celibacy.

Mr. DAVIN. You may look at it from that point of view if you like, but I do not believe that the chance of losing or gaining a vote would ever keep a woman from accepting an eligible offer. These personal questions, Sir, are very embarrassing. But, as a fact, it does not make the woman who votes at municipal elections or for school trustees, if fascinating, one whit less fascinating. History shows this. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Amyot) must be familiar with the history of France, and know what a powerful part in the history of that nation women have played, and played partly from their intellectual power and partly also because of their powers of fascination, the intellectual conjoined with the personal charm, enabling them to play a great part, either directly as rulers, or as influencing rulers. One hon. friend, I think the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) tried to rebut an argument of mine. Knowing what weight anything of scriptural argument has in a case of this kind with certain minds, I referred to the description of the ideal woman in the last chapter of Proverbs, and my argument was this. That clearly woman in the conception of that great writer must at that time have played a great part. The hon. member asked, Did she vote? Why, popular government did not exist then. But if he had gone back several hundred years in the history of the Jewish people, what would he have found? He would have found that in the very dawn of Theocracy, the Supreme Head of that Theocracy treats Miriam on the same footing as her two brothers were treated, Moses and Aaron. I speak it here with all reverence, that the God-head in dealing with the children of Amram in every way treated Miriam precisely on the same footing as the great law giver and as the great high priest, who were her brothers. She is treated as a representative person, as a ruler in that day. We come to a later period, to the time of the Judges, and we find Israel is reduced to a condition in which among 40,000 men there is not a spear, in which there is the utmost degredation and fear of the Philistines and the Canaanitish nations around. And who revived them and gave them subsequently peace for forty years? Deborah, who called Barak to fight against the hosts of the king of Canaan, led by Sisera. He said, "if thou will go with me then I will go; but if thou will not go with me then I will not go." And she said, "I will surely go with thee, notwithstanding the journey thou takest; shall not be for thine honour, for the Lord shall deliver Sisera into the hands of a woman." He thus agreed to go conditionally. The hosts of Canaan were scattered like the sands before the winds by reason of the valour of the soldiers of Israel under Barak, and Sisera fled. Again, we have an example of female thoroughness, and if we had lived in that period we might have found some excuse for what seems treacherous and cold hearted, when we read that Jael invited the great captain into her tent, and after giving him milk and butter and covering him up, she took a hammer and nail and drove the nail into his temple and he died, and the song as sung by Deborah is to celebrate the heroism of Jael. Well, Sir, here we have in the days of the Judges two women playing great historical parts. So in Israel, in those days long before representative government was dreamed of, we find women playing very important parts. That establishes their effectiveness. At the present time in Austria women vote. In Bohemia they vote, but in the capital of Bohemia I do not think they vote. In despotic Russia they vote for members of the assemblies. Of course, the people there have not popular government as we have it here. It is a

government of despotism, but they have assemblies, and the women of Russia do what the women in free England, Canada and the United States cannot do, they vote for representatives in those assemblies. Not only so, if a woman's husband is dead and she holds property she may become a member of the Mir, the village council, and take part therein. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help thinking that the argument that seems to be made very little of by the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) had a great deal in it. I just referred in passing to the literary power that women in the past and in the present have displayed, and my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) said: Well, women have written novels, but the novel of the "New Woman" is not a very good thing. Well, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is a member of Toronto University, and I was surprised to hear a graduate of that university, and who must, of course, be familiar with English literature, express the opinion, that the only great contribution that women have made to English literature is the modern novel, or the woman's novel. Why, Sir, a woman is actually the morning star of the rise of the romantic period in England; a much maligned woman, a woman of great genius, but who has been pilloried by Pope in a few pungent lines. If any one thoroughly familiar with English literature hears her name, he will know that though Alexander Pope was a man of great genius, yet he was a man, like many other men of genius, who could stoop to the very pettiest and most peevish utterances. And this woman, a woman of rare and powerful genius, was the author of a novel whose principal character was the forerunner of the ideal man of Rousseau which created such an impression upon the whole of Europe and upon the civilized world, not only from a literary point of view but from a political point of view as well. Sir, we find in the troubled times that took place in England between the fall of the first Stuarts and the Hanoverian period, that just as the romantic school in France rose in the hotels and in the salons of the brilliant women of Paris, so, in the salons and the drawing-rooms in quiet out-of-the-way places remote from the political storm, where exquisitely cultured literary people met, the romantic school was nurtured that ultimately culminated so powerfully in England. And we have not merely the lady I spoke of who is, as I say a woman of great genius and much maligned, Mrs. Aphra Behn, but we come to Mrs. Ratcliffe, the founder of that school which attained its supreme expression, not in prose but in poetry. If I am not taking up the time of the House too much from the grave matters of the tariff, let me say this: That the character that runs through all Lord Byron's poems, with the exception of one great poem, and the character of man he himself aspired to be—that character is the creation, not of Lord Byron himself, great and magnificent as his genius was, but of Mrs. Ratcliffe. The point I make is this, Sir: that the highest expression we have of the power of man is its power of creating thought, its power of throwing out its creations and giving "to airy nothing a local habitation and a name"; and which becomes a power, as we saw in the case of Rousseau, that acts like dynamite in undermining old and rock-foundationed institutions and blowing them to pieces, and leaving hardly a trace behind. If you can show that women have genius of that sort, you prove incontestably that they have the right to rank with men. I have not referred at all this time to such cases, as women who played leading parts as rulers, or the advisers of rulers, or the advisers of great literary men. If you have to refer to cases of that sort, if you can only show that women have played a great part in the creation of any one literature like that of England, you establish such a position for them, that in a case like this, you cannot refuse them the right that they may claim, without establishing, either their unfitness, or that they would be a danger to the state. I will not take up the time of this House by referring, as I might, to similar instances of their creative power in Greece. In fact, in every literature I might do the same; but I will only say this, echoing an illustrious member of the same race as my hon. friend (Mr. Amyot), A. Dumas fils, who says, speaking in the Academy, speaking in that proud Academy: Here we are accustomed to quote Madame de Sévigné and Madame de Stael, but were either of them living, we would not allow them within these walls. I suppose that Dumas would have been ready to say: There is not an immortal who sat within these walls the superior, hardly any the equal, of Madame de Stael. Some were not fit to wipe her shoes.

Mr. MULOCK. The member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) will tell you all about shining shoes.

Mr. DAVIN. If I go to Toronto at all, I ought to go to the Vice-Chancellor of the University. The fact is, however, that if I were looking for advice on literary subjects, I doubt if I would take the advice even of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto. I shall not further trespass upon the time of the House, but will say that there has been no arguments brought forward to overturn those which I have ventured to present. All history shows that the aesthetic objection is of no avail; all history shows that women are capable of practical affairs, capable of managing great businesses, capable of ruling, capable of playing great political parts just as well as men. The hon. member for East York (Mr.

Maclean) says: they have written bad novels, and, therefore, you must not give them the franchise. If that be so, in the name of Heaven what will you do with the brilliant author of the "Woman who Did"? What will you do with men who write bad novels? You are illogical if you do not disfranchise them. If you refuse to enfranchise a woman because she writes a bad novel, then you ought disfranchise a man for the same reason. In regard to the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, I must say that it is a dangerous amendment to my motion. I do not thank him for it as showing any sympathy. He only uses my motion to raise a very large and important question. It is a question that we have settled in this House, and I think myself it is a question that we can never allow to go from beyond our authority, namely, what power shall send us here. I do not think we can allow any minor bodies to tell us the rock whence we shall be hewn and the pit whence we shall be dug. Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and what I do hope is, that he will withdraw that amendment, and that he will give me that gallant and generous support, which one so entirely the favourite of the fair sex ought to accord this Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the hon. member, who is so distinguished for his gallantry and devotion to the fair sex, has placed the cause of the ladies in a very unfair position before this House. I do not refer to the eloquence with which he advocated it, for nothing could exceed that; I mean the position in which he has left it for his fellow members to vote upon it. In the first place, does he not know that by bringing this motion here he prevents a very large and respectable minority in this House, who believe in provincial franchises, from voting for it? He prevents us conscientiously voting for it, when we believe that electoral franchises of all kinds should belong to the provinces. Not only do we believe that, but it was perfectly apparent last session, from the introduction of a Bill on that subject by Sir John Thompson, that he at any rate, as leader of the House and leader of his party, had arrived at the same conclusion. Now, Sir, I say it is unfair to the cause which the hon. gentleman is seeking to promote to place it in such a disadvantageous position before the House. Then, I think that in another way the hon. gentleman has made a great mistake. He has announced to the House that he wishes to confine the franchise to spinsters and widows; and a great many members of this House, I am sure, would think that a much more reasonable proposal than the granting of the franchise to married women. But, Sir, the resolution of the hon. gentleman grants it to married women as well—to every woman who has the property qualification. Allow me to read the resolution, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to kindly explain how it can mean that it is only applicable to spinsters and widows:

That in the opinion of this House, the privilege of voting for candidates for membership thereof should be extended to women possessing the qualifications which now entitle men to the electoral franchise.

Cannot married men vote?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. Then, under the resolution, married women can vote.

Mr. DAVIN. If they have the property.

Mr. EDGAR. Exactly what I say. The hon. gentleman has made a proposal here—

Mr. MULOCK. The only proposal he has ever made.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, I do not think his proposal will be accepted. However, it is perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman's speech is on one line, and his resolution on an entirely different line; and I am very doubtful indeed if the leader of the House, when he reads this resolution and sees what it means, is going to vote for it. I do not think that is what he has in his mind at all, when he says that personally he is in favour of the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly it is.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think the hon. gentleman means that married women should have the franchise, because the arguments addressed to us by the hon. member for West Assiniboia are to the effect that it would be only reasonable to give women for elections to this House the same franchise that they have in the province of Ontario in municipal matters and in the election of school trustees; and in those cases married women cannot vote, no matter how much property they hold. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has put this question into a very unfortunate shape in this House, and I am afraid that his proposal will not be accepted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to vote on this question without giving some reasons for the vote I intend to give. I have no doubt that there are in Canada a great many ladies who could as ably and intelligently discharge the duties of electors for the Dominion and the local legislatures as a great many men, and perhaps a good deal better. I was very much amused at some of the closing remarks of the hon. gentleman who moves this resolution. When a member of this House introduces a Bill, it is customary for him to state the reasons why he offers it, and in closing his remarks to answer the objections raised against it. In this case the hon. gentleman has wandered all over creation and gone back to the ancient centuries to gather some additional reasons why we should adopt this

measure. If my hon. friend, in place of taking under his wing the entire fair sex of this Dominion, would centralise his affections upon one and stick to her, he would accomplish more, and, no doubt, do himself a very great kindness; and it would unquestionably be a source of relief to all the others to know that they would not be asked to enter into such a contract. Now, with regard to this question, in my humble opinion, there are a great many ladies who can intelligently discharge the duties of voting. In Ontario the ladies now have the right to vote in municipal affairs——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. member—he may not remember it—that he has already spoken on this motion.

Mr. DENISON. As the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has pointed out, this resolution would permit married women who have property qualification to vote; and this would, perhaps, cause discord in the family, if both the husband and the wife possessed property. Either the wife could record her vote on the same side as her husband, as a good wife ought to do, or else, they might vote on the opposite side, which would cause discord. But for that there might be some arguments in favour of the proposition. I believe that in municipal matters it is a very good ting to allow spinsters and widows to vote, because in that way they are looking after their own property interests, and also in school matters, for in the case of widows they are looking after the schooling of their children. But as the resolution would allow married women to vote, I shall be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before this question is put to the House, I wish to say a few words in explanation of the vote which I shall feel myself bound to give. As a friend of women suffrage, and I avow myself to be so, I have felt somewhat pained and somewhat indignant at the flippant manner in which my hon. friend from West Assiniboia discussed this question.

Mr. DAVIN. Flippant?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, flippant; and I am sure that the intelligent women of this Dominion who seek for electoral privileges, feeling that they have a right to have a voice in the affairs of the country, will not thank the hon. member for the manner in which he has presented their claims. I have always felt that women possessing the property qualification ought to have votes, and that in voting they would strengthen that element of the electorate which seeks to promote the best interests of the country, especially upon all moral questions. Holding these views, I feel it due to myself to explain why I shall vote against the resolution. I shall vote against it, Sir, because I have frequently taken the stand in this House against the Dominion Legislature fixing the terms of the franchise in any way whatever. I have introduced a Bill this session condemning the Electoral Franchise Act, and affirming the principle that the terms of the franchise should be fixed by the provincial legislatures. Holding that view, it is impossible for me to vote for this resolution. While I may be, and am in favour of woman's suffrage to a certain extent, I do not believe that the legislation granting that privilege should emanate from this House. I do not believe that this House should deal with the question of suffrage at all. It is one that pertains to the jurisdiction of the province, and therefore I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is not quite so fair as he would wish this House to believe. He says he is in favour of woman suffrage, but at the same time is opposed to it simply because the resolution proposes that it should be granted by this House. I am opposed to the franchise of the different provinces and more particularly that of Nova Scotia, for I believe it would be almost impossible to imagine any country having such a franchise and such a method of making up electoral lists. While apparently it is quite fair, yet under it the most unfair lists imaginable are made. In the first place the assesors are appointed by municipal councils. The councillors are very prominent ward politicians in almost every instance, and the assessors whom they appoint have also great power and discretion in preparing the lists, under the provincial franchise Act. For instance if a man is assessed at $149 real estate, there is no way by which you can get his name upon the lists, but if he is not assessed at all he can go before the reviser and have his name put on by proving that he owns real estate worth $150. There are many similar anomalies. Then the final revision is made by the sheriff, who is appointed by the local government and holds office at pleasure. It is very amusing to see how those lists are revised by the sheriffs. They are deposited on or before the 18th March, and very often are not deposited until the very last day. In the county I represent, this year they were not deposited until the last day. The sheriff commences his revision by law on the 20th and completes it on the 31st March, which gives him exactly about ten days to revise the lists for the whole county; and when you come to consider that the shiretown is over 110 miles from the extreme end of the county, you will find it is almost impossible to have the lists revised except for localities immediately adjoining the shiretown where the sheriff holds office. Notices have to be given to the parties objected to, and notice must also be given of the parties whose names are to be added. I am not finding fault with any particular sheriff, but I

remember one instance when a man went in and succeeded in getting a name on the list. Two or three days later another party came in and gave evidence to strike the name off. This party said: But what is the use, to-morrow you will have two or three men on the other side who will give evidence in favour of having the name put on again. The sheriff said: I will send you word in that case and you will have a chance to bring in two or three witnesses to corroborate what you said. There is no special day fixed for the hearing, and in this way a great deal of injustice is done. Men holding office under the Dominion Government, particularly light-house keepers, men working on the railways and in the customs and Inland Revenue Departments—are very often left off the list. At one time it was proposed that any person holding any office under the Dominion Government should not be allowed to sit as councillor, and if the electoral lists were entirely left in the hands of the provincial authorities, they would manipulate them in such a way that it would be impossible to have anything like fairness. I know of a case where a sheriff, in dealing with an electoral list, had a charge laid against him by a certain party of incivility. The local legislature was sitting at the time, and a day or two before its close, a Bill was quietly put through the House, without anybody being properly aware of its purport, providing that when a charge was laid against a sheriff, the local government need not appoint him as returning officer at the elections, and this particular sheriff was deprived of that duty and its emoluments. It may have been that the House understood that if any sheriff were guilty of malfeasance in office or anything of that kind he should not be appointed and did not understand that the Bill was aimed at one particular sheriff. This House would commit a great mistake if it were to place the making of the lists in the hands of the provincial governments, for these governments use all devices and means in having the lists made out to suit themselves, and if a sheriff does not carry out their behests he can be punished, and this possibility is always before his eyes. Although I am not very strongly in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I think there is every reason for giving it fair degree of support. We know that in the debates that took place in Great Britain it was pointed out that they were continually descending in extending the franchise, and it was thought that they might make a lateral extension rather than a perpendicular extension. We know that a large number of women are successfully engaged in business to-day. In the city of Halifax, at one time the principal dry goods merchant was a lady, and, to-day, one of the largest ready-made clothing establishments in that city has at its head a lady, who conducts the business very successfully. Women are taking the places of men in a great many occupations in the country. The last census of the United States shows that in hundreds of positions of emolument and trust throughout the country, women occupy the places formerly occupied by men, and the same is true of Canada. This being the case, I do not see why the franchise should not be extended to women. For these reasons I propose to vote against the amendment and support the proposition of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. McISAAC. I have no wish to take up time, but the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) has made some statements which, although they do not, in my opinion, relate to the Bill under discussion, call for some notice. He has taken occasion to make an attack upon the Government of Nova Scotia, and he endeavoured to impress this House with the belief that the voters' lists in Nova Scotia are made up under the control of the Government of that province. I desire to tell this House that the government or legislature have no control directly or indirectly over the preparation of those lists. The lists are made up by officers appointed by the county councils of the various municipalities, whose members are directly elected by the people. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the Court of Appeal in case of dispute as to the names to be put on or struck off the lists is the sheriff of each county, and the arraignment he has made is against the sheriff of his own county, I understand.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). There are other counties.

Mr. McISAAC. Yes, the counties of Inverness, Colchester and Digby, for instance, whose sheriffs, constituting the courts of appeal in these counties, are Tories, and in all the other counties the sheriffs, from the nature of their appointment, being during good behaviour, as well as for their good standing in other respects, to say the least of it, compare very favourably with the revising barristers. The sheriff in the hon. gentleman's county (Victoria) is a Conservative, not only a Conservative, but he is the hon. gentleman's own brother-in-law. Now, Sir, the Court of Appeal in the county of Victoria, which court has been established by the local government is presided over by a partisan and brother-in-law of the hon. member. What better court does he want? Yet he seeks to impress this House with the belief that the lists are made up under the control of the government and legislature of the province. The hon. gentleman tells the House that a Bill was smuggled through the Nova Scotia legislature, the object of which was to take away from the sheriffs in some coun-

ties the right to act as returning officers in some cases. That Act, Mr. Speaker, is one which will commend itself to the sober consideration of any legislature. When any charge is preferred against a sheriff, whether a Conservative or a Liberal, is it not right and just that, if he is not deemed fit to discharge his duties of sheriff on account of malfeasance in office, while these charges are being investigated that he should not be permitted to act as returning officer for any particular county? This Bill, the hon. gentleman says, was smuggled through the legislature of Nova Scotia. What does he mean, Sir? Could any stronger charge be made against the hon. gentleman's friends in the legislature than that? What is the use of a Conservative Opposition in Nova Scotia if they permit Bills to be smuggled through against the interest of their own party or of the province generally? I say that no Liberal in Nova Scotia, in the legislature or in the press has ever made a stronger attack upon the friends of the hon. gentleman than he himself has made. What are they good for? Why do they not resign and go home, leaving their places to better men, if they can do no better than to allow such Bills to be smuggled through the House? Sir, this Bill was not smuggled through the House. I was in the legislature at the time it was passed. It passed its first, its second and its third reading in due form, and was fully discussed. If it did not receive adequate consideration on the part of the Opposition, they should, as I say, resign and leave their places to such men as the hon. gentleman who was himself at one time a member of the local opposition in that province, if they have no eyes to see and no ears to hear. In conclusion, let me say that the arguments adduced by the hon. gentleman have no relevancy to the Bill under discussion. If this subject is left to the control of the province, it simply means that it is handed over to the municipal councils elected by the people themselves; it is removed from any direct or indirect control by the legislature or government of the province and the Dominion—in fact, it is placed in the hands of the people themselves.

Mr. GILLIES. I am certainly very much surprised at the attitude assumed by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. That an hon. gentleman, coming fresh from the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia——

Mr. DENISON. Too fresh.

Mr. GILLIES—too fresh, as my hon. friend from Toronto just suggested—a legislature that in days gone by has had every reason to boast of the men who have formed its membership—should take the position taken by the hon. member, is a matter for surprise indeed. The hon. gentleman has attempted to give this House an insight into the manner in which the lists are made up in the province of Nova Scotia. He attempted to show, but in a very lame manner indeed, I am sorry to say, the method pursued by the authorities in making up these lists. He would have this House believe that the Government of Nova Scotia exercises no control whatever over the making up of those lists; but in a few words, I think, I can convince this House that the contrary is the case. What, Mr. Speaker, is the formation of the court that makes up these lists? In the first place the court of appeal in these cases is simply the sheriff of the county, and that sheriff is appointed by the local government and holds office during their pleasure. Could there be a more partisan or more one-sided court than this? Yet this is the tribunal that hon. gentlemen opposite want established to govern the franchise that will elect members to this House. With the Dominion lists it is different. These lists are made up by the revising officer, who holds his office not during pleasure, but during good behaviour, and can only be removed from office by joint vote of both Houses of Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be a retrograde step entirely on the part of this Parliament to vote for the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. It would destroy the uniformity of franchise in elections for members of this House. Why should not the franchise upon which a member from the province of Nova Scotia is elected be the same as for one from the province of New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, or Manitoba, or British Columbia? Why should I from Nova Scotia come here under a different franchise from that which sends here any of my hon. friends from other provinces? If you go back to the provincial franchises as they now prevail in the different provinces, what do you find? In the province of Nova Scotia with which I am most familiar, we find that every individual holding a position of emolument from the federal authority, is disqualified from voting for members for the provincial legislature. No matter how high an individual may be in the municipality, no matter what property he may hold, no matter what rates he may contribute to the municipal treasury, no matter how eminent he may be in the community, yet if he holds a position of lighthouse keeper, or any petty position whatever, bringing him a salary of $500 per year, he is disqualified from voting for a member of the provincial legislature. And you would have that system prevail in electing members to this House? Sir, I will cite a single case from the county I have the honour to represent, which will go far to show the monstrous injustice that is perpetrated by the Act that was passed by the friends of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. There was a case of one of the very best farmers in the county of Richmond, a

man that stands eminently high in the community in which he lives, a man that owns a large property, a man that contributes largely to the municipal treasury, a man that has lived for years and years in the county, and simply because he holds a small lighthouse, he was disfranchised and made incapable of voting for a member of the local assembly. And yet you would have that system prevail in electing members for this House. Though I am not at all in agreement with the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia, I prefer to vote for it than to vote for the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. If I were forced to choose between them, I would prefer the motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia with all its deformities, in my opinion, rather than to take the backward step proposed by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) As it is late, and after the long sitting we had yesterday, this House is tired, and as I have some observations to make in connection with this important question, I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend wishes to carry on the debate still further, of course, like every other member, he should have the opportunity to speak, and we will adjourn the debate. But if my hon. friend is not anxious to continue the debate, I may say that I had made an arrangement by which a vote could be taken. Therefore I will just leave it with my hon. friend to decide for himself. The reason I suggest an adjournment or a vote is because of the late sitting of last night.

Mr. DUPONT. I intend to speak upon this question.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 31st May, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Civil Service Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 103) to amend the Copyright Act (from the Senate).—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. In reference to the matter which was referred to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and which was reserved for further consideration, respecting questions put by members, I find that in the British House of Commons, the practice is as stated by the hon. member for Queen's. I will read what Sir Erskine May says with regard to it:

> An answer should be confined to the points contained in the question, with such explanations only as renders the answer intelligible, though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown; and further questions, without debate or comment, may, within due limits, be addressed to them, which are necessary for the elucidation of the answers that they have given. The Speaker has called the attention of the House to the inconvenience that arises from an excessive demand for further replies, and, to hinder the practice, he has occasionally felt it necessary to call upon the member in whose name the next question stands upon the Notice paper, to put his question.

It will thus be seen that although the practice is permitted in England of putting further questions arising out of questions upon the Notice paper, the limitations are very strict, and the limitations respecting the introduction of debatable matter are absolute. My own experience in regard to the practice in this Parliament is that these supplementary questions are not put here. I have never known supplementary questions such as are spoken of in the quotation I have just given to be put here: and, after careful consideration of the whole matter, and, taking into consideration the fact that the facilities for putting questions upon the paper are very great—on three days of the week questions put by members come first in the order of business—I have come to the conclusion that it would not be wise for us to depart from the practice that has prevailed heretofore. Then, with regard to another matter, the point raised by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) respecting answers given by Ministers to questions put upon the paper, I think it would be just as well to set the matter at rest at once, and to do so, I will quote the decisions of Mr. Speaker Peel:

> The Prime Minister being asked if he adhered to the statement made by the Secretary of State for India, declines to answer such a question, which he thinks ought not to be put, and Mr. Speaker being appealed to by the hon. member who put the question—
>
> Mr. SPEAKER. It is entirely within the discretion of the First Lord of the Treasury to decide what answer he shall give.

Then, on another occasion he says:

> It is entirely within the discretion of a Minister of the Crown to give to a question any answer which he thinks right. It is for him to judge what answer should be given. No question of order can arise on this point.

Upon another occasion he makes the same ruling:

It is within the discretion of a Minister, whether he can answer, and in what way, a question put.

THE MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Monday next, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Minister of Finance to execute, on behalf of Her Majesty, a release and discharge of a certain mortgage given to Her Majesty in 1858 by the Hon. George H. Markland upon certain properties in the city of Kingston, which were sold in 1862 under the said mortgage, and to convey the properties so sold, freed and discharged from the said mortgage, to the persons entitled thereto, on payment of such part of the purchase money as now remains unpaid, either with or without interest, and on such other terms and conditions as the Minister deems expedient in the public interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the Minister of Finance got that mortgage in his custody ? Because it ought, I think, to be laid upon the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not it with me here. All the papers in connection with the matter will be laid upon the Table. The hon. gentleman was not present the other day when I introduced the Bill. On looking over it, it will be seen that we must proceed by way of resolution first.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the Bill printed ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And is the mortgage attached ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not attached to the Bill. I promised, on introducing the Bill, to bring all the papers down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that in a Bill of that kind the full text of the document should be set out. It is very awkward to have such a document laid on the Table just when the hon. gentleman is proceeding with the second reading. It ought to be in our hands some time in advance.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring the papers down before the second reading.

Mr. MULOCK. This resolution, if carried, settles the whole principle, as I understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am only giving notice for Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Monday next, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts, and to provide that the salaries of the judges hereinafter mentioned shall be as follows :—

Two judges of the Circuit Court of the District of Montreal, each $3,000 per annum ;

Five County Court judges in Manitoba, each $2,000 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service, each $2,400 per annum ;

The local judge of the District of British Columbia, $1,000 per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether here is any addition to the number of judges, or whether this is a re-arrangement of salaries ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no addition to the number of judges, this is only done in order to incorporate these appointments in the general statutes, which was overlooked. The salaries have been voted in the Estimates each session, and this practice will be followed this year. But this will bring the salaries of these judges under the same procedure as other similar salaries.

Mr. DENISON. Is it contemplated to increase the salaries of the judges in Ontario ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may say that it is not contemplated to propose increases in the salaries of judges this year.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that I shall have an opportunity to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that one of the judges——

Mr. SPEAKER. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that no discussion can take place under this motion, but a discussion may take place when a motion is made to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BRODEUR. The question to the Minister of Justice is this, whether he is aware that one of the judges of the Circuit Court of Montreal, for whose salaries he is going to provide, died some time ago ? I think it would be in the interest of the district of Montreal that the new judge should be appointed as soon as possible, because I may say the other judge is sick, and a great deal of inconvenience has resulted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that expedition should obtain, and in a short time I hope that the appointment will be made.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Who is going to receive the appointment ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Ask me in a month.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—DELAYED RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before this motion is carried, I desire to draw the attention of the House to the fact that some years ago I asked for a return concerning a dismissal of a postmaster in my county. That return was ordered four years ago, and I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the papers have not yet been brought down. I understand that they could be produced if the Postmaster General were willing. I may say that in 1892 I had a motion carried in this House calling for the production of all petitions, correspondence, vouchers and inspector's reports concerning the dismissal of that postmaster. That motion was carried without any objection on the part of the Postmaster General. Towards the end of the session of 1892, I again called his attention to the fact that this return had not been brought down, and the only answer I received was that the papers had been lost. I thought at that time that this answer of the Postmaster General was perfectly correct, but I understand now, from information which has been conveyed to me, that the answer of the hon. gentleman was erroneous; that in fact the papers have never been lost, but that they have always been and still remain in the hands of the Postmaster General. The other day I asked the hon. gentleman "when will the said papers be brought down?" and the Postmaster General answered:

> In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that the papers referred to in his question, have disappeared from the office of the Secretary of State, and have not yet been recovered. I have already had the honour to give the same answer to the hon. member. The only paper in the Postmaster General's Department is the inspector's report, which is confidential.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to say that the information given to this House by the hon. the Postmaster General to the effect that these papers had been lost, is quite erroneous. The most important paper that I asked from the Postmaster General was a voucher, that is to say, an envelope on which that dismissal took place. That envelope has always remained in the hands of the department, and the Postmaster General has got that envelope in his department to-day. I do not know why, when this House has ordered the production of these papers and of these vouchers, they have not been already laid before the House. I know well that some years ago the same information was given to me; I was then informed that these papers were lost. But, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to issue a subpœna against the Deputy Postmaster General, and he produced those papers, and among them the envelope in question. I must say further that at the same time a letter was sent from the department to my adversaries in that case, in which they were told that if they wanted those documents they could have them when they wished. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, these papers are refused to members of this House when they have been ordered, and the Postmaster General says that he cannot produce them because they are lost, but at the same time he conveys information to my adversaries that he is willing to let them see these papers whenever they wish. It is a very curious position. I was greatly surprised the other day when the Postmaster General told me that these vouchers and this envelope were lost, although the envelope had been produced in court some time ago as an exhibit, and although it is still in the hands of the Government. But there is more than that. The hon. gentleman says he cannot produce the inspector's report because it is confidential. Well, in 1892, a motion was carried in this House that the report should be brought down. I admit there was no discussion at the time, and perhaps it was owing to the terms of the order not being sufficiently explicit, that the Postmaster General did not produce that report. But last year we had a discussion upon that subject, and it was decided by the House that the Government should produce that inspector's report. I may say that Sir John Thompson himself, then leader of the House, spoke on the question, and said that usually it was better not to produce before the House inspectors' reports, but that as it was alleged in this particular instance that the inspector's report was not strictly true, it was certainly well to produce it. The hon. member from South Oxford had previously said that these reports should have been produced, and Sir John Thompson used this language:

> I quite admit that there may be cases in which even confidential reports should be submitted to Parliament, especially if such confidential reports have misled the action of a public department.

After this admission by Sir John Thompson, the motion was carried; consequently the Postmaster General now has no right to say that he will not produce this report when his leader last year admitted that it ought to be produced. But there is more than that. Last year a motion was carried according to which, not only that report should be produced, but also all the documents in the case of Loiselle and Guillet, a case which was decided some two years ago in Montreal. That motion was carried at the instance of Sir John Thompson himself, who said that these papers should be brought down. Yet the hon. Postmaster General told me the other day that those papers were lost, and that he did not have them in his possession. Well, Sir, I am in a position to state the contrary; I am in a position to say that the papers concerning the case of Loiselle and Guillet are in his possession. I went to Montreal last week, and inquired from the Prothonotary, who told me that the papers had been sent to the department, and I know that they are now in the hands of the department. Under

these circumstances, it is strange indeed, that the Postmaster General should tell a member of this House that the papers had been lost, and that he is unable to bring them down. This House, having ordered the production of these papers, which are very important documents, I do not know why they have not been produced, and I do not know particularly why the Postmaster General should inform the House that these papers have been lost, when the envelope, at all events, appears to be in the hands of the department, and when it appears that other parties have seen the papers. What is the object of the Government in delaying the production of these documents? The object of the Postmaster General, I understand to be, is to prevent the truth becoming known concerning this individual. In 1891 the Minister of Railways declared in this House that the postmaster had been dismissed because a registered letter had been improperly detained and the post-mark altered. This was a very serious offence if the charge was true. We endeavoured to have the inquiry made by the Government but it was always refused. New legal proceedings were taken before the court, and these ended in the man being proved entirely innocent of the charge laid against him by the Government, and the Minister of Railways in this House. There was no foundation whatever for the charge, and last year the Postmaster General was obliged to admit that the man was not guilty, and should not have been dismissed for the reasons given. It was proved by the document, which the Postmaster General will not now produce to this House, that the charges made by the Minister of Railways were entirely erroneous, especially that complaint had been made by a man named Guillet. He came into court and declared positively that he had never made any complaint as had been stated by the Minister of Railways. Under these circumstances, I think it is the duty of the Government to produce these papers; I think the Government is bound to produce them, because there is an order of the House to that effect. The fact of having disregarded this order, and failing to fulfil the order of the House will, I suppose, induce the Government to produce the papers immediately.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have to acknowledge the courtesy of the hon. gentleman in writing me previous to the meeting of the House this afternoon that he was going to bring up the question which he has just submitted to the House. But if I do acknowledge his courtesy in having given me notice, I have to challenge his statements as not being absolutely founded on facts. I told the hon. gentleman that the papers had been transferred from the department over which I now preside to the Department of the Secretary of State, when my friend, Mr. Chapleau, occupied that position. The papers which were so transferred have not been recovered. I also told the hon. gentleman, and it was a fact known to every member of the House, that the reports of our inspectors are confidential, and there is an Order in Council, which is known by those gentlemen who have been in Parliament for a number of years, preventing these reports being brought down and laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman state that the envelope is lost?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will answer the hon. gentleman fully, if he will permit me, and I will go into every matter submitted. The reason for passing that Order in Council is quite obvious. These reports are brought down for the efficient administration of the department by the Postmaster General, and it is necessary that the most confidential information be conveyed by the inspectors, who are selected for the purpose of going from one end of the Dominion to the other to investigate every important and intricate question, and submit it to the department, and that this information should be as full and complete as possible. If these reports were submitted to Parliament and discussed and criticised, it would become impossible to get inspectors to submit them in such detail as to enable the Postmaster General to efficiently administer his department. As to this report, we have the report of the inspector in the department. The hon. gentleman cannot point to a single case when the question was brought up—and it has been brought up on more than one occasion—when I stated that the report was not in the department; and I believe that the envelope is in the hands of the department, but I would not be positive. I received notice from the hon. gentleman as I was going into Council, and I say that I believe that the envelope is in the department, but I am not positive. If it is, I have no objection to bring down the envelope, and submit it to the hon. gentleman, and lay it on the Table of the House. But the hon. gentleman knows very well that in the case of Loiselle vs. Guillet, one of the contentions of the counsel for Loiselle was that the report of the inspector should be produced, and the court ruled that the report should not be produced, for the reason I have already stated to the House, that it was a confidential document. If, when the man was on his trial, the court decided that the confidential nature of the report was such that it should not be brought down, I do not see how the hon. gentleman can ask me to break the rules and precedents that have invariably been followed in the department over which I now preside, and

produce that report. The hon. gentleman knows, and he has so stated, that this matter took place before I was Postmaster General. But I am prepared to take the responsibility of my predecessor's action, for I consider the course he followed was as unobjectionable as the course which I am following to-day. A colleague, a member of the Government asked him to send over the record and it was sent over. These papers, as I have told the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion—because there is no reason why I should try to hide them from the hon. gentleman—would be produced if they were available; but they were sent over to the Department of State, and my deputy informs, and has informed me on several occasions when the matter was brought up that the papers were never recovered. I am giving the hon. gentleman the information I have been able to gather from my departmental officers, who are responsible for looking after the documents and official record, and they tell me the papers are not in my department. The only document in possession of my department in relation to this case is the report of the inspector, which, following the precedents and practice established in previous years, I refuse positively to bring down. As to the envelope, I will not pretend to give any official information in regard to it, because I am merely speaking from recollection, but I think it is in the department, and if it is, the hon. gentleman is very welcome to it. Outside that, we have no information that I could convey to hon. gentlemen. In my opinion it was rather strange that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) should say that he has information from my department which led him to state that the Postmaster General refused to convey information which he has communicated to parties who were opposed, or hostile (I forget the exact word he used) to the clients whom the hon. gentleman represents. That is an unwarranted statement for the hon. gentleman to make, and he should have been better informed before he did make it. I state here upon my responsibility as Postmaster General, and from my place in Parliament, that all the documents which could be produced—outside of the report of the inspector, which could not be produced—have disappeared. It looks as if the hon. gentleman has been seeking information in my department in a way in which he should not try to get it. He should not have stated that my object in refusing these papers was to protect some people. The circumstances of the case arose before my time as Postmaster General, and I know nothing at all about the original quarrel. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) makes the broad statement here, that he has been enabled by means which he has not qualified, and which I would not like to qualify, to get information from my department which places me as head of that department in a position which I certainly would not like to occupy before the House. I say again to the hon. gentleman, that if the envelope is in the possession of the department he may have it; but I will not bring down the report of the inspector, because it is my duty to refuse it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The papers have been sent from Montreal to the department to be filed there.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman states so, but that is not an absolute reason why I should consider that the information I get from my officers is not to be credited.

Mr. LAURIER. The reasons given by the Postmaster General why this order, now three years out, has not been complied with, are, to say the least, very extraordinary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given the hon. gentleman the reasons.

Mr. LAURIER. I will discuss the reasons given by the hon. gentleman. Three years ago the House ordered the hon. gentleman to bring forth certain documents. He says that so far as he was concerned, he complied with that order by sending the papers to the Secretary of State's office, and that there they disappeared and were lost. That is the reason he has given why the order has not been complied with ever since that time. Does he not see how hollow that statement is?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, here is the order of the House:

> Copies of all petitions, correspondence, vouchers, depositions, inspectors' reports and documents whatever, respecting the dismissal of B. Loiselle, Esq., postmaster of the parish of Angèle, county of Rouville.

This ordered the Postmaster General, not to give the original document, but simply to send copies. He sent the copies of his official correspondence to the Secretary of State, and now he tells us that those copies have been destroyed or lost. What does it matter if the copies have been lost.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say the originals have been lost.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman had no business to send the originals to the Secretary of State's office. He told us a moment ago that the papers have not been lost in his office but lost in the Secretary of State's office. The papers which were lost in the Secretary of State's office were simply copies and the originals remained in his own department. Why, then, had not the hon. gentleman new copies made for the House? Does he not see that his answer will not do? Does he not see that there is something beyond that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that he sent the original papers to the Secretary of State ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I did.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, the hon. gentleman had no business to do that, and if he did do it, he did not comply with the order which was for copies and not for the originals. If the hon. gentleman has deprived his office of these original documents, he has done what was never done before. He has done what his duty did not call upon him to do, and, moreover, he has done what his duty forbade him to do. If the hon. gentleman did not keep the originals in his office he was derelict in his duty. The statement that the papers have been lost in the Secretary of State's office is a shallow and a hollow explanation to give why the order of the House has not been complied with. The House cannot be satisfied with that answer. Then, the hon. gentleman tells us that after all, one part of the correspondence may be in his office yet ; it may be that the envelope is in his office, but he is not quite sure. How is it that he is not sure ? He had notice that this matter would be brought up in the House, and yet he can only surmise as to whether that original document was in his office or not. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) took exception to the strong language which was used by my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur), but the explanation he has given is another illustration that in this case, as in many others, though an order of the House is passed, and though the Government had not the courage, at the time, to resist it, yet they evade it by not obeying the order.

Mr. HAGGART. If there is any blame in this matter, it rests upon me and not upon the present Postmaster General. When that order of the House was passed, Mr. Chapleau was Secretary of State, and he sent over for the papers in reference to this particular case. The original documents were sent over, as is done every day. When a Minister asks his colleagues for particular papers, the original papers are sent over to him, and that is the practice in the departments. Some way or another, the papers were mislaid in the Department of State, and from that day to this we have not been able to get the original papers from that department. Mr. Chapleau did not know what became of them ; but the fact is, that the documents never came from his hands back to the Post Office Department.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have seen them in the courts of Montreal since.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have seen them myself.

Mr. HAGGART. I remember the circumstances, and I have been informed by the deputy, who is outside now, what documents did go down to Montreal. The report of the inspector was sent down and the Deputy Postmaster General refused to show it in court, and he was authorized by the judge who presided at the trial not to show the documents, as they were confidential. The only document that is at present in the possession of the Post Office Department is the report of the inspector ; the original envelope, as the hon. gentleman states, which I do not see any possible objection to showing ; but the report of the inspector is regarded in every department as confidential, and is never brought down, even although an order of the House is given, because the reservation is always that if the report is ordered by the House, and the Government thinks it is confidential, they have always a right of retaining it, and have always exercised that right hitherto.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has made a statement which I do not think is altogether accurate, and I will read the order of the House from which he will see that it does not warrant that statement :

> Copies of all petitions, correspondence, vouchers, depositions, inspectors' reports and documents whatsoever.

Now, whatever may be the inclination of the Government— -

Mr. HAGGART. Let me ask the hon. gentleman before he proceeds in what particular am I in error ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will state to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman says that even though the House has ordered a report to be brought down, the Government have a right to keep back that report. I deny any such proposition. The Government are subordinate to this House, and while they may urge the confidential character of the report as a reason for not agreeing to such an order, if the House nevertheless disregards the reason assigned by the Government and makes the order, it is the business of the Government to comply with that order. Now, why did the House make this order ? My hon. friend, when he made the motion on the first occasion, showed that the inspector had made an improper report. The inspector was charged with being a conspirator with certain parties in the constituency for the purpose of removing this man from office ; and in the face of such a charge, the Government had no right to refuse to bring down the report of the inspector. Why should that report be withheld ? If the inspector, instead of discharging his duty faithfully, entered into such a conspiracy and made a false report to the Postmaster General for the purpose of giving

the Government a pretext for the removal of this man from office, it was the duty of the Government to bring down that report and allow the facts to be disclosed, in order that the inspector might have an opportunity of defending himself, or that the Government might be called upon by the House to remove him from office. Why, Sir, if the rule just laid down by the hon. Minister of Railways were a correct rule, it would be in the power of the Government to make any officer of any department a conspirator for the removal of some political opponent from office. I do not say that that power would be used; but in this case the charge was that this man did so act, whether with or against the advice or intention of the Government is a matter of no consequence. What is of consequence is that that charge was made against him, and it is because of that charge that the Minister of Railways as Postmaster General did not resist the order of the House. Now, Sir, the order of the House is perfectly clear: it is that all papers shall be brought down, and amongst those papers it specifies the report made by the inspector. Now, the hon. Postmaster General of to-day says he will not bring down the report of the inspector. Does the hon. gentleman intend to set at defiance the order of the House? Does he intend to set himself above Parliament and to say that although Parliament has made this order, he will not obey the order? Is that the position he takes? If it is, we ought to know it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him for one moment? I do not at all contend that I may disobey the order of the House, but I contend that the order of the House would not ask me to bring down a document which is considered to be confidential; and the reason the inspector's report has not been brought down is that an Order in Council was passed removing such documents from among those which were to be brought down to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must again remind the hon. gentleman that the charge was that the inspector had become a conspirator with other parties for removing this postmaster from office, that he prostituted his office and abused the trust committed to him; and it was because that charge was made that this House decided that the inspector's report should be brought down. The question of the confidential character of documents is a question of policy. If the House, for any reason, considers that such a document ought to be brought down, it orders it. If the Government think it ought not to be brought down, they resist the motion for the order; but if they are beaten on the motion, the document will nevertheless be produced. The Government did not think proper to resist the motion for this report; they assented to the motion, and having done so, they have no right to refuse the production of the report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot bring to this discussion any lengthy experience in Parliament; but I can refer, and, I think, with some relevance, to my experience since 1883. There has been an understanding, both tacit and expressed across the floor, in connection with returns with which I have been particularly concerned, that when a general order for papers was passed, such papers or despatches as were of a confidential nature would not be included. In this very session, if I mistake not, certainly in other sessions when I was connected with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that was the understanding.

Mr. LAURIER. Stated at the time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And stated at the time, as the leader of the Opposition says. If the House thought well, the order was so made as to cover every document in the hands of the department, with the understanding that as a matter of course confidential despatches could not and would not be brought down.

Mr. MULOCK. That would be limited to the particular motion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was limited to the particular motion. I say that while in some cases that understanding was expressed, and they might differ in that respect from cases in which no statement was made, the practice has been that papers of a confidential character would not be brought down unless specially referred to. If the House desired to depart from that practice, it would state in the order the reports of officers, confidential or otherwise. But this question which the hon. member for Bothwell has raised, can, I think, be summarily disposed of by referring to the discussion that took place in reference to this very report. When the present Minister of Railways and Canals was at the head of the Post Office Department, and at the very time, in 1890, I think, when this subject was mooted and this order was moved for, he stated that he could not bring down the reports of inspectors because there was an Order in Council which made these confidential documents in the interest of the public service, and such as should not be laid before Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not in this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought it was in reference to this case, but in 1890, the hon. gentleman will find, on consulting "Hansard," that the Postmaster General then laid down the rule that the reports of the Post Office inspectors were considered as confidential, and my recollection is that no one disputed that fact. This rule has obtained ever since we had a government. It

is a rule of common sense which commends itself at once. The reports would be of very little value if the officer reporting, in connection particularly with charges of fraud, knew that his report was liable to be laid before Parliament. Until the House reverses the rule that has always obtained, hon. gentlemen opposite have no reason to complain. I think it will be a long time before they will see that rule reversed, and until we do, until this House decides that such reports are not to be considered secret and confidential, my hon. friend the Postmaster General cannot be assailed for not producing them. I referred a moment ago to the session of 1890 when a similar motion was made with reference to a post office at Pierreville, Quebec. The Postmaster then said, without any demur on the part of the hon. gentleman :

> There is no objection to bring down all the papers which are usually brought down, but the reports of the inspectors are generally printed as confidential.
>
> Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Strike out the words, "and report."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen certainly, to some extent, make a point, but it is only a technical point. It is a very narrow point, that because the safer course was adopted in that particular instance, that because the word "report" was struck out, they make a case. Against that I set the uncontradicted statement of the Postmaster General that these reports were confidential. Against that I set the practice that has obtained, and which did obtain in that case, against bringing down that class of reports. It is the same practice that obtains, for instance, with regard to confidential despatches between this and the Imperial Government. Whether there is or not an open understanding across the floor of the House, no Government, even if the papers were ordered in general terms, would hesitate for a moment in refusing to bring down secret despatches between it and the Imperial Government. The Governor General himself is forbidden to allow these papers to be laid before the House. He is expressely directed not to do that, and that position has never been challenged on the floor of this House.

Mr. LISTER. I do not see that the remarks of the Minister of Justice have strengthened the position which the Government has taken in this matter in the slightest degree. What are the facts ? It appears that at the time this order of the House was passed, the Order in Council referred to by the Postmaster General was in existence. It was then his duty to have refused to produce the inspector's report if he ever intended to refuse it. The charge was made that the inspector was a party to a conspiracy for the purpose of injuring an official of this country. In order to substantiate that charge, my hon. friend asked that all the papers should be laid before the House. The Government at that time might have refused to bring down what they considered a confidential report. The Minister of Justice at the time, who was also leader of the House, was aware of the object, and after considering the circumstances concluded that while it might not be expedient in many cases to produce such confidential reports there were cases in which the production might be necessary and expedient. It was admitted then by the Government that the report of this officer was one of those cases. I am told that after the vote of the House had passed, the Postmaster General said that that report would never be laid before Parliament, and three years have elapsed without our having obtained it. What are the facts ? A man is appointed postmaster, a conspiracy is hatched for the purpose of depriving him of his position and ruining his reputation and character. The Government stand by the conspirators and refuse to bring down evidence that will vindicate the reputation and character of that man. Is it possible to imagine more contemptible and disgraceful conduct ? You have dismissed the man upon evidence that will vindicate the reputation on a report that was not founded on truth or fact, and when evidence is brought to show that this man was not guilty of the charge made against him by the inspector, you refuse to restore him to his position, and you refuse to give him the commonest justice that would be accorded to any man in a free country—the right to establish beyond doubt his innocence of the charge made against him. Could any conduct be more contemptible or disgraceful ? Why, if such reports as this be considered confidential, the greatest tyranny and despotism may be exercised by the Government. It is within my knowledge that in the case of a post office, within a hundred miles of Ottawa, of which the postmaster is a son of a member of this House, where the letters were regularly opened, where the report of the inspector had sustained the charge, yet the Government refuses to dismiss this postmaster. They refuse to produce the report of the inspector which establishes his guilt. Not only that. In that same post office, letters have since been opened and read and resealed. An investigation is taking place again, but in spite of all that can be done the Government retain that postmaster who is practising law, who does not attend to the office at all, and who, rumour says, is not receiving the emolument of the office. That is the way that injustice may be done to some and wrong and improper dealings of others are covered up, under the excuse that there is an Order in Council stating that these papers are confidential

and ought not to be laid before Parliament. If the contention of the Government is to be sustained, what will be the position? They may pass an Order in Council in secret conclave, and say: we will not bring down any papers at all. And when we ask for them, they may deny Parliament the right, by saying, Why, there is an Order in Council; we are not bound to bring down the papers at all. Sir, the Government are the servants of the people of this country; they are bound to obey the commands of this Parliament. Parliament has ordered that these papers shall be brought down, and it is the plain and manifest duty of the Government to bring them down. Why, what a trumpery excuse the Postmaster General raises here—"These papers have been lost"——

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not lost.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They are lost.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend here says the papers are not lost, and he has seen them in the office in Montreal. But if that be held good, how easy it is to have papers lost. All that is necessary is that one Minister should send a note over to his colleague: "Send me the papers"; and they may be lost in that department, and there is no redress. These papers may be lost. It is extraordinary they were lost. Mr. Chapleau—I do not know whether he was a friend of this postmaster, or a friend of the people who are persecuting him—intervened, what business had he with the papers, what right had he to have them? The Minister of Railways was then Postmaster General; he was the custodian of these documents. Mr. Chapleau had no more right to them than I have. He had no right to poke his nose into the business of the then Postmaster General. He wrote to the Postmaster, and the Postmaster General with remarkable simplicity sent them over; and the next time they were asked for, the papers were 'non est.' In the meantime, some unfortunate man who had lived, for aught I know, creditably in the town or section of the country where he had his home, finds his reputation wrecked and himself dismissed from his office and disgraced in the eyes of the public—this is all proven in a court of justice—and another man placed in his position. And the Government, instead of trying to make some restitution, instead of even affording the means to have the charge made against him cleared up, which can be done by the production of the papers my hon. friend asked for, refuses even to give him this small measure of justice. The answer of the Postmaster General cannot be supported from any point. It is a trumpery excuse the hon. gentleman gives to this House, and, as my hon. friend says, he has a copy of the record. Sir, the late Minister of Justice agreed that these papers should be produced, and I do not think the Government, two years afterwards, should repudiate the promise of the then leader of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think a word or two should be said further on this subject. So far as I understand the custom of Parliament, and so far as I understand the custom of the departments, the rule hitherto has been that if a Minister objected to produce any particular documents, he gave notice at the time the motion was presented. But, behind this, Mr. Speaker, there are circumstances which, I think, lead to a more important principle. I quite agree with the contention of the Minister of Justice that, in ordinary cases, reports of this kind should not be produced. But there are exceptions. They should not be produced without cause, without clear cause being shown. But when cause has been shown, then, I contend, there is no sufficient ground or reason for the Government refusing to produce the documents. They are official documents, after all is said and done. The Minister takes action upon them upon his responsibility, and it is laying down a very dangerous principle to say that no confidential reports shall see the light, even when there is strong prima facie grounds for suspecting—as there appears to be in a case of this kind—that the inspector has been a party to a conspiracy to injure one of the officials under him. Where a charge is made against an official, such as is made in this case, I submit that there is most ample grounds for bringing down his reports whether confidential or otherwise. Now, in this case, not only has the charge been made, but, so far as I recollect the circumstances of the case—and the Minister of Justice can correct me if I mistake them—it was proved in a court of justice that the ground on which the then Postmaster General had justified the dismissal of this postmaster were wholly and utterly unfounded. Sir, if any possible circumstances can justify the production of a confidential report, surely they may be said to exist in this case. We on this side do not ask, and have never asked, that confidential reports should be brought down indiscriminately; but, when such statements as my hon. friend has made have been made, and when it was known that the inspector in question was charged with the gravest violation of his official duties—or, to put it on the lowest ground, was charged with having acted most grievously in error—then, Sir, I must say that when an order of the House has been passed declaring in so many words that this report should be brought down, there is no possible excuse that I can see for disregarding that order.

Mr. FORBES. While you are on the subject, I would like to know whether it is possible for any——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Wait, wait.

Mr. FORBES. It is in the same line.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only intervene in the debate at the present time—because it is almost impossible to supplement the forcible arguments that have been presented to the House already—because it seems to me desirable to call the attention of the House to this fact—that we should not be entering upon a discussion of this matter at all. It seems to me rather beneath the dignity of Parliament that we should be called upon to discuss a second time whether we should have these papers or not. This matter was brought up by my hon. friend, who recited the facts. The Postmaster General took objection, contending that, under the circumstances, he ought not to be called upon to produce this report, because it was a confidential report. The question whether it was of such a confidential nature that it ought not to be produced was the subject-matter of discussion for over an hour. The then leader of the House, the late Sir John Thompson, said he would not go so far as to say that all confidential reports should be withheld; there were some which should be withheld and some that should not. These are his words:

I quite admit that there may be cases in which even confidential reports should be submitted to Parliament, especially if such confidential reports had misled the action of a public department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not seen the discussion. Was it distinctly understood that confidential reports——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the point I am leading up to. I want to show that we ought not to be discussing this matter, because we have passed upon it, and that not upon a formal motion only, but after a thorough discussion upon the very points of the introduction of this very inspector's report. When the late Sir John Thompson laid down that rule, my hon. friend followed in support of the proposition that this was a report which, under the circumstances, should not come within the category of confidential reports to be withheld.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From the debates of last year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But when the order passed, there was no discussion at all, as I understand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am coming to that. If I understand it aright—I may be wrong—after that, as I want to point out to the Minister, the discussion took place on this question. Is this a report of such a character that it should be withheld because reports are generally considered confidential, or are the facts such that it ought to be produced? That question was discussed, it was threshed out; the Postmaster General took one view, the House took another; and before the debate ended the hon. gentleman moved a sub-amendment, if I understand it aright, to include this identical document. The original motion ran in this way:

For copies of all correspondence, reports, or judgments in relation to the dismissal of B. Loiselle, postmaster at Ste. Angèle de Monnoir.

That was amended by adding the following words:—

And a copy of the record, depositions, declarations and pleadings in suit brought in Montreal, of Loiselle vs. Guillet, and the inspector's report.

That is found on page 2754 of the Debates. Now, mark me, that was decided by the House after the demand was made by the hon. member, after a discussion had taken place across the House between the leading members as to what should be considered confidential and what should not, after the question of this particular document had been thoroughly threshed out, as to whether it should come within the category of those which should be withheld; and then it was unanimously agreed to by the House, the Prime Minister and Postmaster General concurring, that this particular report should be brought down. Sir, it was so ordered, the question is 'res judicata,' passed upon, settled, finally determined by this House; and I may echo the hon. gentleman's statement here that it is monstrous, it cannot be considered debatable for a moment, that a departmental officer of a government can, after a question has been solemnly decided, after full discussion in the House, reverse that discussion in council. The thing is monstrous, it is intolerable. The Minister of Justice and the leader of the House, I am sure, won't commit themselves to such a proposition. We just stand in this position, that a document which was objected to being brought down on the ground that it was confidential, was ordered by the House to be produced, after thorough discussion, with the consent of both sides. Under these circumstances I say it was treating the House with marked contempt, a contempt that the House must resent, if this order is not obeyed.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think, in discussing even a matter of this kind, in which a return asked for some time previously has not been brought down, that there is any need of over-exaggerated warmth. For my own part this is the first time that

I have listened to a discussion on the matter with any care. I do remember that the matter was brought up before, but it had entirely passed out of my mind. Now, the position that was taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is a perfectly proper position to take, that confidential reports are not to be brought down and that they are not to be asked for, as a rule. That is something that is not only binding on this side of the House for the benefit of a government, but it is a thing which is binding upon the House for the good conduct of business generally. I think both sides of the House must agree with the position taken by the Minister of Justice that confidential reports are to be treated as such. It has often happened with reference to the Post Office Department that when returns have been asked for by motion that would involve the bringing down of inspectors' reports, if the motion was specifically objected to at the time on the ground that the report was confidential, the motion has not been pressed; or the inspector's report has been excluded from the motion, and the motion passed without calling for it. It has also happened that such a motion has passed without specific objections to the report of an inspector being produced, on the ground of its being confidential, relying on the generally expressed course of the House and the Government not to ask for or to produce confidential reports; so it might happen that a certain motion had passed which called for the report of the inspector to which at the time there was no objection entered by the Minister who had charge of the department, he thinking that it was not necessary to make the specific objection in that case, because it had often been made before, and was generally acted upon as a rule of the House. Now, I think this might have been the case——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, that is not the case.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will hear me through before he dissents. There is another side of the question which is brought up to-day. I have not had time to read that debate, but this much I am prepared to say, that if a specific debate arose, at that time or later, with reference to that specific subject, in which the report of the inspector was the subject of debate; if it were stated on one side of the House that that report was necessary in order to justice being done in a case; if the Government, seeing that position of affairs, agreed to the motion or allowed it to pass; or if it were passed without their agreeing, ordering that the paper should be brought down, without doubt that paper should be brought down. Now, I am yet without any other information than I have heard whilst this debate has been going on. My mind has been specially drawn to this subject by a statement of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) and a statement of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies); and I have no hesitation in saying that if that motion were passed on a specific motion, and it were allowed by the Government, the order of the House with regard to it must of course be obeyed, and the report be brought down. But this whole discussion, so far as I and my hon. friends here are concerned, and so far as my information went, left out that point, which seems to be fairly well established, that the specific motion was made for a specific report and that it passed the House after discussion. If that be the case, I have no hesitation in saying that the report will be brought down.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear the admission just made by the Minister of Finance with regard to returns ordered by the House. There is one thing that must not be forgotten—the prerogative of the House must not be invaded by the action of the Government in refusing to bring down reports when ordered by the House. It is the duty of the Government, when a return is asked for comprising any particular document, if that document is regarded as confidential or private, the Government should at the moment raise an objection and have that particular document or report eliminated from the order. The late First Minister took that course with regard to the case cited by the Minister of Justice. When he saw that the report was looked upon as a private and confidential document, he had the word "report" eliminated from the order of the House. But when the order of the House is granted for a return, it must be obeyed. I do not even admit that the contention of the Minister of Finance correct when he proposes to limit returns to the fact of a debate having taken place on the order. If an order of the House is secured for a return, that mandate has got to be carried out, under our system of government, and the House must not be asked to abandon its prerogative, its command, and permit the Government to say whether any particular item in that return shall be brought down or not. We cannot afford to permit the Government to encroach upon the rights of Parliament in this way, to sit in judgment on what particular return, or what particular document should be included in a return to be laid before the House. If the Government wants to present to the House any argument why any particular report should not be included in the papers to be brought down, the time to do so is when the order is moved for; but the order having been secured, no Order in Council or action by the Government should stand in the way of the return being presented to Parliament in accordance with this order. The Government should take the opportunity of reading up motions for returns. The Minister of Justice laughs at my suggestion. In my opinion, the Government require to read a great deal more

than they do. They should make themselves more familiar with the proceedings of the House, and then they would not become involved in such serious difficulties, which indeed appears to be increasing daily. If they read the motions they would gather whether the returns would include any confidential papers; but I hold that when the mandate of the House has gone forth it must be obeyed by the Government, and the Government has no right to sit in judgment and decide whether a return ordered by the House should be brought down or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I put my promise hypothetically, if I found the statement of the case to be as was made out by my hon. friend. I have now before me the Votes and Proceedings, and I find the motion in amendment was carried, and that the order of the House was issued for that report. It will, therefore, be brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be well understood by every old member of this House that a number of discussions have taken place on this very question, and, no doubt, it is equally well understood by every old member that there are always confidential papers which cannot, and will not, be brought down. In making motions for papers I always understand that such papers will be brought down as are allowable, and such as are not confidential. I believe it was for the purpose of having this well understood that the Order in Council was passed a few years ago, because there was a difference of opinion as to what papers should or should not be brought down, and the effect of the order was that hon. members should distinctly understand that confidential papers would not be brought down. In the case of every motion made, I always understand that whether the return would include confidential papers or not, it is distinctly understood that all confidential papers will be excluded from such returns.

Mr. MARTIN. It occurs to me that this matter requires a word or two of comment. We have a most extraordinary proposition to-day. I remember well the debate of last session on this subject. I remember when the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) brought up the matter, and it appears to me most disgraceful that a postmaster should, on an ex parte examination of his affairs, be disgraced in the public manner in which this officer was disgraced, and that, after a great deal of trouble and expense, he should be obliged to go to the courts for the purpose of vindicating his character, and that having done so, he then found it impossible to obtain justice from the Government. I remember the stand the Government took at that time. The position taken by the Postmaster General was that the report of the inspector was confidential and would not be brought down, and the Minister of Justice to-day puts forward

the same contention, that the report was a confidential document and should not be brought down. No one has disputed the general rule that a confidential report should not be brought down. But surely if any inspector lends himself to false charges against an official of the country, he is not to be protected. The object of the rule is not to protect an inspector and allow him to act as he sees fit; it never could have been passed for the purpose of placing an inspector in such a position that he could make any charges whatever without the fear of being brought before Parliament and forced to substantiate those charges: the object of the rule must have been in the interest of the public service and in order that an inspector might feel free to give every matter the fullest consideration and report to the department every fact that came before him. But when we find an inspector charged, as this inspector was charged, by the hon. member for Rouville last session and the previous session, with having used his position knowingly and designedly for the purpose of making false charges against this officer, charges which before the courts were proved to be false, while we must condemn the inspector, what must we think of a Government which backs up such action? We have the Minister of Justice taking the position that the Government should not divulge anything connected with this matter; we have the present Postmaster General stating that he will stand by the inspector. While the hon. member for Rouville has shown that the inspector has abused his position for his own purposes and made false charges, we find the Postmaster General taking the stand I have mentioned, and saying that he will not bring down the report. After these two debates have taken place, we find the Minister of Justice rising in his place boldly and attempting to justify the action of the Government behind the Order in Council, which it has already been clearly shown does not apply to such a case. Speech after speech has been delivered on this side of the House by the hon. member for Lambton, the hon. member for Bothwell, the hon. member for South Oxford, and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., each hon. member repeating the facts, without adding any new facts, but dinging into the ears of hon. gentlemen opposite the grossness of the position they have taken. And what do we find at last? That the leader of the House is not able to justify the action of his colleagues, that he finds it necessary, after he had been told, not once but five or six times, by different members on this side of the House, that the Government occupied a false position, to condemn emphatically, first, the Minister of Railways as regards his action when Postmaster General, then the present Postmaster General, whom he condemned most emphatically, and

to repudiate in the most plain and distinct manner the speech of the Minister of Justice, who has just taken his seat. This action is on a par with everything hon. gentlemen opposite have done. An hon. member of the Cabinet takes a certain position, which is not defensible, and is then backed up by his colleagues, and unitedly they refuse to assent to the force of the arguments put forward by this side of the House. But in this particular case we have an instance where the Minister of Finance is not able to withstand the justice of the case made out by the hon. member for Rouville. Every argument and every point that we have heard to-day were before the Government, and before Parliament three years ago. Again last session we had a long debate, lasting two or three hours, in which every one of these facts was brought forward, and in spite of that the Government defended the position taken by the Post Office Department. Again to-day, after address after address has been made from this side of the House, the Government have sat silent, and refused to do anything. It was only after making an appeal, time and again, that eventually the Minister of Finance repudiated the action of his three colleagues, and that is what I wish to compliment him for doing. It was a straightforward, honest thing for him to do. He admitted that the Government was wrong, and he promised to make it right at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. BRODEUR. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make a personal explanation. I have asserted, a moment ago, that the inspector's report and the envelope had been brought down to Montreal in 1893. I have not seen the report, but I have seen the envelope, and the envelope has not been lost. I have asserted, also, that I have seen a letter coming from the department, in which it was said to the adverse party, that they were ready to put into his hands the document in question. I have seen the letter, and although the denial is made by the Postmaster General, I tell him these papers have not yet been lost, and that there was a letter issued by the department in which they admitted that the papers were in existence.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I repeat exactly what I told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) and my statement will go as far as his, any time. The hon. gentleman is completely mistaken. From the information I have received in my department, the papers which I said were lost, have been lost.

Mr. BRODEUR. Which papers ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The only papers which we have are the report of the inspector, and, I believe, the evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one point we cannot lose sight of. When this motion was presented to the House, and before the attitude of the late Prime Minister was known, we found various members of the Government astute to find many reasons whereby they should not obey the order in question. If there was one thing that endeared the late Prime Minister to the people more than another, it was the conviction in the public mind that at least he had a regard for justice. We always found him on the floor of this House sensitive to what was right, and when it was brought to his attention that an alleged injustice has been done in this case through a report of doubtful good faith, he at once said that the House should remove the cloak of privilege and lay the report before the country. That was a manly and honourable course, and was adopted by the House. This Government to-day has chosen to adopt a position antagonistic to that. The Postmaster General says that all these reports are confidential, and that even if the report was fraudulent, nevertheless, that justice must not be done by producing it. The Minister of Justice, the successor of the late Sir John Thompson, also resorted to fine points to endeavour to defeat the ends of justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. I will say, "calculated."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may be unfair, but he has no right to impute improper motives to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) had better withdraw.

Mr. MULOCK. I withdraw. I say that his attitude was calculated to interfere with the administration of justice. We cannot too strongly repudiate the inference that a practice had grown up in this House whereby the force of orders of this House were to be whittled away by understandings across the floor. I say as a member of this House, with as much parliamentary experience as the Minister of Justice——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No more.

Mr. MULOCK—as much, at all events, and as much regard for precedent, and as much respect for the order of the House. I say that there never has been any implied understanding that reports, and so on, were exempted from the order of the House, simply because they were reports of officials to heads of departments. The very point that the Minister cited has disproved his case. Speaking from his old position as Minister of Marine, he says that many despatches of a privileged nature were not supposed to be produced under an order of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And were not produced.

Mr. MULOCK. I admit that it frequently occurs, and always will occur, that there will be exceptions to a sweeping order, but these exceptions are referred to at the time, and, moreover, the subject-matter under discussion must, to some extent, determine the exceptions when dealing with a general order. I can understand confidential despatches between the Government here and the Foreign Office being regarded as privileged, and it would only be necessary for the Minister to call attention to that fact, so that the Government might not be expected to comply with an order for them. But the very fact that it was necessary to make such an explanation, even in the speech of a Minister, showed that the general rule applied, and that an order of the House had to be obeyed. There is no plainer rule of law than that when something is stated it excludes any inference to the contrary: there can be no inference that an order of the House does not mean what it states. Now, Mr. Speaker, another extraordinary defence is offered by the Government for not complying with this order. If one defence is not good, they try another, and one of their defences in this case is that the documents have been lost. The order of the House is that all the papers and correspondence shall be produced, and is it not a pitiable state of affairs that documents belonging to the records of Canada upon which the reputation of people may depend, documents probably of vast importance in the custody of these gentlemen have been lost, and that they have to come before the House and the country and state that they have a reckless system by which these papers are bandied around from department to department, and are not forthcoming when required? Can there be any stronger evidence of the disregard of these gentlemen for their public duties? They have for months been neglecting their departments, and they have been systematically handing over the work of their offices to subordinates. Sir, the country will take notice of such administrators. The country has already passed judgment, to some extent, and no doubt it was a sense of their loss of the confidence of the people that caused them to reverse their recent decision to go to the country. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), speaking a short time ago, alluded to the Government as having defied the people and being now independent of the people. We have complained heretofore of government by Orders in Council; but now we have a committee of the House repudiating the House itself, and stating that they defy our constitutional system of government. I am amazed that on the eve of going before their masters, the people, they do not take warning of the direction in which they are drifting and endeavour to some extent to make amends for past defaults. Meantime, I doubt if this matter should be allowed to rest here. If the Government say they cannot find these documents, is there no process by which the House could supplement their efforts, with the view of having them produced? It may be necessary for the House to lay down a rule for the guidance of these gentlemen. The hon. Minister of Railways says that it is customary, and hundreds and hundreds of times it has happened, that original documents have been passed from department to department, and have been lost. What can we do with these hon. gentlemen?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Commit them for the rest of the session.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what may be done to compel them to do their duty, but I have no doubt what will happen when they present themselves before the people.

Mr. DALY. The last speaker seems to have overlooked the fact that until the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), referred to the debate on this subject in 1894, none of the previous speakers on the other side of the House or on this side had knowledge of the fact that a motion was carried by the House last year for the production of this inspector's report, but the argument on both sides was based upon the supposition that the original motion of the hon. member for Rouville called for the inspector's report. Now, it would appear, from the fact of the inspector's report not being mentioned in the original motion of the hon. member for Rouville, and the fact of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) moving an amendment to include that report, that the rule obtained when the original motion was made that the inspector's report should not be brought down; because, if it did not, what was the necessity for the amendment of the hon. member for Quebec Centre? Here are the proceedings as recorded on page 234 of the Votes and Proceedings of last session:

> Mr. Brodeur moved, That an address be voted to His Excellency the Governor General, for copies of all correspondence, reports or judgments in relation to the dismissal of Mr. B. Loiselle, postmaster of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir.
>
> Mr. Langelier moved in amendment thereto, that the following words be added to the said motion—"And a copy of the record, depositions, declarations and pleas in suit brought in Montreal of Loiselle vs. Guillet, and the inspector's report," which was agreed to.

So that if the inspector's report is to be brought down, as the leader of the House says it will be, it will be brought down in pursuance of this amendment, and not in accordance with the original order of the House. In view of this, a great deal that has been said on the other side of the House

might have been left unsaid, and the charges that were made by hon. members against the hon. Postmaster General could not, I think, be held good.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a statement of the hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am perfectly in order; I wish to correct a statement——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. FRASER. Perhaps I can do it. I think it is like shooting a dead duck to say anything more against the Government. The humiliation in which they stand is apparent to this House, and will be to the country. But I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. Minister to pass without saying that it must strike an ordinary mind that the Minister should have understood what the order of last session was: and the fact of that resolution having been passed shows that there was no attention paid by him to the previous order of the House. When an order of this House is passed, I should suppose that each department would take care to understand it and to see whether it referred to matters in that department or not. But no one could suppose that the Minister would fall back upon an outstanding Order in Council and feel perfectly safe in disregarding the order of the House. The Minister was bound to know what the order of this House was, and he should not present the spectacle of rising here and saying that he should not bring down the report, in view of the fact that the House passed another order last session that it should be brought down.

Mr. LANGELIER. It is quite evident that the Minister of the Interior did not listen to the speech of the hon. member for Rouville to-day, in opening this debate; for he mentioned the order passed last year, although, of course, he referred back to the original debate on the subject in 1892. Here is the original order, as passed in 1892:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence, vouchers, inspectors' reports, and documents whatsoever.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to ask him——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; spoke.

Mr. LANGELIER. That was moved by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), in the absence of the hon member for Rouville. Then, last year, as the return had not been brought down, another motion was made by the hon. member for Rouville, and I moved an amendment.

Mr. DALY. Why was your amendment necessary?

Mr. LANGELIER. Not only the order of two years ago, but the order of last year was not obeyed; and the hon. Postmaster General stated most boldly that he would not obey the order of the House, because it was for a report which he called a confidential report, and a few moments ago we heard the ex-Postmaster General corroborating the position taken by the present Postmaster General by stating that he would not obey the order of the House either. I am very glad that that position is not taken by the leader of the House, who sat down very nicely on the Postmaster General and stated that the order of the House would be obeyed, and that the report would be brought down. These hon. gentlemen may be left to settle between themselves whether the Postmaster General will obey or disobey the leader of the House, whose place he wanted to occupy. But we have the promise of the recognized leader of the House—not recognized perhaps by the Postmaster General, but recognized by the House—that the report will be brought down, and we are expecting it from day to day.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Assistant Receiver General's Office, Charlottetown—Amount required to cover payment of the salary of the late T. Foley	$ 81 67

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the hon. gentleman, with reference to that office in Charlottetown, a question arising out of this vote. I see that he proposes to increase the vote in the general Estimates by $100 for that department. I quite approve of the course the Government took after Mr. Foley's death, in allowing the office to be administered by the Assistant Receiver General and two clerks. One of those is an appointment of late years. The other has been in the office since confederation. His salary is not a large one, and it has not been increased for many years. I wish to ask whether it is the intention of the hon. gentleman to increase the salary of Mr. Bruce Leitch?

Mr. FOSTER. When we come to the main Estimates, I will give the information required. This is just a supplementary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only wish to say a few words in favour of that official. I have known him for a great many years, and he is recognized by everybody as an exceedingly competent and painstaking official. While I am willing at all times to support any measure having economy for its object, I think that the services of a good, faithful, honest man, who has been twenty years discharging his duties faithfully from year to year, without ever having had a holiday, and whose work has commended itself on all occasions to the approval of his superior

officer, with respect to whom there is no question of politics one way or the other, and who receives a salary on which he can but barely live, deserves consideration. We ought not to carry our desire to economize to the extent of keeping efficient officials below the salaries which they can live upon. I commend this case to the hon. gentleman as one well deserving consideration. I was in hopes, when I saw that $100 vote, that it was for Mr. Leitch, and it was for the purpose of putting the question that I rose.

Department of Customs—To provide for payment to Mr. W. D. Bales, messenger, of amount voted in Supply Bill for fiscal year 1894-5, for his salary at the maximum of the class, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act—(Revote) $80

Further amount required for sundries, being unused portion of vote for clerical and other assistance—(Revote)..... 750

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is the Civil Service Act set aside in this manner?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount was voted last year for Mr. Bales as a messenger in the Customs Department. But it was impossible to pay him because his name was not mentioned. Consequently he was deprived of the vote, and the object is to place the name of Mr. Bales there so that he may have what Parliament voted for the messengership he has in the Customs Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the $750 for his salary also?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote for contingencies used to be in one vote. Two years ago we divided it under four heads—sundries, clerical assistance, printing and stationery, and I forget what the other was. This is simply to take a portion of the vote appropriated for clerical assistance, and which was not used, and supplement to that extent the vote for sundries which was exceeded. The total vote was not exceeded, and this is simply a redistribution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule of law is that if more than an adequate sum is voted for the supply of any portion of the public service, it shall lapse. What the Minister proposes is to increase the vote for sundries by $750, and there is no object in explaining about clerical assistance and thus loading up an appropriation for the public service with expressions that are not required. It looks like undertaking to put upon the Estimates an apology for an appropriation. No allusion of that sort ought to be permitted. If a vote is more than adequate, it lapses, and that is the end of it; and if a sufficient sum has not been appropriated, you ask for more. There is no necessity of making excuses in the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right. As a rule I score all explanations out, and am quite willing to score this out also. This was simply a reason given to me why the vote was asked for. When contingencies were in one vote, there was no necessity to state what was required for each branch, but since we have decided to make separate headings, it has been found impossible to gauge exactly what each requires. I therefore move that the explanations be struck out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Department of Trade and Commerce—To pay A. C. Carleton for services as acting messenger, during the months of June, August and October, 1894.....$68 33

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if, during the time covered by this vote, he was engaged otherwise?

Mr. FOSTER. The regular messenger of the department at that time was away from Ottawa on account of the visit of the Intercolonial delegates, and this man was employed in his place.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he previously engaged on the staff performing similar duties in another department, and was he performing two-fold duties in order to secure this additional pay?

Mr. FOSTER. No, he was a temporary employee during the absence of the regular messenger of the department, who went to Vancouver to meet the Intercolonial delegates and accompany them as far as Ottawa.

Governor General's Secretary's Office—further amount required for contingencies—

Printing	$300
Sundries	500

Mr. McMULLEN. This requires explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation is easy. The printing was insufficiently estimated for, and $300 was necessary to make up the amount. There was also an insufficient estimate for sundries, and this estimate is almost entirely taken up with the cost of telegraphing, which has been very heavy in the Governor General's office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What special printing is done in the Governor General's office?

Mr. FOSTER. The sum of $250 was voted, and $300 is necessary to make up a total of $550.

Mr. MULOCK. I have been trying to ascertain from the Auditor General's Report of last year how the expenditure for the Governor General's Secretary's office for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1894, compares with that of the previous fiscal year. I find on page LXX., the gross amounts for each of these years, but I cannot find the details.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not think that anything was omitted from the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to be pretty comprehensive, but I do not find these details. I do not find section E in this report that I have.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have it here. It covers one page only. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has missed it.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Finance Minister tell me how the expenditure for the Governor General's Secretary's office for this year compares with that of last year ?

Mr. FOSTER. For contingencies: the items voted this year were:—Clerical and other assistance, $1,400; printing, $250; stationery, $700; sundries, $11,150.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that more than the expenditure of last year ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is about the same.

Post Office Department—Further amount required for contingencies—Clerical and other assistance.....	$1,650

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is it considered necessary to ask a vote for this amount, in addition to that already voted ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This amount is required to complete payment of salaries to extra clerks.

Mr. MULOCK. Will this facilitate preparation of returns, if voted ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am afraid that is a confidential one.

Department of Justice—To pay J. W. Hughes, for his services from the 1st to the 31st January, 1895, notwithstanding anything in "The Civil Service Act"..	$ 77 50
To pay Mr. F. H. Gisborne for extra services, notwithstanding anything in "The Civil Service Act".....	150 00
Penitentiary Branch—To pay Mr. H. B. S. Lane, in addition to his salary for acting as Accountant of Penitentiaries, from 1st May, 1894, to 1st July, 1895.....	200 00

Mr. GIBSON. What has Mr. Gisborne done to entitle him to this $150 as an extra amount ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the case of Mr. Gisborne, I am asking the House for this small sum because of some special and confidential work done by him in connection with the Manitoba schools case. The work had to be done at the time promptly, and I called upon Mr. Gisborne to do it after office hours. He is an excellent officer, and not one of those who regard the hour for ceasing work very carefully, but is ready and willing at all times to work after office hours. This was not the first occasion he had been asked to do special work, and I ask the House to vote this amount.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. He is a very competent officer and a hard worker, and the amount ought to be paid to him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is a very good officer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what duties Mr. Hughes performs ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Hughes was over age, and could not be appointed on the temporary staff at the rate of salary he was getting, and consequently his salary was voted each year by the House. When I came into the department in January, it was found possible to do without Mr. Hughes' services at the end of this month. So Mr. Hughes is not now in the service; but for that month I am asking Parliament to do as they did for a year or two before. He has not been in my department since January, and this is simply to square him up. The services that he has rendered to the department are over; and after that he was employed somewhere else; but he informed me yesterday that since 31st May, he had not been in the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You shunted him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I did not shunt him. I would like to have kept him at this rate of pay, but it was impossible for my officer to give the ordinary certificate in that connection. It was a technical employment, and he had not the necessary attainments.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he occupying a position without any certificate ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, under a vote of Parliament each session. But I was not prepared to come to Parliament and ask for a special vote in connection with his services, as they were not of a technical character.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How long was he there ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think his name has been in the Estimates for about two years, speaking from recollection.

Mr. RIDER. I notice that Mr. Hughes is set down in the Auditor General's report, page H 3, as having worked 426 days at $2.50 per day. I find this includes Sundays as well. I would like to inquire if it is the custom of the department to pay for Sunday services ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Sundays may have been in connection with some special work, to do which he may have had to run into Sunday. But

I have no recollection ; of course, that was long before my time. Sometimes the officers of the department do have to work on Sunday.

Mr. RIDER. I notice all the Sundays are included here, and I wanted to know if that is customary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course, the facts the hon. gentleman quote are not within my knowledge. He may have been paid at that rate, including Sundays, without his doing any work on Sunday, at the rate of so much a month, making so much a year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that the practice when officers are paid a per diem allowance ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think so. If he is employed by the day, Sunday is excluded ; if he is employed by the month, I think Sundays are included.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the nature of the services he rendered ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was a copying clerk.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was he a lawyer ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not much of a lawyer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He is not required in the department ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To what department did Mr. Hughes go after leaving Justice ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I understand the hon. gentleman, he is not employed now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He informed me that he would not be employed on or after 31st May. But if I could possibly keep Mr. Hughes, I would. If his work was required, I would willingly take him on, but he could not be paid at a greater rate than $400 per year, without a special vote of Parliament. So if he comes back to me, it will be at that rate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He has been shunted from the Justice Department to the Militia, and the Militia has shunted him somewhere else. I want to know where ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I should be very glad if I could induce a colleague to take him ; if not, I may take him myself.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a serious matter. This man has been kept in the department in violation of the Civil Service Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the authority of Parliament each time, as I have already explained. I explained each time that he was being paid a larger amount than he could receive under the general law, and the sanction of Parliament was obtained for the amount.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice he has drawn at the rate of about $912.50 a year. Now, there are a great many employed in the Civil Service who passed examinations, taken out certificates, who do not receive as much as this man received ; and it appears he has not complied with the Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He would have been very glad to get $600 per year under the Civil Service Act, and be put on the permanent list.

Mr. McMULLEN. While he has not done that, he is paid largely in excess of those who have complied with the Act. Including Sundays, he is paid about $1,000 a year, while there are many in the service who have complied with the Act, who have the necessary qualifications, and who are not getting, perhaps, over $600 or $700 per year. Now, there must be some cause why this particular man has been kept in the Department of Justice, and has been transferred to the Department of Militia and Defence. I suppose, after he has served there awhile, and possibly the Minister finds that he has been loaded down with this man in his department, he will shunt him over to some other Minister. Possibly the Secretary of State will find him wandering into his department after a while. It is not right this thing should go on. Parliament should set its face against giving grants to men who have not complied with the Civil Service Act, but who are receiving salaries far in excess of those who have complied with the Act.

Mr. DICKEY. In reference to what the hon. gentleman says about the amount paid to Mr. Hughes, perhaps it is fair I should say that the officers of the department report Mr. Hughes to me as being a thoroughly efficient man and as having well earned the money that was paid to him, although personally I know very little about him. I was very sorry indeed to part with Mr. Hughes, and I did so because the appropriation at my disposal did not allow me to employ him further.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Hughes had not been in the Militia previously ? I do not understand he had any technical knowledge for that department.

Mr. DICKEY. No. The only qualification he had was that he was not a lawyer.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have been told this man has been paid $2.50 per day, Sundays included, for fourteen months, and we are now asked to consent to an additional grant of $77.50.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, the hon. gentleman does not understand me. Mr. Hughes, with the full knowledge of Parliament, has been voted a special salary each year, and he was retained in the Department of Justice up to 31st January. The time ran a little over the period for which his pay was voted; and I am asking Parliament to grant him $77.50 on the same terms as he was paid before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he ever do any work at all?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He worked very hard. He is really an estimable man, a man of considerable experience, and an excellent clerk, and I would have been very glad to keep him, if I had had the work for him.

To recoup the vote for "Unforeseen Expenses," the amount transferred by Orders in Council to the credit of the Contingencies Appropriation of these departments:

Justice	$3,500
Marine and Fisheries	1,000
Agriculture	1,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw the Chairman's attention to a point that was raised last year. In going over the Estimates, there was an understanding come to that the items would be taken seriatim. Now, the Chairman reads over the whole, and asks the concurrence of the House for the whole lot. I think we should be asked for a separate vote on each item.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We have tried for two years the plan of discussing item by item, but we have found that hon. gentlemen go over the whole list, so I have adopted the plan of allowing every hon. member to say as much as he likes on the whole vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Deputy Speaker took item by item and confined the remarks of hon. members to the item under discussion, it would be better.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not been able to do that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry to hear the Deputy Speaker admit his inability to rule the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It depends whom I have to rule.

Department of the Secretary of State—To pay Mr. G. de la Porte for services as an extra clerk in the Records Branch.. $62

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire an explanation of this item.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This amount is to pay an officer, who was not qualified under the Civil Service Act, he not having passed the necessary examinations, and, therefore, cannot be constantly employed without the authority of Parliament. This amount is to pay balance of salary. At the end of the present year his services will be dispensed with.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much per day did he receive?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose this is a month's salary.

Mr. MULOCK. What did he do?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He is engaged in the Record Branch, but as I am reorganizing it, his services will not be required.

Mr. MULOCK. Then he has been an unnecessary charge. The hon. gentleman now promises to carry out economies. Why were they not made before?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The work in connection with the Record Branch is very much less than it was three or four years ago. Officers have been engaged in copying historical records, and the work from its nature has necessarily diminished. This is why I have been able to lay out a plan by which, on reorganizing the branch, economies will be effected.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the nature of that plan?

Mr. MONTAGUE. When the main Estimates for the department are up for consideration, I shall be happy to state it.

Department of Indian Affairs—To provide an additional amount in the vote for extra clerks and messengers..... $300

To pay Mr. S. Bray, D.L.S., for work in settling Indian reserve claims in the Pas Agency, and in surveying reserves in the same district..... 150

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like an explanation of these items.

Mr. DALY. The first item of $300 has reference to a clerk, a permanent employee, who was removed last year, and his position taken by a messenger who was promoted. We had to supply the messenger's place, and had to pay the necessary amount out of the contingent fund. By the removal of this clerk and the promotion of the messenger we save $677 annually.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister might give the committee some information with regard to the general increase which has taken place in this department, the expenditure of which has run up in a surprising manner during recent years. I find that when the hon. member for Both-

well (Mr. Mills) administered the department, in 1878, there were at headquarters at Ottawa, eight officers, receiving salaries amounting in the aggregate to $9,350. The report of the Indian Department for last year shows that the number of officers had been increased to forty-six, and their salaries to $48,490, not taking into account $4,000 or $5,000 for outside services at headquarters. We can understand that in some departments there must necessarily be considerable increases, and in this department, perhaps, some increase might be allowed to pass. But, as the Minister knows, the Indian population is not increasing rapidly if there be any increase whatever, and it is past belief almost that it was possible to efficiently administer affairs at headquarters with eight officers, while forty-six are now required, and an extra amount is now asked for a special clerk. Why has the work increased so rapidly since 1890? No less than sixteen out of the forty-six officers have been appointed since that year. The Minister should tell the committee frankly where the extra work has taken place at headquarters. If we look to the outside service, we find a great increase there also; but for the present I confine myself to what may fairly come under our consideration at the moment, the increased number of officers and the large expenditure at headquarters at Ottawa.

Mr. DALY. It will be more convenient to discuss this matter on consideration of the main Estimates, when I shall be prepared to explain the increases that have taken place. For instance, at the time the hon. member for Bothwell administered Indian Affairs, not one-half the North-west Indians were under treaty, and the expenses of administration have necessarily increased since. I shall also be able to show in regard to increased expenditure that increased work became necessary, especially during the last four or five years. I do not think it possible that any Government could administer the department more economically, but I will enter into a full and free explanation on the main Estimates.

Mr. RIDER. In regard to the item of $150, I find by referring to the Auditor General's Report, F 3, that S. Bray is in receipt of a salary of $1,400 a year. That should be sufficient to cover his entire services, and if he is called away, another clerk has to do his work. It seems hardly right that he should receive additional remuneration.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Bray is an officer of the inside service, and was sent up to the northern part of Manitoba to settle some disputes among the Indians on the reserves, he being a Dominion land surveyor. He was engaged there four and a half months, he endured considerable hardships, and settled up a number of difficulties that had been engaging the attention of the department, and of the agent there. This amount of $150 was given to him for extra services rendered.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is only a repetition of expenses that have been incurred in almost every department, the payment of clerks for additional services, while those services really come within their ordinary duties. The Auditor General's Report shows 500 or 600 cases of officers who have received double pay in this way. Here is an officer receiving the ample salary of $1,400 a year. I am quite sure the Government paid his travelling expenses, even his Pullman car fares and other expenses connected with the trip, and yet it is now proposed to grant him $150 in addition to his salary of $1,400 annually.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who was doing his work when he was away?

Mr. DALY. There was no person doing his work. Mr. Bray is a Dominion land surveyor in the employment of the department. Trouble had arisen amongst the Indians and it was necessary to subdivide the reserve. Had we employed an outside man, it would have been more expensive. Mr. Bray was not only a surveyor, but he had a knowledge of Indian matters and of the Indian character, and he was able to settle a number of disputes that had arisen amongst those people. He had necessarily to endure great hardship during these four and a half months, as it is a very inhospitable region.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What time of the year was it?

Mr. DALY. In the spring and summer months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) One can hardly conceive that there would be much hardship then.

Mr. McMULLEN. The duties of this gentleman must be very unimportant when he could remain away from his office for four or five months. He must have little or nothing to do as the Minister virtually acknowledges. If the Minister has no stronger argument to present to the House to justify this vote, I do not think we should consent to it. We are urging upon the Government the necessity of cutting down expenditure and here is a case in which money could be saved. This man gets $1,400 a year, and is more than paid for his services, and in addition to that he is to get $150 as a gratuity. He travelled in luxurious style to the North-west, was over four months away, and got paid all his expenses. He must have reaped all the advantages to his health of inhaling the vigorous air of the North-west for the principal part of the summer, and now he is to get $150 extra. That is not right.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not want to say anything about this particular case because I do not know the facts. It does appear to me that taking a permanent official away from one of the departments and allowing him to do some work for the department in another part of the Dominion at a time of the year when it must have been looked upon as a holiday trip, and then paying him extra for it, is a vicious principle. From time to time it is within my own personal knowledge that the Marine Department has sent a man to the maritime provinces to do some little work, but I do not know that he has got extra pay for it. He gets his holiday and his expenses besides. That I do not object to, because the work has got to be done. It is a plum that falls to one or the other of the officers of a department. He is away on that trip while his co-employees are stewing in the heat of an Ottawa office, and it does seem to be an injustice that such an officer should receive extra pay in addition to his ordinary salary.

Mr. GIBSON. Is Mr. Bray a land surveyor in the employ of the department?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Then he was discharging his ordinary duties for which he was paid his salary, and he is not entitled to this gratuity. He is sent to the North-west by the Minister to perform his ordinary duties, as he might be sent to any other part of the Dominion, and as he receives his pay for doing his duties nothing extra should be granted him.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Bray had no holiday in this matter at all, and if he had his choice he would have stayed at home. It was because of his knowledge of the Indian character that he was selected to go, and if he were not sent there we would have to hire an outside surveyor at a greater cost to do the work. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke about his travelling in luxurious style in a Pullman car. Well, he only made the trip to Winnipeg in the train and he had to go the rest of the way in canoes. He suffered great hardship and was put to extra expense which the Government cannot recoup him for, and he saved to the Government a good deal more than the $150 we are giving him.

Mr. GIBSON. But he was away in the performance of his ordinary duties. Whether he liked to go to the North-west or not, he was obliged to go if the Minister sent him. That is no justification at all for giving him this extra money. I do not say that this gentleman did not do his work properly. He occupies the position of Dominion land surveyor, and if no one took his place when he was away, then it naturally follows that he had very little to do when he was in Ottawa.

Mr. LISTER. The explanation given by the Minister of the Interior may be entirely satisfactory to himself, but it is not so to others. This official receives $1,400 for his whole year's work, and whether he works in Ottawa, or whether he works in the North-west, makes no difference. The country is entitled to his services for the whole year. I do think that this giving of extra pay in such a way is a very vicious principle. If this gentleman is to be paid for what the Minister calls extra services, then every other official who is sent to Manitoba or Quebec or any other province, is entitled to say that he should get the same, or that the Government has treated Mr. Bray more favourably than they are treated. They may say: Our services are just as valuable in the scope of our duties as Mr. Bray's and we have as much right to ask additional compensation for duties discharged by us while outside of the departmental buildings. The principle is entirely vicious. When this gentleman takes his position, it is part of the contract with him, implied if not expressed, that his whole time is to be given to the Government; and all the compensation he is to receive for any and all the duties he discharges as a servant of the Government, is the sum fixed as his salary, namely, $1,400 a year. Then, what principle can the hon. gentleman invoke to justify such an expense as this? It is all very well for my hon. friend to talk about this gentleman's travelling in a canoe as a hardship at a season of the year when many people would like to do the same thing. To many men that is a very delightful mode of travelling, and I deny that this gentleman, in doing that, underwent any hardship at all. He was having a little summer vacation at the Government's expense. As well might we pay Mr. Speaker $1,000 a year extra for doing something that is within his duty as Speaker, as well might we pay the Minister of Interior an extra $1,000 a year in addition to the $7,000 he receives for doing something extra. If this man is not getting enough salary, increase it; give him $1,550 instead of $1,400; but do not pretend to give it as extra pay for extra work. The amount is small, and hon. gentlemen may think it is not worth while discussing it; but the principle underlying it is important. If this expense is justified in this case, then every public servant in every department who is employed outside of the department at any time will feel himself entitled to demand the same treatment. Such being the case, this item cannot be defended; and the Minister does not attempt to justify it. The excuse he gives is no justification at all. As the principle is vicious, we should see that it shall not be in the power of a member of the Government to say to some favoured servant: I will give you a nice little summer trip to the North-west, and the Government will

pay you $150 and allow you three or four or five dollars a day for living expenses. Can the Minister of the Interior give any information to the House as to how much was paid to Mr. Bray for travelling expenses ?

Mr. DALY. He was allowed what he paid for his travelling expenses. He has to account for every item.

Mr. LISTER. Can the Minister say how much it is ?

Mr. DALY. I do not know how much it is He was allowed his travelling expenses and a living allowance of one dollar a day.

Mr. LISTER. If the gentleman travelled in a canoe, he had, no doubt, two or three men to take care of him and to cook for him. We certainly have a right to ask the Minister to take us into his confidence and inform us how much was paid to this gentleman for travelling expenses and living allowances while in the North-west. I think he should let this item stand until he is in a position to furnish that information to the House.

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot agree at all with the suggestion that a gentleman undertaking a duty of this kind incurs a great deal of hardship. I am rather inclined to agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Queen's, that Mr. Bray, in leaving Ottawa to spend four and a half months in the northern part of Manitoba, in the summer season, was taking a holiday trip. I cannot understand the statement of the Minister that Mr. Bray got a dollar a day for his living expenses. Of course there are no hotels in that district, and I understand that canoes and men and everything else, including provisions, were furnished by the Government.

Mr. DALY. Nothing of the kind: he had to provide his own provisions out of the one dollar a day.

Mr. MULOCK. What about the attendance ?

Mr. DALY. Of course that was supplied to him.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Minister compelled him to live on $1 a day, he has been very close and has treated this man very different from other officers when they go out on trips of this kind. My experience is that the department has been very liberal with its employees, and I think more than $1 a day must have been spent on this trip. A canoe trip in the hot season in Manitoba is a favourite method of spending the holidays; but whether it is hard or easy, a Dominion land surveyor is supposed to travel in that way. If he gets $1,400 a year as a Dominion land surveyor, which is a very fair salary for a surveyor, he cannot be said to have done anything to entitle him to additional pay, so far as we have any facts before us. The precedent is a very bad one indeed, and gives ground to the opinion in the department that there are certain favourites selected for work of this kind.

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

After Recess.

THE NOVA SCOTIA STEEL COMPANY, LIMITED.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 56) to amend the Act to incorporate the Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are some hon. members, who are not present, who desire to speak on this Bill, and I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Ottawa and Aylmer Bridge Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

THE LANGENBERG AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Langenberg and Southern Railway Company.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a feature of this Bill. I called the attention of the committee to it, but with only partial success, and informed the committee that I would bring the matter to the attention of the House. The road is said to run over a prairie section of the North-west, across several ravines, and ultimately connect with the Manitoba and North-western Railway. I know nothing about the cost of the road. The promoters desire to obtain borrowing powers to the extent of $20,000 a mile. There was no evidence submitted to the committee, nor was any asked, as to the approximate cost of the enterprise. After some discussion, the promoters consented to a reduction of the bonding power to $15,000 a mile. They, at the same time, intimated their absolute lack of information as to the cost of constructing the road. There were no preliminary estimates, and so we were granting powers absolutely in the dark, and mortgaging this road, and in this way the earnings of the people, for

all time to come, to the extent necessary to pay a dividend on $15,000 per mile. The time has long since passed when the Government ought to have had a policy with regard to the granting of borrowing powers to railway companies. I doubt if there is any question of greater importance to sections of our country than the question of railway rates. Our Railway Act provides that the Government cannot interfere to reduce the rates until the railway is able to pay its obligations to the bond-holders. That is a very proper provision if we are to keep faith with the creditors of these companies, but the public is interested in the reduction of rates, and consequently in the economical construction of the road, and they are specially interested in seeing that there is no watering of stock or bonds whereby fictitious capital is charged against an enterprise, and in that way becomes a charge upon the customers of the road itself. We have for years heard discontent in the North-west in consequence of the excessive rates. A commission has recently investigated that matter and reported that the rates are not excessive, but that finding has to be based upon more than one consideration. Not merely upon the relative rates in Canada and the States, but also upon the circumstance that the road is largely owned by creditors, and that they have the right to manage it as they see fit until their first claims are discharged. If, for example, the Canadian Pacific Railway's mortgage—its regular mortgage, outside its stock—were $50,000,000 less than it is, you would find the Canadian Pacific Railway lowering its rates. But, so long as it is necessary to pay interest upon all this nominal capital, so long must the rates be maintained at a comparatively high level. Up to this moment, the Government, in my judgment, has not taken the proper position in regard to this feature of railway legislation. What I contend is that in all cases where persons apply for corporate power for the purpose of building a railway, powers that practically create monopolies in the sections to be served, the Government should, in the first instance, satisfy themselves as well as they can as to the approximate cost of construction, and they should not empower promoters to issue bonds infinitely in excess of the cost, bonds which may be sold to contractors at 50 cents on the dollar, but which, in due time, are passed off upon the public, and rank as a charge at par value against the labour and enterprise of the customers of the road. Now, with regard to this particular enterprise, to illustrate the laxity with which this legislation is being granted, it was stated by an hon. member in the committee, and I think I have heard the statement elsewhere, though I cannot recall upon what authority, that the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities had stated that it would only cost about $7,000 a mile to build and iron, ready for running, the Hudson Bay Railway. Now, if that is the standard of cost of building a railway through a section of country like that, on what principle should we grant to this company as the committee was prepared to have done, borrowing powers to the extent of $20,000 a mile, over a section of country much easier for railway building, I fancy, than that over which it is proposed the Hudson Bay Railway is to run. The committee did cut the amount down to $15,000, but it had no data to go upon. The promoters themselves had no data to go upon, and this House is in no better position. And yet, no doubt, we shall, to-night, authorize this company to issue its bonds for $15,000 a mile, which amount may or may not be ample to meet the requirements of the case. I do not intend to move an amendment, but I think it is the duty of the Government to refer this Bill, and all Bills of a similar character back to the committee, and to advise the committee, and afterwards the House, as to the cost of the enterprise, before we authorize the company to bond the road in that way. This, I conceive to be one of the most important questions demanding public attention. It concerns not merely the passengers, but particularly the labour of those who furnish freight to the road, who, in the North-west particularly, are the farming community. This is a question that affects every customer of the road, whether he travels or sends merchandise over the road as freight. I believe that the people of Canada to-day are being taxed to pay interest on millions of dollars of fictitious capital which have been charged up against Canadian railways, because of the carelessness, the laxity and the indifference with which the House has, in times past, dealt with questions of this kind. I pressed this matter upon the attention of the Minister of Railways in the committee; I press it upon his attention now. He may say in an off-hand way that this road will cost a certain amount, that there are coulées to be overcome, and rivers to be crossed. But the Minister of Railways has not the first item of information; he has not a profile, he has not a preliminary survey. The promoters have not even definitely located the line, and they do not know any more than the average member of the public what the cost of the road is to be. And yet it is proposed that the House shall deliberately sanction this mortgage upon the labour of the people in this section of the country for all time to come. Is it guarding the interests of the people, to thus place an obstacle on the way of the development of the country? Sir, that is the way to retard the development of our country, and it is such lack of business capacity, as is shown in this matter that has

kept the North-west an almost unpopulated country up to this moment. So long as this laxity continues, so long will dissatisfaction exist, and so long shall we find the surplus population of older lands avoiding our shores and seeking sections of the world where there is some business ability brought to bear in dealing with important questions like this. The Minister of Railways, I suppose, will pass it off in a light way, but, if he is going to address the House, on this subject, I ask him to tell us in businesslike fashion what this road is going to cost. Has he a single line from a surveyor about it ? Does he know a single thing about the difficulties of construction ? Why, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the prairie section of the Canadian Pacific Railway cost, for construction, only one-third of what you are giving this company power to bond their road for. I do not speak of what the company paid for it. But what I mean to say is—Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice says that that would not pay for the iron. The Minister of Justice has very little——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Justice did not say one word to you or to the House.

Mr. MULOCK. All the better for the House. I say it is well known that the construction of the prairie section of the Canadian Pacific Railway did not cost over $5,000 a mile.

Mr. DALY. That is absurd.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be so in the hon. Minister's judgment, but I do not think he can give any evidence in support of what he says.

Mr. DALY. Yes, I can ; I will give the evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not speaking of what the company had to pay, but of what the road cost. Mr. Speaker, I know a case in point. As long as ten years ago, a road was to be constructed through one of the oldest settled parts of this province, and the contractor was paid $10,000 a mile for the purchase of the right of way, the grading, the ironing, the building of the stations —every bit of the work in connection with the road, with the exception of putting on the rolling stock. And I know that he did not lose any money by it. At that time, the price of rails was $50 per ton, and to-day the price is not half that. And yet we are giving power to this company in the North-west, where practically the right of way is free, to bond its road to the extent I mentioned. In this particular case it might be possible to give evidence that the road would cost $15,000 or $50,000 per mile. What I complain of is that we we are absolutely in the dark as to the cost. My estimates may be wrong, you may find fault with them, but what I say is that we are entitled to have official information as to what the cost will be, as near as may be, and that we should, as a principle, take our stand upon the ground that we will not sanction the creation of charges upon public carriers such as railways are, involving the taxation of the people to any greater extent than is necessary in order to pay a fair dividend upon the capital which goes honestly into the construction of such enterprise.

Mr. AMYOT. If the evil which the hon. gentleman mentions is so great, so imminent, why did he not warn this House before ? He has waited many years, he has allowed many charters to be granted by this Parliament, without warning us.

Mr. MULOCK. I have often objected.

Mr. AMYOT. But it is always the same story. He complains that they are watering the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, if there had been no liberality shown towards the Canadian Pacific Railway, there would be no Canadian Pacific Railway to-day ; and if there was no Canadian Pacific Railway, the lands in the North-west would have remained unsettled, and there would be no use of any railways there. If we were to be too severe in granting charters, we could not bring in capital from England, we could not build railways, we could not encourage these settlers who are there now, and we could not invite new settlers. I think that it is too late to complain at this stage of the Bill. The hon. gentleman should have complained before the committee where the Bill was first considered. At all events he now comes only with generalities. For my part I am ready to show myself liberal towards new companies who do their best to open the country and to bring in capital and settlers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The speech of the hon. gentleman shows a very extraordinary notion of what is the public interest. We have in the North-west Territories an immense mileage and a very small population. We have thousands of square miles of territory within easy reach of roads already constructed, and that is, up to this moment, wholly unoccupied. The hon. gentleman, before there is an adequate population to make the railways that are already constructed paying enterprises, proposes further to increase the burdens of the country, and further to put impediments in the way of settlement, by extending the railway system in that section of country. Then, if the hon. member will look at the map and see the direction in which this road runs, he will find that after it reaches its connecting point with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the products and the traffic which would spring from a popu-

lation residing along it, would have as far to go to reach the Montreal market as if a road were constructed in a straight line from the point from which they started. I cannot conceive anything more detrimental to the public interest, more at variance with what is the real interest of the country, than to undertake the construction of railways in that comparatively level country, running in a direction different from that which the trade of the country must ultimately take. Sir, that is what is proposed by this Bill. It seems to me that before this House or this Government undertook to grant any further railway charters, they ought to be satisfied by actual explorations and surveys, what is the approximate cost of the road proposed to be constructed. They ought also to know whether the parties who are promoting the enterprise are possessed of such an amount of capital as to make it to their interest to undertake the construction of the road. Sir, what have we been doing for years with regard to the North-west country? We have been giving railway charters to persons who are penniless; we have been practically making large appropriations out of the public treasury, or promises of large appropriations, to aid these enterprises, and we have enabled the parties to hawk these enterprises amongst the capitalists of New York and London. For what purpose? To promote the interests of the people who are likely to settle in that country? Not at all, but to make the largest sum possible out of the railway charters for themselves, and so, when it gets into the hands of parties who have capital with which to build the road, they find it burdened by hundreds of thousands of dollars of expense that has not gone into the construction of the road at all. I think it is time that an end was put to that state of things. I think that a more profitable use of the resources in the hands of this country can be made than by granting aid to exploit undertakings of this sort solely for the benefit of the parties who are to receive the charter, and who are seeking to make merchandise of it on account of the advantages attached to it. It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen who have promoted this Bill in the House ought to be here to give evidence, to give the House information, as to the parties who are in that country now, and who are to be accommodated by this construction. I say again that we ought not to build a mile of road in the North-west Territories where there are no settlers at the present time, until there is a fair amount of settlement along the lines already constructed. Why, Sir, if we go on in the way in which we have been going for some time past, what will be the result? At this moment we might place in the North-west Territories half a million of people within ten miles of the roads that are already built. If that be so, does it not become evident to any one that if you build a new line of railway, you are burdening the population, you are putting additional impediments in the way of settlement; that the charges for travel and for traffic must be proportionately greater in proportion to the number of miles that you construct in the country for a given population? And so, instead of assisting the settlement of the country, constant impediments are put in the way of actual settlement. I say that the House ought not to encourage incorporations of this sort without more evidence than we have at this moment before us, as to the necessity of the enterprise, its cost, and the proportion of the population existing there who are to be served by it.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock). If he had taken the trouble to examine the papers filed under the rules of our committee, he would have found a lot of information which he now complains he has not seen. There is a regular plan, there is an estimate of the cost, of the capital stock, and how it is to be raised under the rules. If the hon. gentleman had come in to the committee yesterday at the start of the business, and had attended it throughout, he would not have made these reflections upon the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. Allow me to say that I asked, in the committee, the Minister of Railways, whom I considered the official authority, if he had any idea whatever as to the cost of this road.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I was not there at all. It was in reference to the electric railway.

Mr. MULOCK. I asked the Chairman himself for a statement, and he could not give a bit of information as to the cost. I asked the promoter, and he gave the same answer, and said he did not know what the cost would be, said he did not know anything about the cost.

Mr. TISDALE. I disagree entirely with the hon. gentleman, or else my memory is at fault. I know personally that these papers were filed there, and he could have examined them. The fact is that until to-night I did not take the hon. gentleman seriously, and I do not think the committee did so yesterday, when he came in and raised a discussion.

Mr. MULOCK. I was there at the beginning.

Mr. TISDALE. The reason why I feel it my duty to say something is because the reflections cast on the Minister of Railways are reflections on the Railway Committee. The committee is composed of members of both sides of the House, and they earnestly and carefully endeavour to carry out certain lines of policy, which the committee have adopted, not the Government. I did

not understand until a little while ago that it was proposed to challenge the whole policy on which the committee has been acting. If the House is pleased to instruct the committee to adopt some other policy, we shall be quite ready to do so: but the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), in his statements in regard to the amounts for which roads have been bonded has not informed himself in regard to railways, otherwise he would be aware that $15,000 per mile was a small sum, and I do not understand how the company are going to get along with it. I will mention to the hon. gentleman two items which will involve an expenditure of $5,000 per mile. Rails cannot be laid down for less than $4,000 per mile, and ties for not less than $2,000 per mile. This will be apparent to the hon. gentleman if he will take the cost of rails and freight from Montreal, and in making this remark I am not only expressing my own views, but I have taken the trouble to make inquiries. Then, a certain amount of bridging has to be provided, for even in a prairie country more or less culverts have to be put in: also a certain amount of fencing must be done, and these items have to be paid out of capital. Then there is grading and track-laying. Again, the rolling stock has to be provided, and $10,000 per mile is a very moderate estimate for rolling stock, if the road is going to be operated independently.

Mr. MARTIN. $1,500 per mile is ample.

Mr. TISDALE. The rolling stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway cost millions, and that of the Grand Trunk Railway involved an enormous expenditure. The lesser roads, of course, have a much smaller quantity, and I will reduce the estimate to $5,000 per mile. Taking 100 miles of road, this would involve a large amount. $10,000 per mile would probably be excessive. It should be mentioned that the Railway Committee are called upon every day almost to enlarge capital stock of companies, not to reduce it. Companies are constantly appearing before the committee with too small capital, and we are compelled to put the capital at a larger amount in order to obtain a substantial guarantee that the road will be constructed. I speak with confidence when I say this, that the committeee, representing both sides of the House, is anxious to provide every safeguard in the public interest. In regard to the road in question, there is no question about the responsibility of its promoters and the necessity of the road itself. Those seeking its incorporation are: Andrew Allan, Hugh A. Allan, Andrew A. Allan, James B. Allan, A. A. McKenzie and Charles McEachren, all of the city of Montreal, and Bryce J. Allan, of the city of Boston. Why is the road desired? Because a difficulty has arisen in connection with a road in which they invested some millions of capital, one of the few roads in the North-west in which a large amount of private capital has been invested. It is notorious that there is an issue between the bond-holders, who hold a large portion of the road, and other parties. This road is intended to give the promoters an outlet. The case is at present in appeal. If the decision is upheld in regard to the receivership, this will give another outlet and provide a cut-off, so that the balance of the road can be operated, and another connection made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, if the bond-holders are successful with their suit. Mr. Nicol Kingsmill appeared before the committee and furnished information.

Mr. MULOCK. He said he knew nothing about it.

Mr. TISDALE. $15,000 of bonded debt was so unusually small that no one had any doubt about granting it.

Mr. LAURIER. If it was so small, why did the committee reduce it by $5,000?

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Kingsmill was asked if he thought the promoters could get along with that sum, it being stated that the committee usually granted $20,000. He replied that he thought they could, that it was a comparatively cheap country for railway construction, although it was not all level prairie, but was broken prairie. I am not one of those who would object to the adoption of a policy under which a less number of charters would be granted; but until the rules of the House are changed, this cannot be done, and in many parts of the country where there are no railroads, especially in the old provinces, the electors sometimes wish to build railways, and complain if charters cannot be obtained. I agree with the idea that possibly we chartered too many roads, but I claim that within certain limits we cannot refuse charters until some new policy is authorized by the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does this road extend north-east and south-west?

Mr. TISDALE. I do not know the directions by the points of the compass, but it runs nearly north and south, and it is required for the purpose I have mentioned, and, as was explained by the promoters before the committee. If the Railway Committee are to have a new set of rules, very well: I am only making these remarks in justification of the course adopted under our existing rules. Until the discussion of yesterday and to-day occurred, I was not aware that hon. gentlemen were prepared to advocate that a less number of railway charters should be granted. I do not know a road except the Canadian Pacific Railway, that has been built of late years, but that the bonds have been sold at a large discount. If you get 80 cents on the

dollar you do well, and you have to allow for that if you give a practical charter. The reason why it is not as dangerous as it might look is, that it is harder to get capital for railway schemes than it is likely that railways will sell their bonds too high on the market. That is the reason why the committee are generally moderately liberal. As a matter of fact we do consider the cost, but it is in a rough way. By looking at what our different railways cost we can get at a pretty safe estimate. In the prairie country we give from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars a mile, usually twenty, and in older provinces, from twenty thousand to twenty-five thousand, or even higher if it is a rough country. We do not require, nor until the rules of the House are changed have we any right to ask any further information. The change of policy advocated by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will be a serious divergence from the rules upon which the committee have hitherto been acting. Until my hon. friend raised the point yesterday we have been going on the old lines, and if there is to be a change in the rules the House should say so.

Mr. LISTER. I think the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) is entitled to the gratitude of the House for bringing this matter to the attention of Parliament. I suppose there is no country in the world to-day, that has so great a railway mileage for its population as has the North-west Territories. They have a mile of railway for every eighty inhabitants, and from the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) I take it for granted that the application for this charter, is in order to affect to a certain extent the lawsuit which is now pending between the bond-holders and the stock-holders of the North-western Railway in the Territories. The bond-holders are at variance with the stock-holders; litigation is pending, and if one of the parties is successful then this railway will be built for the purpose of giving it an outlet to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. TISDALE. Will my hon. friend allow me to correct him. There are forty-two miles of railway built beyond the point. In the meantime they have a joint understanding, but it is particularly in one ownership, and then there is 180 miles down the Canadian Pacific Railway. The forty two miles I speak of will absolutely be cut off unless we get the outlet.

Mr. LISTER. Will be cut off in case the decision in the lawsuit is in a certain direction. If the decision is in a certain direction a portion of the road will be cut out, and it will be necessary to construct the road provided for in this charter. Therefore, so far as this charter is concerned the object of it is to influence the litigation now pending. It is all very well for my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) to talk about bringing in capital. I expected that from the hon. gentleman. He seems to think that if we can draw capital into the country it is unimportant what becomes of the men who lend the money. As long as the money can be brought into the country under any scheme that schemers think proper to exploit, it is of no consequence at all if the capitalists of England and elsewhere lose their money, so long as it is spent in Canada. I am glad to feel that the expressions of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) do not find entire approval throughout the country. There is a large section of the people of Canada who do not believe in any such thing as that, but who believe that if a scheme is placed upon the British market, it should be an honest scheme, and that there should be a fair chance that the men who invest shall get adequate return for their money. This Government has been reckless in the extreme in granting railway charters. Go to any province in the Dominion, and you will find in almost every railway, a testimony of wrecked fortunes, and ruined families, through legislation passed in this House for the purpose of bringing, as it is said, foreign capital into the country. Take, if you will, the Albert Railway in the county of Albert. They thought proper to build a railway. They issued bonds, and they pledged these bonds to the banks, and a supporter of the Government got possession of these bonds and he went over to England and he secured to the men who bought them six years interest. But how is it paid? It is paid out of the capital received for these bonds, and after the six years expired, the men who invested the capital and received their interest out of their own capital, find that the whole thing was lost, that the railway was bankrupt, and that even the Dominion of Canada was one of its creditors to a large extent. Take the Caraquet Railway, authorized by the legislature, and incorporated by an Act of this Parliament. These men go to England and exploit that railway on the English market, putting by a portion of the money received for the bonds to secure the interest for a certain number of years, and when these years expire the investors receive nothing. Their money is utterly gone, and the railway to-day is not paying its running expenses. Go to the North-west if you will, and the same story is to be told there. Only the other day, before the Railway Committee, we had an application from the promoters of a railway running from Dunmore, to be allowed to reduce their bonded indebtedness. They had issued bonds for a very large amount, the road was not paying, they were not able to pay the interest upon the bonds, and they were forced to come to Parliament to get an Act allowing them to issue new bonds for the purpose of reducing the interest charges upon the bonds which were outstanding. The bond-holders invested in good faith, believing they would have a fair

return, but they find now that the company is unable to meet its liabilities, and they will gladly take the bonds the company propose to substitute for the bonds issued in the first place. The probabilities are that in the next few years, these bonds again will be in arrears, and if the road is not entirely insolvent, this company will be back again to Parliament asking power to reduce the interest on the bonds they have issued. Sir, the whole system of building railways in this country has been a system, in a sense I say it, of fraud. Men without a dollar of capital, mere schemers and speculators, who think that a railway ought to be built from a certain point to a certain point, come to this Parliament and ask for a charter. They have not a dollar to invest in it, they get subsidies from this Government, and I have no doubt that the next move in the case now before the House will be to ask Parliament to give them a subsidy for this road. Then they get authority to bond the road for a large sum, enormously greater than the cost of the road, because nobody will pretend to say that in a prairie country such as the North-west and the states to the south of it, that any road will cost $15,000 a mile to build and equip. They get authority to issue the bonds for a large amount, and then they go with these bonds and sell them to the English capitalists. Out of the moneys they receive from the Government subsidy and from the proceeds of the bonds which they sell in the old country for about 80 cents, when they are not worth more than 40 cents or 50 cents, they are able to build the railway, and it does not cost the promoters one single dollar. I believe that, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, all the railways have been built without the promoters putting one dollar of their own money into them. It is a national disgrace, it is something that is affecting the credit of Canada in England —the wildcat schemes which we are authorizing year after year for the obvious and manifest purpose of getting English people to invest their capital in them. They are merely trapped into investing their capital in these schemes. After building them out of the subsidies and the bonds, the promoters of these railways are able to place a handsome margin into their own pockets. These men are not doing this for the public interest, or the public good; they do it to enrich themselves. Point out if you can a single railway in Canada, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, into which the promoters have put their own capital.

Mr. TISDALE. I am prepared to assert that the Allans of Montreal have put $2,000,000 into this road.

Mr. LISTER. Do you mean to tell me that they have put in $2,000,000 in stock? I venture to say that they have not put in more than the amount that the statute requires to be paid before commencing operation. If they have put in $2,000,000 it certainly has not been in stock, but our of the bonds issued and sold, which they probably hold themselves. That is the way railways are built in this country, and I say we have a right, in the interest of our national credit, to see that the bonded powers given to these railways are not greater than they are fairly entitled to. We have a right to see, in the interest of the public, as my hon. friend from North York has said, that these roads are not burdened with debts which will compel their owners to charge exorbitant rates for transportation; because, as my hon. friend has stated, the Government have no power to reduce rates until the railways have earned a certain percentage of the cost. So that, in whatever way you look at the matter, I believe the time has come when this Parliament, before granting a railway charter, should satisfy itself that the proposed railway is a public necessity, and that its promoters are prepared to hazard a proportion of their own capital in the enterprise. If that were done, there would be some guarantee to the public that the road would not be extravagantly built, and that men should not be induced to put their money into an enterprise under conditions and circumstances that would afterwards turn out to be fallacious. I think the time has come when we should consider the enormous railway mileage in the North-west as compared with its sparse population. It is utterly impossible that the roads in the North-west can be operated profitably for half a century from the present time, unless population goes in there with greater rapidity than in the past. With a population of only 200,000 or 300,000, twenty years or more after that country has come into this Dominion, with an increase in the last ten years of only about 100,000, how long will it be before these railways can be run at a profit? It is the bounden duty of Parliament, before authorizing the construction of any more railways, to satisfy itself that they are required by the public, and that there is a reasonable prospect that they will make a return at all events to the bondholders who invest the money in them.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with a great deal of what has been said by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I think that for a long time this Parliament has given too great bonding powers to the railway companies that come here for incorporation. This is a matter that has been brought to the attention of Parliament before, and in the Railway Committee many members have raised objection to this custom: but it has gone on with a recklessness that is scarcely compatible with good management. Another matter to which the hon. gentleman referred is, I think worthy of consideration,

that is, the very limited information which was given to the committee with regard to this railway. I was present when the discussion took place, and when the hon. gentleman asked for an estimate as to the cost of the road, its length, and its indebtedness likely to be incurred for its construction: but, so far as I heard, no information was given to the committee on these points, and the committee had either to go on the general principles of previous railway legislaion or to go it blind. I was rather amused at the line taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). If I understand him correctly he argued that we should put obstructions in the way of the granting of railway charters: yet, if I remember correctly, only a few years ago the hon. gentleman advocated very strongly the passage of a general railway law under which any company might go on and build a railway. He was willing to have free trade in railway building at that time, while to-day he wants greater restrictions. I do not think the two positions are consistent with each other.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think they are.

Mr. SPROULE. The general opinion of the members of this House, I think, is that we are allowing a little too much freedom in the chartering of railway schemes. I think there is a good deal in the argument of the hon. member for North York that after we authorize these railways to incur a considerable bonded indebtedness, and then try to get a reduction in their freight rates, we are met with the statement that they are unable to pay 2 per cent on their indebtedness, and therefore they cannot reduce their rates. If that indebtedness represented the actual cost of the road, there would be no ground of complaint; but it is often made up largely of watered stock for which there is little or no value. Yet we go on giving these railways as heavy bonding powers as we do to railways in the lower provinces. The hon. member for South Norfolk said we give the railways in the older provinces bonding powers to the extent of $15,000 to $20,000 per mile. I think we give them more like $20,000 to $25,000 a mile, but that is through an undulating country where there are heavy cuts, and in some cases large sections of rock to be cut: but in the North-west, where there is little to be done beyond laying the rails upon the open prairie, we give equal bonding powers. I do not think it contributes to the credit of the country or the corporation to give these heavy bonding powers, because it must surely lead to extremes in borrowing money. If the bonding powers had some approximate relationship to the cost or value of the road, it would be a criterion of their value to those who invest their money in it how much they should advance. But if you give power to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile in a prairie country, and $20,000 a mile in these lower provinces, where it will cost ten times as much to get the right of way and three times as much to build the railway, that is no criterion of the value of the road, and those lending money are likely to be altogether at sea on this point. We ought to be much more careful in giving bonding power. When we reduced this $5,000 a mile, I thought we were going in the right direction, and I think we might safely have reduced it another $5,000.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think there could be a better example of the justice of the point which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has brought before Parliament than this very railroad and its condition. This road is asked for on account of the troubles that have arisen between the stock-holders and bond-holders of the Manitoba and North-western Railway. The bond-holders of the original portion of the line, from Portage la Prairie to Langenburg, contend that their mortgage entitles them to have the earnings of that road applied in payment of interest on their bonds. The contention of the Allans, who hold the stock of the road, is that they have the right to distribute the earnings over the whole road, including the forty-two miles west of Langenburg, which are not covered by the bonds. The courts have decided up to the present, that the bond-holders are correct. The road their bonds cover is a valuable one, earning sufficient to pay the interest on their bonds, $15,000 per mile on the old portion of the Manitoba and North-western Railway. But here we have the promoters of this Bill coming to Parliament and asking for another outlet to their forty-two miles, so as to meet a probably adverse judgment of the courts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER called attention to the fact that the hour for private Bills had expired, and the Speaker left the Chair.

Bill reported.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To pay Mr. S. Bray, D.L.S., for work in settling Indian reserve claims in the Pas Agency, and in surveying reserves in the same district.....$150 00

Mr. McMULLEN. What allowance did he get for his expenses?

Mr. DALY. He got a dollar a day for his board.

Mr. MARTIN. We ought to have a full account of what this trip has cost. I understood the Minister of the Interior to say that an allowance was made to Mr. Bray of $1 a day for living expenses. That is

very much below the ordinary allowance, which I think is $3.50 a day.

Mr. DALY. There is no allowance now. The rule now is they have to account for their ordinary expenses.

Mr. MARTIN. When there was an allowance, it was $3.50. If the hon. Minister has only given $1 per day, that must include only a very small part of what the $3.50 per day used to cover. On account of the principle involved in this claim of $150, I would suggest, if the item be not allowed to stand, that it be struck out, and I will take the opinion of the House on the question. If the Minister will bring down the information, I will allow it to stand.

Mr. DALY. I have given all the information we have. It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen who attack this item are rather inconsistent. A similar item passed this afternoon, with scarcely any discussion at all in connection with an allowance to Mr. Gisborne for extra services in the Department of Justice, exactly on the same principle as the allowance for extra services rendered by Mr. Bray. I have given even fuller explanations than were asked for or given on that item. I can only repeat that this gentleman is an officer of experience in the department, the work had to be done, he was sent to do it, and he did it faithfully. He started in June, and did not return until December. On his outward trip he had a very hard experience, having been caught in the ice, and it is nothing out of the way, under the circumstances, to give him this extra allowance. His duties are entirely in the inside service, and if we had not utilized him, we would have had to get somebody else. We sent him because of his experience and peculiar qualifications, and we made a saving in consequence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What were the services?

Mr. DALY. He was four and a half months away surveying several Indian reserves in the agencies of the north-western portion of Manitoba, where a great many disputes had arisen amongst the Indians. There was a great deal of ill-feeling amongst them, and it was necessary to send some one to settle the dispute. This man did settle the dispute satisfactorily to all parties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the departments, he will see that the Government have paid a surveyor for this service. There is a Mr. John C. Nelson, Dominion land surveyor, who is in charge of the surveyors of the Indian reserves in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-west Territories, and who receives a salary of $2,190 a year. I would like to know why he was not sent to do this work. I would like to know why Mr. John C. Nelson has been brought down from the North-west Territories and whether he is engaged in the inside service or not, and what reason there was for bringing him away from the country where his duties lie, to Ottawa, and sending Mr. Bray at a considerable expense to that country?

Mr. DALY. The reason that Mr. Nelson was not sent was that it was necessary for him to remain to complete his maps and field notes in connection with surveys he had made. It was necessary that he should get through that work.

Mr. McMULLEN. A remark was dropped by the Minister of the Interior that I hope the Opposition will note. He draws attention to the fact that an item of a similar character was passed on a previous occasion without extended criticism, and urges this as a reason why this item should be treated in the same way. It is to be hoped that the Opposition will, in future, carefully criticise every item in these votes. Ministers are in the habit of offering such excuses. The Minister of Railways, in his trip through the west last year, in defending the expenditure on the Tay Canal, said that the Opposition raised no objection to the grant for that work. I hope the Opposition will note these things and will efficiently perform their duty. I endeavour to perform mine in criticising these items, and I do not think that I personally stand charged with the reproach that we do not criticise expenditures. The Minister has not yet given us all the information in connection with this item. I would like to know what sums, beyond the dollar a day, were granted to Mr. Bray during his absence for four and a half months.

Mr. DALY. Of course, he was paid his railway fare from here to Winnipeg, his steamboat fare from Selkirk to the head of Lake Winnipeg, and any hotel expenses he may have had in the city, and Pullmans and meals on the cars. That is all. Speaking from memory—it is some time since I saw the papers—the total expenses for the four and a half months amounted to $360 odd.

Mr. McMULLEN. That would be about $3 per day.

Mr. DALY. That includes railway fares, of course.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister said he had to go a considerable distance in canoes. Had he any staff with him?

Mr. DALY. He had the usual staff, I suppose, chainmen and canoemen—three or four men altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. Are any of these expenses charged, directly or indirectly, against the Indian funds?

Mr. DALY. There are no funds to the credit of these bands, and the money was

paid out of the usual sums voted by Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. My question has a wider application than the hon. Minister seems to understand it to have. Speaking generally of the expenses of the department, are any of them charged to the Indian funds? This item, if I understand the hon. Minister correctly, would have been charged against the fund of this band if it had not been used up.

Mr. DALY. They never had any.

Mr. MULOCK. And having no way of charging it against the Indians, you behaved generously and charged it to the country.

Mr. DALY. It was paid in the ordinary way out of funds voted for these purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. But there are Indian funds held in trust by the Government—lands and proceeds of lands and timber. The capital is held by the Crown, and, from time to time, interest is credited, as I understand. Now, is any portion of the expense of administering the Indian Department charged up against the funds of the Indians?

Mr. DALY. In connection with the services for the Indians of Ontario and Quebec, certain items are charged to what is known as the land management fund, which is made up of 10 per cent of the moneys realized from the sales of lands and timbers. This fund was started a great many years ago. The items chargeable to this fund include salaries of some of the agents, medical superintendence and so on.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman furnish the House with a detailed statement showing what items are charged against the funds.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will find that information in the annual report of the Indian Department.

Mr. MULOCK. Those reports will give the information for some years back?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have heard it stated that 54 cents out of every dollar of the Indian fund goes to the staff and 46 cents to the Indians. I would like to know if that is the proportion of the cost of management?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the report show what it is?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Those who have gone through the accounts tell me that is the proportion.

Mr. DALY. They are entirely mistaken.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We should have the facts before us so that we might know whether these moneys go to poor Indians or to the poor staff.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think this item ought to be struck out. Here is a man with a salary of $1,400 a year, who leaves his office for four and a half months, nobody taking his place, which shows that he has hardly anything to do, and he goes to the Northwest on work that properly belongs to him as a Dominion land surveyor. He goes there to survey lands for the Indians, and, as the hon. Minister says, to settle some disputes. We do not know but that these disputes might have been settled otherwise, for there are many Indian agents and many other employees of the Government in that locality. He goes up on a nice summer trip, and the hon. Minister asks us to vote this sum for him. It is an outrage on the country, and if such expenses came out of the Minister's own pocket, he would not pay a five-cent piece for this purpose, nor would any other business man. If this man's salary is not enough, raise it in manly, open-handed fashion, instead of trying to sneak a vote through the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. If there is any sneaking about it, you are doing the sneaking.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the word I use is out of order, Mr. Speaker, I beg to withdraw it. I say it is an outrage on the House—I do not think that is unparliamentary—to vote this money as a bonus to this gentleman who, according to the statement of the Minister, has had nothing at all to do. I dare say that he is drawing his $1,400 a year now; and if he could have left that office for four and a half months, he might have been dispensed with altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say in reply to the Minister of the Interior, lest his denial should be taken as a rebuttal of the statements that have been made, that I went carefully over the Indian accounts last year myself. I had them ordered down by the Public Accounts Committee, and carefully went over every item of expenditure, and I am prepared to state that for every dollar out of the $700,000 and over spent last year on the Indians, only 54 cents of it ever reached the Indians in the way of food, pocket money, or clothing. The balance went into the hands of officials, and if the Minister is now prepared to challenge that statement, I am prepared to go over the accounts ending 30th June, 1893, and to prove my statement.

Mr. DALY. I am prepared to challenge the hon. gentleman"s statement, because I remember that the hon. gentleman, sitting beside me here last session, told me that he had gone over all these accounts twice, and he knew no more about them than when

he started. I do not say that to disparage the hon. gentleman, because he showed a lot of industry. But the hon. gentleman, and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) were talking about different things. The hon. member for Grey and the hon. member for North Norfolk had reference to the Indian Trust Fund. Perhaps the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) had nothing to do with the Indian Trust Fund at all. I do not dispute his figures; they may be correct, but I can hardly fancy they are. But the hon. gentleman had reference to an entirely different matter to that raised by the hon. members for Grey and North York. So far as the Indian Trust Funds are concerned, everything in connection with them, will be found in that Indian Report. There are no expenses attending their administration beyond the ordinary expenses of the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister is correct. My statement refers to the expenses on Indians in Manitoba and the North-west. On the occasion he refers to, I went over to speak to him for the purpose of ascertaining how the accounts were kept, because in looking over the Auditor General's Report I found that 28 agencies were reported, but when I looked over the accounts, I found there were 34. I went over and asked the Minister how it was there were accounts from 34 to 35, when in reality there were only 28 enumerated in the Auditor General's Report; and he kindly explained to me that the others were sub-agencies. After getting that explanation, I was able to go through the accounts and compile the statement made to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman stated this afternoon that there are a far larger number of Indians now under the superintendence of the department than there was in 1878. I can say to the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken: that there has been no Indian treaty made since 1877, and that the Indians of the North-west are nearly 5,000 fewer in numbers now than they were at that time. I wish to call his attention to these facts, without discussing them: that in 1878 there were eight clerks in the Indian branch whose salaries amounted to $9,350; that at the present time there are fifty-two clerks in the inside service whose salaries amount to $54,888. I wish further to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in the Accountant's branch there were, in 1878, two persons employed, an accountant and his assistant, but to-day there are, I think, ten clerks in that department. In 1878 there were two clerks in the correspondence branch: at present there are seven in that branch. In 1878 there were two persons in the registry branch, and now there are ten. I call the hon. gentleman's attention now to these facts, when we came to discuss the main Estimates, I shall expect a statement from the hon. gentleman to show how each of these parties are employed. I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion there are at least four times as many persons in that department as can be profitably employed in it. I am speaking now of the Indian branch, and I think I will be able to satisfy the House and the country that it is so.

Mr. DEVLIN. The other day I put this question to the Government: Is it customary for the Government to allow permanent employees, who may be surveyors, to engage in work outside of the regular Government work? and the answer given to me was that such permission is not given. Now, I would like to know from the Minister of the Interior if it is within his knowledge that employees who are surveyors by profession, do, as a matter of fact, compete with outside surveyors in works that are not Government works.

Mr. DALY. It is not within my knowledge. I never heard of it: in fact, I cannot understand that it can be so.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have heard of it, and I bring it to the Ministers attention, because it has been brought to my notice through the complaints of those who allege that they suffer in this respect. I have heard that gentlemen who have good salaries as surveyors do outside work, and if I am not mistaken, one of the names mentioned to me was that of Mr. Bray. My informants complain that they have difficulty enough to obtain professional work at present, and that one of the causes is that gentlemen belonging to the Department of Interior compete with them for this very class of work, that they have acutally taken contracts, if not in the city of Ottawa, at all events in the vicinity. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that these complaints have been made, and they deserve his attention. Those who have worked hard and got through their profession have a right to secure contracts outside without being interferred with by gentlemen who are already well provided for by the country.

Mr. RIDER. It is the principle rather than the amount involved that justifies contention. I observe that $6 per day is paid, Sundays included. Such an item should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. An individual in receipt of $1,400 surely should be satisfied without having the privilege of making excursions through the country and adding to his salary, especially when it has been admitted that no inconvenience was felt in the department in consequence of his absence for four and a half months. If it is the custom of the department to allow Sundays to be counted, the practice should be stopped. In fairness to the committee, the Minister should allow the item to stand until further information is given.

Mr. MARTIN. With respect to the payment made to Mr. Gisborne, I do not think the suggestion of the Minister that criticism should have been indulged in on that item at that time, is likely to facilitate the passing of the Estimates. There is a considerable difference between the two cases. In the one case we accepted the statement of the Minister that the work performed by Mr. Gisborne represented extra services entirely apart from his regular duties. While as a general rule it is a bad principle to grant extra remuneration, sometimes it is proper that officials that do extra work should be remunerated for it. The case of Mr. Bray is entirely different, for it is not suggested he did his regular work at Ottawa. He simply gave his whole time to the Government on the work in which he was engaged in Manitoba, and received his salary of $1,400 for it. I move that resolution No. 171 be reduced by the sum of $150.

Motion negatived; yeas, 40; nays, 42.

Mr. MULOCK. On referring to page 15 of the Report of Indian Affairs, I find an account entitled Indian Trust Fund, and to the debit of that is an item of $225,318. What is the principle on which the expenditures are charged against the interest? Am I correct in assuming that there is a gross sum allowed for interest, and it is apportioned among the various bands, according to their rights in that fund?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And that against the separate bands separate charges are made. So it may be that when you charge $250,000 odd against the gross amount before it is divided, you are deducting out of each band's allowance a proportion for the general expenses, and it is the residue of the interest which goes to the credit of the bands and is distributed, and is then chargable with the items specially connected with the band. Is that the scheme of charging adopted? The sum of $255,000, I suppose, represents all the charges against that fund.

Mr. DALY. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is correct.

Mr. MULOCK. All the items we find charged against the sum of $255,000 are first charged against gross interest, and to the extent of their charge they reduce the interest of the various bands.

Mr. DALY. The particulars respecting the Indian Trust Fund appear in the report of the Department of Indian Affairs, and the hon. gentleman will find under Indian Trust Funds, "Returns C with subsidiary statements, showing transactions in connection with the fund during the year ending 30th June, 1894." If the hon. gentleman will take the subsidiary statements he will find the expenditure given under the head of each band.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it the total capital which appears on page 15 as credited up to each band, and the interest credited as part of the general interest on that account, except where specially accruing to any particular part of that band.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I take this opportunity of asking the Minister with reference to the reports that were to be sent to the different Indian bands. Some 300 extra copies were I suppose printed according to the order of the House last year. I asked the Minister how many had been sent to the Six Nations band and he told me some fourteen copies.

Mr. DALY. Yes, the chiefs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought there would be a larger number sent to the Six Nations, and I was quite disappointed that only fourteen should have been forwarded. How many Indians have trust funds in the hands of the Government?

Mr. DALY. I should say, roughly speaking, about ninety bands altogether. Some of them of course have small amounts and others much larger. I cannot give the number of members in each band.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Six Nations band has 3,500 members, and it appears to me that the number of reports forwarded is very small. I presume that many of the North-west bands have no use for the reports.

Mr. DALY. None whatever.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like the Minister to personally look into this matter and see if he cannot forward more copies to the Six Nations. My impression was that he would have sent 75 or 100. There must be fifty or sixty in the council alone, and I would like the Minister to forward a larger number.

Mr. DALY. I will do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of the Interior has forgotten, I think, that he and I discussed this matter a couple of weeks ago, and he told me then when the figures were before him, that he had provided a much larger number for the Six Nations reserve.

Mr. DALY. Only fourteen copies were distributed at the time the hon. member (Mr. Paterson) asked me about it, but since then I think more have been sent out to the Six Nations reserve.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is quite correct in stating that a larger number should be sent to the Six Nations than to the other bands.

To pay the Hon. Mr. Justice Crease, as local Judge in Admiralty, Exchequer Court, as salary from 27th November, 1893, to 25th March, 1895, at $600 per annum $796 02

To pay the Hon. Theodore Davie, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, salary as local Judge in Admiralty from 25th March, 1895, to 30th June, 1895, at $1,000 per annum..... 268 49

To provide for additional amount required for judges' circuit allowances, British Columbia..... 500 00

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Justice Crease acted as judge in admiralty after the death of the late Chief Justice, and this is simply to pay him the salary that would have been paid to the Chief Justice had he lived. The other item is to pay the present Chief Justice as judge in admiralty at a higher rate than $600 a year, and I ask the House to vote that on this ground. Under the statute the present Chief Justice receives $5,000 a year as Chief Justice while his predecessor received $5,820. There is a deduction therefore, from the old salary of the Chief Justice from the date of the union up to the present time, of $820. We propose not to restore the whole amount of that to the Chief Justice, but we propose to add $400 to his salary as judge in admiralty thus making it the same as the judges in admiralty in the other provinces.

To provide for travelling expenses to judges holding weekly sittings of the High Court of Justice at Ottawa and London $500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you want this for?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Ontario Legislature arranged, for the convenience of the bar in the localities concerned, that the judges should have sittings at London and Ottawa, and it was therefore necessary to pay their expenses.

Mr. LISTER. The local legislature passed an Act providing for motions that could be made before a single judge, instead of going to Toronto, the judges would sit once a week in London and Ottawa, so that the profession in those sections of the country could make their motions there instead of going to Toronto. It is a great convenience to the bar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why not in Kingston then, as well as in London and Ottawa.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The local legislature has not so provided.

Mr. FRASER. I suppose that the Government will be ready to do the same thing in respect to other provinces.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may rely on my being ready to try and get justice for his province.

Mr. FRASER. All the business of the province of Nova Scotia is now done in Halifax, and I vote for this on the understanding that something similar to what is done in Ontario may be done in Nova Scotia.

To pay Chief Justice Casault part of salary as Senior Puisne Judge residing at Quebec, from May 27th, 1894, to July 23rd, 1894, at $1,000 per annum..... $153 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this not provided for by statute?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Chief Justice Casault did not press for this. On his construction of the statute he did not think he was technically entitled to what he would have been entitled to under the law had he been acting for the Chief Justice on leave of absence. The late Chief Justice was dead when the present Chief Justice acted in his place and the statute did not provide for that. But had the then Chief Justice been absent and alive, Judge Casault would have been entitled to this allowance.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary—To pay guard W. W. Gibson the difference between $400 and $500 per annum, from the 1st April, 1894, until 30th June, 1895, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Penitentiary Act..... $125 00

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This officer commenced at $400 a year and after several years obtained a maximum of $500 as guard. He then resigned, but the officers of the penitentiary were most desirous of obtaining his return to the service, and in the interests of the service it was arranged to take him back. It was found that he would be obliged to lose the advantage of the $100 increase on returning, and this is simply to give him the salary he had previously. He is an exceptionally good guard and is so reported.

British Columbia Penitentiary—To pay Hon. Mr. Justice Drake for services as commissioner re investigation.....$200 00

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall not press this item, except with the committee's consent, for this reason. If they desire to discuss, as I take it we must discuss, the subject of the judge's report and the reorganization of the tariff, it will be a long discussion; it would occupy certainly the balance of this evening. If the committee will allow this small item to pass, about which there is no dispute, the discussion of the whole subject will come up on the item in the main estimates, when I shall be prepared to go into it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we would prefer to take this separately, and not mix it up with the general items in the main estimates.

Item allowed to stand.

House of Commons—Further amount required to pay for expenses of revision of the voters' lists..... $40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you require $40,000 ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The vote given last session was $200,000. That was not the sum asked for by Dr. Dawson, the Queen's Printer, when he made his estimate. His estimate was that it would take at the lowest calculation $240,000, and it turns out that his estimate was very correct. The sum of $40,000 is required over and above the amount voted last year.

Mr. LISTER. Is that the total cost ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will explain to the hon. gentleman the items, and then he will see. Already there has been paid to the revising barristers $148,000, and it is estimated that there is due to them $12,000 ; this is at the ordinary rates. There are, besides, one or two cases in which revising barristers whose districts cover a very large tract of country have made small claims for extra allowances. These I have instructed the Auditor General to deal with on some fair basis, and decide what he believes to be right. It required for the printing of the preliminary lists, which are not printed in the Bureau, but at various newspaper offices outside, $35,000. The printing at the Bureau, together with the payment of the cost of printing a few lists at outside offices in the cities of Montreal and Toronto, total about $40,000. These items made up the $240,000. I have gone into the matter very carefully with the Queen's Printer, and he states to me that that will be the total amount.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This item is one which one would suppose the Minister of Finance and his colleagues would have taken every opportunity to avoid for the future : but they do not seem to be taking any step in that direction. Last year the late Minister of Justice introduced a measure to supersede this expensive piece of machinery by providing another and wholly different system with regard to the voters' lists ; and the hon. Minister of Finance, while indicating his disinclination to face the serious expenditure that must be incurred from year to year if this system is continued, nevertheless insists upon its retention on the statute-book. Well, Sir, I am not going into a discussion of the impropriety of the measure out of which this enormous expenditure arises, further than to say that the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches have indicated that, in their opinion, this country is not a unit and has not common interest unless those interests find expression in this Parliament. The hon. gentlemen have not only incurred an enormous expenditure in the preparation of these lists which would have been wholly unnecessary if a different franchise policy were adopted, but they seem to have increased the expenditure beyond what the statute warrants. I notice that they have in several instances appointed two revising officers for the same constituency. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that so far as I know there is nothing in the law, certainly nothing in the revised statutes of Canada, to warrant the adoption of such a course. It is true, where a revising officer is appointed for the whole of one constituency, he may be a revising officer for a part of another : but to have two revising officers for the same constituency seems to me a monstrous practice, and one which finds no warrant whatever in the provision of the statute. The Secretary of State, I think it was, a few days ago, in answer to an inquiry, informed the House that in several constituencies in the provinces of Quebec there were two revising officers. So apart from the needless expenditure which the country is obliged to sustain in consequence of the retention of this measure on the statute-book, the expenditure is very much increased by the course which the hon. gentlemen have adopted. What does $240,000 mean ? It means the interest on a capital sum twenty-five times that amount. And for what purpose has the hon. gentleman incurred that enormous expenditure ? For the purpose of taking the preparation of the voters' list out of the hands of the municipalities, where it exists in the United Kingdom and in every other dependency of the Empire except Canada, and putting it in the hands of the appointees of the Administration. That is the condition of things existing, and the hon. gentlemen have not yet taken the first step towards a revision of the lists for the current year. There is not in the Estimates any estimate for the revision of the voters' lists according to law, although the law requires a revision every year. We know right well that there is on an average change 10 per cent by removal, expatriation, and various other ways, in the population every year, and yet the hon. gentleman has not taken the first step towards securing the right to vote to those who are entitled to go upon the lists, either because they have attained their majority or have become residents, or for other reasons.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a notice already given of a Bill respecting the voters' lists of 1895, and that Bill is down for a second reading. The whole of this matter must come up on the discussion of that Bill, and does not my hon. friend think that would be an opportune time to bring it up ? If we are to precipitate that discussion now, of course it must be engaged in on both sides.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We cannot have too much of a good thing, and I am so convinced that the hon. gentlemen are all

wrong in this, that I wish to give them an opportunity of obtaining enlightenment.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's intention is to take up the time of the House?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it is to call the attention of the country to the course hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. Every gentleman on the treasury benches except the Secretary of State and the Minister of Militia, were last year committed to a policy which this year they have repudiated. That policy was in the interests of the country, and the hon. gentlemen now find that the revision of the voters' lists cost $240,000, and that it ought to be done every year, and they dare not undertake to carry out the law. We will have an opportunity of discussing this subject upon the measure to which the hon. gentleman has referred, but I wish the House to remember that there is a large number of young men who have attained their majority and are entitled to go upon the lists, and who will not have the right to vote unless there be a revision. There is a large number also who have acquired the right to vote by coming into the country, and there are others who have gone from one constituency to another, and these will not have an opportunity of voting which they would have if the law were carried out. That is what I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman, and, when he proposes to put off the revision of the lists by the introduction of a Bill to amend the law, he is exercising a dangerous power. The hon. gentleman knows that the exercise of a dispensing power in England cost a sovereign his crown and drove him into exile, and he is undertaking to exercise a dispensing power and to say that the law shall not be carried into effect.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no dispensing power in this item.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is $240,000 unnecessarily expended of the money of the people in this item.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and the hon. gentleman dare not repeat that.

Mr. DENISON. There is $150,000 to pay the judges. Does the hon. gentleman advocate the doing of the work by the judges without pay?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would leave the municipal authorities to do the work, as it was done for seventeen years under the law of this country, and no person complained of his rights being interfered with. I call the attention of the country to the fact that the Government are expending $240,000 unnecessarily, purely for party considerations, and that they dare not continue this expenditure from year to year, although, if they maintain the system which they now have, the revision ought to take place every year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. FOSTER. As it is evidently the intention of my hon. friend to precipitate a long discussion upon an item with which it has nothing to do, and as it is evident we shall not make any more progress, and that the intention is we shall not, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the motion, as we have been sitting late for several nights, but I must object to the inference, that because my hon. friend raises a discussion which is absolutely germane to the item, he is wasting the time of the House. He is doing nothing of the kind. He is doing a service to the country in endeavouring to rid us, first of all, of the expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars which we cannot very well afford, and, in the next place, he has been doing his best to draw the attention of the country to one of the most outrageous measures ever put on the statute-books.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is not the place to do it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister finds this is an expenditure he cannot defend. Does he propose that the committee rise in the hope that when the committee meets again, there may possibly be a thin House, and he may get the item through? Is he not prepared to answer? Why does he take the ground that it cannot be discussed to-night?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. We have not been asked for any information by the hon. gentleman who precipitated this discussion. This item does not refer to next year's work, but to work which has been done, and for which we have to pay. My hon. friend has drifted into the region of questioning the necessity of the Act at all, but that question is not germane to this item. It will properly come up on the second reading of the Bill of which I have given notice. Any details of this item which may be required will be given, of course, by the Secretary of State. The object does not seem to be to obtain information, but to provoke a debate on a question of principle involving the Franchise Act, and have a long discussion upon it. What I say is that, if we are going to go into that, it will be better not to start at this late hour. We are quite ready to discuss that question where it comes in germanely, and where an old parliamentarian like my hon. friend knows well enough it comes in properly. He knows what orderly business means, and where a discussion is germane and where it is not, and he knows that the debate he is seeking to provoke would be much better had on the second reading of the Bill than on an item providing payment for work done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know my duty in this House, and in the discharge of my duty I undertook the discussion of an item that is an extremely objectionable one. Sir, I am not repudiating an obligation which we have incurred, I am pointing out the impropriety of an act out of which the obligation arose. Suppose the hon. gentleman did not propose to introduce the measure. Suppose that no dispensing power was to be exercised in consequence of the charges accruing under this measure, would the hon. gentleman say we had no right to discuss the question on this motion ?

Mr. FOSTER. In that case, the hon. gentleman would be within his right to discuss it. But he knows perfectly well that there is a Bill pending for its second reading dealing with this matter. He has no right to make suppositions contrary to the fact.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is proper if the Bill had not come in is equally proper when this item comes before us.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a Bill to repeal the Franchise Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know that quite well. And I intend to avail myself of the opportunity of discussing this question whenever that opportunity arises. I know my duty, and my responsibility to my constituents, and if the hon. gentleman had known his, this appropriation would not have been called for, and there would not have been this charge upon the revenues of the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Of course we are always glad to hear our hon. friend.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to hear the hon. gentleman give a precedent from the proceedings of the British House of Commons for the position he takes. If he finds any member on an item of this kind discussing what the law ought to be, and objecting to the law as it is, he will only have to look a little further to find that that member has not been very long in Parliament or occupies an insignificant place. No gentleman who has been in Parliament for one-half as long as the hon. gentleman would follow such a course, and it is very rare in this House for even a junior member to discuss the subject as the hon. member proposes to do. We had evidence this evening on the item with reference to an officer of the Department of the Interior how much progress the hon. gentleman wanted to make. When the hon. member for Bothwell follows the lead of these hon. gentlemen, by discussing on an item of this kind a subject which may be fully discussed on any one of three different measures now before the House, I think the leader of the House did well to put an end to that sort of thing. And I think the hon. member, on reflection, will be of the same opinin.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is rather bumptious, and presumes a little too much on his position in undertaking to lecture me. If it were parliamentary I would say that the stool of the dunce rather than the chair of the critic belongs to the hon. gentleman ; but as it is not parliamentary, I will not say that. Does not the hon. gentleman know—speaking of the British practice—that the whole policy of the Government on the subject of the navy, the propriety of building more ships, or the nature of the ships, is always discussed upon the Estimates ? Does not the hon. gentleman know that the whole policy of it with regard to the army, the number of men to be maintained, the system to be followed in the different branches of the military service is discussed upon the Estimates ? When the hon. gentleman undertakes to lecture me upon a question of this sort, a serious abuse affecting the interests of the country, a system which prevents the putting upon the voters' lists of the names of those who are entitled to vote, he would be engaged in better business and show better sense if he were to keep his seat until he is better informed. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, thinks he is well qualified to give advice on a matter of this sort, but he would better discharge the duty that appertains to his position as a Minister of the Crown if he would try and repeal the law and prevent such unnecessary and improper expenditure, than by undertaking to lecture those who are seeking to get rid of an abuse of this kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am glad to find from the language the hon. gentleman has used, which is language such as he seldom indulges in, that he has taken to heart the lesson I ventured to give him. As to what the hon. gentleman said concerning the army and navy Estimates, he knows perfectly well that it is not a case in point. When the Government comes down and asks for a large sum of money for the construction of ships, it is quite germane to that vote to discuss the wisdom of building more ships. But when the Government here comes down with a supplementary Estimate to pay for certain services provided for under an Act of Parliament the case is entirely different. The hon. gentleman will search in vain for the case of any member of the British House who is careful of his reputation taking up the time of the House in discussing the principles of a Bill of any general question of reform in connection with the navy, upon such a vote.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is labouring under two apprehensions—or, I should say, misapprehensions. He is labouring, no doubt, under apprehensions, also, but they are probably more than two.

as the heat of the tone he adopts shows. He is under the misapprehension that the debate on the Franchise Bill has been stopped by the leader of the House. He will find that he is most grievously mistaken. The discussion upon the Franchise Bill and the necessity for abolishing it is going on. He is labouring under the delusion, also, that he has taught a lesson to my hon. friend from Bothwell, and that that gentleman has taken it to heart. When we find the hon. Minister under a delusion of that kind, we are inclined to handle him gently, for we know that he must be very tender and very soft and very susceptible to be so deluded. He talks about the practice in England, and undertakes to give my hon. friend a lesson upon that subject. I am afraid the hon. Minister's ignorance of what is the rule of debate in the British House of Commons is, as Mark Twain used to say, wide and comprehensive.

He is labouring under a third delusion, judging from his didactic tone, that he can fill his father's shoes, talk with his father's voice, and use his father's manner of addressing the members of this House. As I have had occasion to say, once before, as the old cock crows, the young cock learns; but I regret still to be obliged to repeat what I said two years ago, that, although the young cock crows very much after the manner of the old cock, his voice is still only the voice of a spring chicken. I am not alluding to the trouble in the hon. gentleman's chest, of which I am very sorry to hear, but to the manner in which he places his ideas before the House.

Sir, he has told us that the discussion of the navy Estimates and army Estimates in England is not a case in point, because these Estimates are for ships to be built in future. Did it never occur to him that supplementary estimates might be required while these ships were building? Does he not know that the whole policy of the Government in building these ships comes up in review on supplementary estimates? Does he not know that the Opposition have a right to say and do say to the Government, under those circumstances, Look at the amount of expenditure in which you have involved the country. We told you when you began to build these ships that they were going to cost twice as much as you estimated, and here we find our warning borne out by the facts.

Of course, the Opposition do say that whenever they get a chance; and the Opposition here have a right to say, and they have said, and will say, that the necessity of these Supplementary Estimates for carrying out the Franchise Act, shows that that Act was ill-considered, that it was oppressive, that it was expensive, that it was unfair, that it was an Act that never should have been put on the statute-book, and that it should be removed as soon as possible.

Why, Sir, how long is it since the hon. gentleman's late lamented leader had a Bill before this House to do away with this Franchise Act? Last session. It went through some stages, and why did it stop? Sir John Thompson gave the reason himself; he said, I wish this Bill to go through. I think it is a thing that ought to be done; but there is an influential and important minority of the party who do not want it put through this session; but I will see that it goes through next session. That was the position of the leader of the Government in regard to the Franchise Bill last year.

Sir, if Sir John Thompson had lived, we would now be discussing a Government Bill to repeal this Franchise Act and to substitute something which the Government considered better. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was among the important minority who objected to that repeal going through last session; perhaps he was one of those who thought it might be convenient that the lists for the coming elections should be made on the old plan rather than on a new and improved plan. Perhaps it may have been the Minister of Finance. It may have been the hon. gentleman who is now Secretary of State, and who had already then begun to have an influence in the councils of the party. At all events, Sir John Thompson was committed to the principle of repealing this Act, and yet the Minister of Justice, his successor in office, and in office alone, comes down to the House and says the Opposition have no right to discuss the Franchise Bill on an item for expense involved in carrying out that Act during the past year.

Now, Sir, there are several things that require to be discussed, even from the point of view of a Minister of Finance, in connection with this item, before it can be allowed to pass. One is the printing of the lists elsewhere than in the Printing Bureau. When the Printing Bureau was established, I believe it was made the law, speaking from recollection, that all Government printing should be done there, that the printing of the voters' lists in particular should be done. And yet we found, during the past winter, that the Government, in their reckless haste to be ready for an early election, in their haste to avoid the exposures of the financial incapacity, of the deficits, &c., that would be caused by a session, in their haste to go to the country on an unfinished record, ordered the printing of some voters' lists elsewhere than in the Printing Bureau. That is one reason why we should demand from the Minister of Finance an explanation as to how he justifies this breach of the law in having these lists printed elsewhere than where they ought to be printed. It will take the hon. Minister some time to explain that. He will also have to explain his selection of newspaper offices in which to have

these lists printed. He will have to explain why some were given to the "Orange Sentinel," some to the "Catholic Register," some to the Methodist Book Room, some to the manufacturers' organ, some to the importers' organ, and so on. It will give him a little exercise to explain all these particulars, and I think we should have them before we pass this vote, even for the money that has been already contracted for and expended. Now, when the Minister has satisfied the curiosity which the House must feel in these respects, we shall be at liberty to go on further with the discussion of the general principle involved, and to prove conclusively that this Act should never have been put upon the statute-book, and that it should be repealed as soon as possible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Speaking to the motion for adjournment, if the House had been sitting very late for a number of nights together, it might seem reasonable to adjourn early, as we did last night, but this being Friday night, and no sitting to-morrow, the motion to adjourn which was made at 10.20 o'clock, is something rather unusual. The House could have gone on at any rate for another hour very well. The reason assigned by the Minister for moving it is that a discussion has sprung up upon a certain item in the estimates, and in a manner somewhat peevish, and not becoming the dignity of the leader of the House, it seems to me, and in order to avoid a discussion, he moves, in a rather petulant manner, that the committee rise. Now, has he any idea that his motion will stop the discussion on this item? That is no reason to assign why the committee should rise and report. If my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is discussing a matter which is not relevant and which is out of order, the proper way, Sir, is to appeal to your ruling, and have it decided. But the Minister did not venture to do anything of that kind, because he knew very well that you would not rule in that direction, and that my hon. friend was speaking on a subject that was quite relevant. He could not take exception to his remarks by raising the point of order; therefore he adopted this other course. Now, I object to that. I object to it because it seems to bear upon its face an idea on his part that he could stop discussion of this most important matter. Now, as to whether a discussion is pertinent or not, remember that the Secretary of State has told us that $200,000 was voted last year for a revision of the voters' lists. That was granted. It was not granted without opposition on the part of those who sit on this side of the House, because they objected to the bill, they objected to the expenditure connected with it, and the wonder is that the hon. gentleman opposite did not also object. If you were to take the sum of $200,000 alone, it represents an additional to the national debt of between four or five millions; and when you propose another $40,000 for the same purpose, making $240,000 in all, it means that the maintenance of this Act is equivalent to adding $6,000,000 to the public debt of Canada, and at present we are not in a position very well to stand these additions. And when the hon. member for Bothwell finds that the House having granted, not without protest last year from this side of the House, $200,000 for this purpose, when he finds the Secretary of State asking for another $40,000 in addition, it seems to me that it was inevitable that the Minister should expect the Act itself, in its various bearings, and with its consequences, must come under review. As I said before, the Minister himself recognizes that it is legitimate, for the reason that he did not venture to take the point of order to the chair, but has taken this unusual proceeding of seeking to stop the business of the country in order that he might thereby stifle the deabte. Sir, what will be accomplished if the committee do rise an hour or an hour and a half before the proper time? When the item appears again, this subject will come under review and be discussed again; but if it comes up to-night and was participated in on both sides, it could have been finished, it may be, so far as this item is concerned, and the business of the country would have progressed that far. The Minister says his object in moving to adjourn the debate was to promote more speedy legislation in the House; but can he not see that he fails entirely in that object, and that he has simply, through an exhibition of temper on his part, prevented the proper legislation of the House from going on? When the House resumes, the debate will start again at the point at which it has left off, and he will only have succeeded by his motion in taking an hour and a half's work off the House, and lengthening the session by that time. As one anxious to get through the business of the House in a fair way and leave the capital as soon as possible, I regret that the hon. gentleman has seen fit at 10.20 o'clock to make this proposition, because he became a little annoyed by remarks made by an hon. member who was perfectly within his right in making them, and who was simply discharging his duty in making them, and thus tend to lengthen the session.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd June, 1894.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Ottawa Land and Security Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FLINT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the House if he can tell us when it is at all likely that the members of the House will be in possession of printed copies of the Report of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic? I ask this question, because I have a notice on the Order paper of an important motion in which a large number of people are interested, as well as the members of this House; and I do not wish to proceed with that motion, in fact I shall not be prepared to proceed, until the report of the commission is in the hands of the members. Of course I shall have to proceed with the motion without that report being in the hands of members, if it is too long delayed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I informed my hon. friend that the report, on presentation, was sent to the Printing Committee, but as the committee had not been able to meet, owing to the absence of the Senate members of the committee, I had sent it over to the printing department. I have since asked the Queen's Printer to facilitate the printing of the report with all possible despatch. I am not able to say when it will be ready, but if I can get the information I will inform my hon. friend to-morrow.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

THE LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. McDonald, Assiniboia.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to say a word or two more with regard to a point brought up on the previous occasion, concerning the bonding power. I was saying the other day that the litigation between the bondholders and stockholders in this road had developed the fact that there is a mortgage on the bonds amounting to $15,000 a mile, and the present shareholders are prepared to allow 180 miles to go—at any rate that is what I understand is put forward as the reason for passing this Bill. They say that if the litigation is decided in favour of the bondholders that they will want another outlet for their 42 miles which are not covered by bonds. It seems to me that fact is convincing proof of the justice of the criticism of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in stating that this House should not allow so great bonding powers to these railways. It is admitted that the old railway, which passes through a fine section of country and has already developed considerable earning powers, is not worth more than the bonds that are against it, $15,000 a mile; and yet this company comes and asks to be allowed to bond a railway through a country in which there are very few settlers indeed.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman correct in his statement that there are only $15,000 of first bonds?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, there are $15,000 a mile against it, £3,000 of English money. If the suggestion put forward by the bondholders in asking for this legislation be correct, that the result of the litigation may end in their obtaining 180 miles of road, that seems to prove the justice of the criticism offered against giving so large a bonding power, and it seems wrong for this House to give to the same persons power to bond a railway through a very much inferior country for the same amount. If it be true that one section cannot earn interest on more than $15,000 per mile, how can a railway from Moosomin to Langenburg, through which country the soil is light, and there are only a few settlers, earn interest on $15,000 per mile? In nearly all these railways built in that portion of Canada, as in other portions of Canada, the interest of the promoters lies in the building of the railway as regards the money they can obtain on the bonds. Once the bonds are floated, the interest of the promoters is gone—they have no further interest in the railway. Whenever the money they can make out of the construction and the commissions which come out of the bonds is secured by them, the railway is abandoned to the bondholders; and the effect on the public is this, that a railway has been built through a section of country to serve that section, it is not possible to expect another railway to be built there, and the settlers along the line must pay sufficiently high freight rates to pay interest on the bonds, the real fact being that a very large proportion of the money realized on the sale of the bonds

is not put into the construction of the railway. The suggestion made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is, that it is the duty of this House to protect settlers along the line of railway, because the moment such settlers petition the Railway Committee of the Privy Council asking for lower freight rates, the answer given is that the freight rates already charged are not sufficient to pay interest on the bonds. So the House should intervene, and refuse to sanction any railway bonding its properties for a larger sum than the amount put into construction.

Mr. LISTER. It seems to me that what the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has said does not cover all the ground. A very important point has been altogether omitted. What are the facts as regards these roads? Here is a railway consisting of two sections run as one road. The owners have bonded a portion of the railway for $15,000 per mile. Litigation has arisen between the bondholders and stockholders. The owners of the road now say to the bondholders: You may bond a portion of the road for $15,000 per mile and realize on it as you may; so far as we are concerned, we will make another connection. Thus there is thrown on the bondholders a road on which they loaned their money, and the effect of this action is to cause them to lose the whole of their investment. I ask the promoter of the Bill whether the bondholders have been notified? As I understand, litigation is now pending between the bondholders and stockholders. The evident purpose of this legislation is to hold this Act as a sword over the heads of the bondholders, and it is a question for the members of this House to decide whether they will be a party to the scheme which would have the effect of destroying entirely the investment of the bondholders. I do not think we should sanction such legislation, at all events until the rights of all parties in the road have been legislated upon and decided by the courts before which their claims are now being litigated. Before this legislation is carried through this House, all the people who hold bonds and securities should have an opportunity of attending and opposing the proposed legislation, or, at all events, of asking Parliament to secure their claims as far as possible. This is one of those arrangements which we sanction so often. A number of men—and no doubt this was the case as regards this company—apply for and receive a subsidy in the form of a land grant, and they bond the road for a larger sum than it will cost, and subsequently when they find the undertaking is no longer profitable, and they cannot make an arrangement with the bondholders, they say, Very well, if you do not do so, we will apply to Parliament and obtain an Act to construct another road. If these are the facts, it would be entirely improper to pass the legislation now proposed.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether this is a proper time or place to discuss the principle of the Bill. No objection, however, has been made to the principle of the Bill, either before the committee or in this House. The agent of the English bondholders, Mr. Rankin, in Montreal, is well aware of the legislation proposed, and no objection to the principle of the Bill was put forward in the Railway Committee. As to the amount of bonds which should be issued on these roads, and the principle on which the committee should sanction the issue, I think we should establish the principle laid down by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the committee should not sanction the issue of bonds in excess of the amount required for the construction of the road. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has stated that $15,000 per mile is far in excess of the amount required. I have a statement of the cost of other portions of the road similar to this about to be undertaken, and the amount expended on the road in actual cash, exclusive of all charges for commission, discount, exchange or interest, is largely in excess of that amount named. On the first division, the cost exceeded $20,000 per mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was that built?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe it was commenced in 1882. The fourth division, covering 50 miles, includes very heavy work in the Bird-tail and Assiniboia valleys, and the actual cash expenditure was over $40,000 per mile.

Mr. MARTIN. That includes crossing the Assiniboia with a very expensive bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. That section now under consideration has to cross both the Assiniboia and the Qu'Appelle.

Mr. DALY. Oh, yes, this line will have to cross the Assiniboine River, of course.

Mr. MARTIN. It crosses the Qu'Appelle River, but I do not see how it crosses the Assiniboine.

Mr. HAGGART. The statement to me is that it crosses both rivers, and the plan shows it. Suppose they actually get $1 cash for each one dollar in bonds, it would not more than build the road, and I think the bonding powers asked by this company are very moderate. The engineer of my department estimates the ordinary cost of building a road in that section of the country, exclusive of these bridges, at from $12,000 to $12,500 per mile. That includes the rolling stock, and the building of the road, and the rails. These bonds generally realize about 80 cents on the dollar, which would amount to about $12,000 per mile, so that they are not asking any bonding power that is not absolutely necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are some features of this measure that the Minister of Railways has not discussed. The road from Portage la Prairie up to Yorkton runs in a north-westerly direction, and it is a continuous road. The bondholders control a very considerable portion of that road lying nearest to the Portage. Then you propose to begin at Langenburg and to build a road in a southerly direction, to cut off the northern portion already constructed, and to convert it into a portion of another road, which will make one continuous road of what you propose to build; not running in a straight line, but the southern portion diverging much further westerly than the present line. What will be the effect of that? The hon. gentleman knows that if you build a road from Langenburg, you turn away all the trade of the road beyond that point towards Prince Albert. You will cut off a large portion of the traffic from the road as it is now constructed, and render that portion between Langenburg and Portage la Prairie of comparatively little value. Ought Parliament to do a thing of that sort, and ought the Minister of Railways lend his influence as a Minister of the Crown to carry out such a scheme? The hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Masson) stated the other day, that I had changed my views with regard to this matter, and that I had formerly favoured the free construction of railways. Well, Sir, I believe it is the proper system, and I think so still. But, when I proposed that scheme to the House I provided that 10 per cent of the cost should be deposited with the Government as an evidence of the good faith of the companies which propose to undertake a line of road. People will not knowingly invest their money in a line of railway unless they can make a comparatively fair dividend upon their investment. But what the Minister of Railways proposes now is that the Government should lend its countenance and support to the construction of a road from Portage la Prairie to Yorkton, and render two-thirds or three-fourths of that road of comparatively little value by the construction of another line, if it be constructed. As I understand the matter, there is litigation at present between the bondholders and the stockholders of the road, and this is simply putting a weapon into the hands of the stockholders to compel the bondholders to surrender and yield to their terms. The Government ought not to lend itself, and Parliament ought not to be called upon to lend itself to a scheme of that sort. No one will pretend to say that this road is a necessity at the present time, or that it would be an advantage to the North-west Territories to construct it. On the contrary, it will render 180 miles of existing railway of comparatively little value, if it is carried out. Now, who would put any confidence in Parliament and in the proceedings of Parliament, if, after having put their money into a structure of that sort, they found Parliament lending itself to a scheme to render their investment comparatively worthless? That is what the Government are doing now. That is what they are asking Parliament to do, and I say that ought not to be done. I have no hesitation in saying that we would do a serious injustice if we were to intervene in the present litigation between the stockholders and bondholders, by a measure of this sort. If the bondholders were unreasonable, if they were acting in an unjust and unfair way; if the Minister of Railways had been called upon to arbitrate between the parties and they would refuse to agree to what was fair and reasonable, then the coercive power of Parliament might be invoked in this way to secure fair terms. But nothing of that sort has transpired, so far as we know. No information of that sort is before the House or the committee, and I think that, under existing circumstances, the hon. Minister ought not to lend his power in the House to the furtherance of this scheme.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman surely was not listening to my remarks. I did not discuss the principle of the Bill, and I stated that the committee stage was not the time to do that. I said that the parties who were most interested, if there was any objection to the principle of the Bill, were the bondholders on that section of the road next Portage la Prairie. They were offering no objection. They see no reason why the request of the owners of the other portion of the road should not be complied with. I think, therefore, it is superfluous for Parliament to step in, with a view to protecting interested parties who have no complaint to make themselves, and who do not ask the intervention of Parliament or of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were the bondholders represented when the Bill was before the committee?

Mr. HAGGART. The bondholders had the usual notice of the application for the Bill, as everybody else has. Messrs. Hanson Brothers, in Montreal, are the agents for the bondholders, and I am sure they must be aware of this legislation. If they had any objection to offer to the principle of this Bill, it was their duty to appear before the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. I would suggest to the Minister one consideration upon which we would be entitled to intervene, without the application of the bondholders. With regard to that portion of the railway which is mentioned as a branch from Langenburg to Binscarth, I suggest that it is against public policy that we should charter

a line to parallel another line to which we have given a large subsidy. Binscarth might be considered the centre of the stock-raising district, and that is now supplied by the Manitoba and North-western Railway. If this road were built from Langenburg to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and then to Binscarth, it would be a competitor for the trade of the stock-raising district of Russell. Now, if we could be certain that that competition would result in the lowering of rates to the people of that country, I would have nothing whatever to say against it. But we know very well that that is not the fact in all cases of this kind; and we know that the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company are not at present in a position to give to the settlers along its line that degree of railway accommodation they are entitled to, because the traffic will not warrant it. That being so, is it judicious and proper for this Parliament, from its own standpoint, having devoted 6,400 acres of its land to the building of the first line of the Manitoba and North-western Railway, to sanction the building by these gentlemen of a parallel line from Binscarth to Langenburg? There is only one crossing of the Assiniboine on this line and I doubt very much if the Minister of Railways' estimate is not a good deal too high for the present cost of railway building in that country. I know that in dealing with the Northern Pacific we found that it was possible to build the road for a great deal less than that; and I am satisfied that considerably less than $10,000 a mile will cover the cost of building and equipping railways in the country through which this railway runs. At all events, the point taken by the hon. member for North York is that the committee should thoroughly investigate the question of cost before agreeing to the bonding power, and there has been no such investigation beyond the mere statement of the promoters as to the probale cost. Under the circumstances, there does seem to be a case for consideration whether it is judicious and proper on our part after having granted this large bonus of 6,400 acres per mile, much of which has been sold for from $5 to $7 an acre, to allow the same men who got that land grant, to build another railway alongside of the first one, when the present railway company are obliged to charge freight rates very much in excess of what the people in the district can afford to pay, in order to pay anything like interest on the bonds against the existing line.

Mr. DALY. I understand that the original objection to this Bill, as raised by the hon. member for North York, was that Parliament was giving power to this railway company to bond their line in excess of what was necessary to build the railway. According to the Bill as printed, the bonding privilege is limited to $20,000 per mile; the committee reduced that to $15,000 per mile. Now, it seems to me that the best evidence that we can get as to what is requisite to build a line of railway in that country, is furnished by the local legislature of the province of Manitoba, which has already bonused the Manitoba and North-western Railway. I find that as late as the session of 1893 that legislature passed an Act entitled an Act respecting Aid to Railways, in clause 4 of which power is given to a company called the Lake Manitoba and Canal Company, to issue bonds to the extent of $16,000 per mile; and by a prior clause the Government undertakes to lend the company $9,000 a mile, making this loan a second lien on the railway, after giving power to the company to issue $7,000 a mile of first mortgage bonds. This line of railway was to run from Portage la Prairie through the Dauphin district, where there are no obstructions to make the line expensive to build, such as the crossing of the Assiniboine in this case, but only the level prairie.

Mr. MARTIN. The Riding Mountain has to be crossed.

Mr. DALY. No, the line does not touch the Riding Mountain. It is an ordinary prairie line 125 miles long; and, according to the estimates, it was to cost $16,000 per mile. I also find that by an Act passed by the Manitoba legislature to incorporate the Melita and Northern Railway Company, to construct a railway from the international boundary to Melita in a westerly direction, bonding powers were given to the company to the extent of $25,000 per mile; and this was purely a prairie road. Now, it seems to me that if the local legislature and the Government of Manitoba, the members of which have a direct and immediate knowledge of the cost of building lines of railway in that country, have been willing to grant bonding powers to the extent of $16,000 per mile in one case and $25,000 per mile in another case, for railways exactly similar to this one, this Parliament may well be guided by the example of the local legislature. As has been shown by the Minister of Railways, it cost $22,000 a mile to build the first fifty miles of the Manitoba and North-western Railway. Since then the cost of railway building has been lessened; but in any case the cost of building and equipping will not be less than $14,000 per mile; and at $15,000 a mile the sale of the bonds at 80 cents on the dollar will barely realize the actual cost of construction and equipment. The hon. member for Lambton seemed to labour under the impression that this railway is to parallel the Manitoba and North-western, in which the bondholders are interested. Now, the bondholders have bonds on the railway for a distance of 180 miles, from Portage la Prairie to Langenburg, and as that railway runs through a good country, it is going to be a paying concern; and I cannot see how the construction

of this railway from Langenburg to Elkhorn is going to affect the traffic from Langenburg to Portage la Prairie. It is all very well to talk about the rights of the bondholders; but the people who built the railway from Langenburg to Yorkton have rights as well as the bondholders, and it seems to me that the bondholders are attempting to squeeze out the men who put their cash into the construction of that line. If the rights of these people are guarded, I cannot see how that will effect the rights of the bondholders of the line from Langenburg to Portage la Prairie. They are getting to-day all the earnings of the railway afforded by the traffic between those two points, which was all that the company undertook to give them when the bonds were issued.

Bill reported.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST LOAN COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 53) respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Denison.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved that the following clause be substituted for clause No. 1:—

The company may hold such real estate as is necessary for the transaction of its business, or such real estate as, being mortgaged or hypothecated to it, is acquired by it for the protection of its investments,—and may from time to time sell, mortgage, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same; provided always that it shall be incumbent on the company to sell any real estate acquired in satisfaction of any debt within seven years after it has been so acquired, otherwise it shall revert to the previous owner or his heirs or assigns. Provided further, that any real estate acquired in satisfaction of any debt before the passage of this Act, and now vested in the company, may be retained for the term of seven years from the passage of this Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why did the Banking and Commerce Committee substitute that clause for the old one?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Because the Committee on Standing Orders reported that these amendments were not covered by the notice which was given and the petition presented to the House, so that the committee could not adopt the clause. The only way it can be inserted in the Bill is to move it in the committee of the whole House. The clause was considered by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and the form presented is the form in which they consider it should be inserted in the Bill. It is similar to the clause in all Bills of this character and to the clause in the General Company's Act, with this exception, that this company is allowed to retain for seven years any real estate it may now have. The reason the company ask that is because most of their investments are in Manitoba, and it is very difficult to dispose of land there at present.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I opposed this measure as being one foreign to our functions, when introduced some years ago, and I now again make my protest against legislation of this sort by this Parliament. Those companies are essentially local in their nature and character, and the security you undertake to enable them to acquire is, except in the North-west Territories, security under the jurisdiction of the local legislature. The whole system is vicious of encouraging companies to come here for incorporation and legislation of this nature. A company, when incorporated, is an artificial person, and may exercise the rights of any other person, so far as its franchise may permit, in any country where it is permitted to operate. Such companies ought not to come here for incorporation.

Bill reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Dominion Trust Companies.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, When do the Government expect to bring into operation the several clauses of the French treaty relating to the importation of goods from that country? What has caused the delay in bringing the provisions of the treaty into operation? When does the Government expect to apply the provisions of the treaty to the several classes of goods named therein?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a Bill now before the House for second reading which it is necessary to pass before the ratifications can take place, and the treaty come into operation. Of course, that explains the delay—legislation was necessary. The treaty will come into operation as soon as the Bill is passed and ratification has taken place.

MAGOG WHARF.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. Rider) asked, What use has been made of the $2,500 voted in 1894 for Magog wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. Steps are now being taken, through the Department of Justice, to procure the transfer of the property from the present owners.

GOVERNMENT LAND IN IBERVILLE.

Mr. BECHARD asked. Has the Government land situated on the east side of the Richelieu River, in the county of Iberville, opposite Isle aux Noix, and containing some 195 acres in superficies, been sold? If so, on what date, at what price, and what is the name of the purchaser?

Mr. FOSTER. The property in question, consisting of 135 acres, 2 rods, 5 perches, was sold for $600 to Hiram Sewell Foster. Patent dated 16th May, 1894. The purchaser is no relation of mine, I may say.

Mr. LAURIER. Except a political relation.

Mr. FRECHETTE, for Mr. Lepine. How much does the letter-box carrying service, in Montreal, cost yearly? Who performs the service? When does the contract expire? Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to renew the contract without tender, as he did last time?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that that service costs yearly $5,374. The contractor is M. P. Kennedy. The contract will expire on the 31st August, 1895. The authority for the renewing of M. Kennedy's contract has been given on the 21st March, 1895.

Mr. LAURIER. What Kennedy is that—Kennedy of the bridge?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. LAURIER. What is his name?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. His name is P. Kennedy.

J. EARL HALLIWELL'S PENSION.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Does J. Earl Halliwell, of Sterling, receive a pension? If so, how much, and for what service, and when granted? Is he now in good health? If so, will the pension continue? What is his occupation?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. J. Earl Halliwell, of Sterling, receives a pension. The pension is $280 per annum, on account of wounds received at Batoche on the 12th May, 1885, by a bullet entering in front of left shoulder joint. The pension was granted by Order in Council of 26th January, 1886. Mr. Halliwell's pension has been paid until now, on the receipt by the department of the required medical certificate showing that he still labours under the effect of above-mentioned wounds. The pension will continue so long as Mr. Halliwell has not recovered from the effect of the wounds. He was a law student at the time the pension was granted.

PHILIPPE S. BOURASSA.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Choquette) asked, whether Philippe S. Bourassa, inspector of Weights and Measures for the city and district of Quebec, was suspended from duty between 1st January, 1894, and 1st January, 1895? If so, for what reasons; during how many months was he suspended; has he been reinstated in his position, and if so, since what date?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that Mr. Bourassa was not suspended during the period mentioned.

LANGEVIN BLOCK—CLAIM FOR EXTRAS.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked. 1. Was any answer sent to the letter dated 29th November, 1894, to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, from Mr. A. Charlebois, respecting his claim for extras for work on the Langevin block? 2. Has the Minister of Public Works considered or dealt with such claim? If so, what has been the Minister's decision? 3. Has any money been allowed or paid in respect of such claim? If so, what is the amount, and when was it allowed, and when paid? 4. Has the Minister of Public Works made any report to Council respecting such claim, or the payment or allowance of any sum on account of such claim? 5. Has any Order in Council been passed respecting such claim, or any such allowance or payment?

Mr. FOSTER. The answer to each of these questions is a negative.

I.C.R.—SUMMER TIME-TABLE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Carroll) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Railway authorities to change the time-table for the express trains on the Intercolonial Railway about the 20th June next? Is it true that the express train from Halifax, which used to reach Lévis, last summer at 11.30 a.m., will not, under the proposed new time-table, reach Lévis until 4.30 p.m.? Is the Government aware that the proposed change would be much to the detriment of the travelling public of the district of Quebec? Is it the intention of the Government to see that the said change shall not be made, and that the Halifax express shall reach Lévis, as it did last summer, at 11.30 a.m.?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the intention to put the summer time-table in force on the Intercolonial Railway on the 24th June, and it is proposed to change the time of the express trains. The time-table is not yet fully completed, therefore, I cannot say exactly the hours the Halifax express train will reach Lévis, but it will be some time in the afternoon. The attention of

the Government has been drawn to the subject, which is receiving careful consideration. It is necessary that the Halifax express, which is a fast through train, should reach Lévis in the afternoon.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AS BROKERS.

Mr. FRASER asked, Does the Department of Customs intend issuing instructions to inspectors of customs to direct collectors of customs receiving less than $400 a year not to act as brokers in the ports or other places where they are collectors, in conformity with the rule of the department, as given in reply to the question put on the subject on the 20th May, 1895?

Mr. WALLACE. I may say that officers of customs have already been instructed from time to time, that they are not to act as customs brokers. The original regulation was to the following effect:—

> Officers of customs are not, either in their own name, or in the name of, or in company or in partnership with any other person, to trade as merchants or as factors, agents or brokers for any person, in any goods, wares or merchandise whatever, or in any matter whatever, affecting the customs.

In the month of April, 1894, this was supplemented by an order addressed to all collectors, setting forth that:

> There must, positively, be no charge made, or expense incurred of any kind beyond postage, if any, and the proper amount of customs duty.

Then, again, in the month of October, of the year 1888, the attention of customs officers was called by departmental instruction, to that regulation. If it be found necessary, the department will again issue a circular letter of instruction to collectors of customs calling their attention to the fact that customs officers are not allowed to act as brokers, except in the case referred to in my former answer —that of settlers crossing the frontier, when collectors have permission to make free entry of settlers' effects, but nothing more.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS FROM McINTYRE'S STATION.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. At what date were the mails ordered to be carried from McIntyre's Station instead of Hawkesbury, on the route from Hawkesbury to Sydney, C.B.? 2. Was any payment made to the contractor, or any other person or persons, when such change was made? If so, what were the grounds for such payment?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Port Hawkesbury and Sydney main route was replaced by the route between McIntyre's Station and Sydney on 15th December, 1894. No payments were made by the department on this occasion.

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL.

Mr. LISTER asked, What are the names of the several persons appointed to the permanent staff of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal? When was each of such persons appointed, and what is the salary of each? Has the canal been opened for traffic? If so, when? How many vessels, including steamers, have passed through since the canal was opened? Has application been made to the managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Beatty line of steamers to pass through said canal instead of the one on the American side? If so, what answer, if any, has been received? Do such managers refuse to use the said Canadian canal?

Mr. HAGGART. (1.) Mr. Boyd, superintendent; Mr. Montague, electrician, and Mr. Taylor, electrician. (2.) Mr. Boyd was appointed on 28th May, 1895; Mr. Montague, 18th June, 1894; Mr. Taylor, 8th March, 1895. Mr. Boyd's salary is $150 per month; Mr. Montague's, $75; and Mr. Taylor's, $60. (3.) The canal has not yet been opened for traffic, and will not be until the channels through it approaching the canal at each end are proved, by sweeping, to be clear of obstructions in the shape of rocks. (4.) One, the steam tug "Booth." (5.) Neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor the Beatty line have applied to pass their vessels through the Canadian canal. (6.) The managers do not refuse to use the Canadian canals, so far as my knowledge goes.

MR. SUTTON AND THE ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked, Whether Mr. Sutton has recently been appointed to the Royal Canadian Dragoons? If so, when? Was he recommended for such appointment by Major General Herbert, or did the Major General refuse to recommend him? On whose recommendation was he appointed? Who were the applicants for the position? Were any of them graduates of the Royal Military College? If so, how many and what are their names? Where did Mr. Sutton reside at the time of his appointment?

Mr. WALLACE (in absence of the Minister of Militia). (1.) Mr. Sutton was recently appointed to the Royal Canadian Dragoons. (2.) By Order in Council of 1st April, 1895. (3.) There is no record in the department of any such recommendation. (4.) On the recommendation of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence. (5.) The records of the department show only the following applicants:—Lieut. Hon. Elphinston, Manitoba Dragoons; Lieut. R. Cock-

burn, 3rd Cavalry ; Capt. A. Sweatman, 10th Batt. (6.) None of these was a graduate of the Royal Military College. (7.) None. (8.) Mr. Sutton was a resident of Quebec at the time of his appointment.

CAP ST. IGNACE STATION, I.C.R.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, According to the new time-table on the Intercolonial Railway, is the Halifax express going to stop at Cap St. Ignace station, as requested for a long time past and badly wanted by the general public and business men ? If not, why not ?

Mr. HAGGART. The time-table is not yet fully completed, therefore I cannot say exactly the hour the Halifax express train will reach Lévis, but it will be some time in the afternoon. As it is a through fast express, it is not possible to stop at the numerous small stations along the line.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. This is a large and important station.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPERIAL HONOURS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether His Excellency, in lately making recommendations to the Imperial authorities for Imperial honours, has acted on his own motion or on the advice of his Ministers ?

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say that it is presumed His Excellency acted in accordance with well-established principles in his recommendations for Imperial honours.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY AND SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked. Has the Government any intimation to the effect that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not make use of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal (when opened for traffic) for their line of steamers ? If so, what is the reason for their not so using it ?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have had no intimation of the kind.

CADETS AT ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked. What is the total number of cadets now in attendance at the Royal Military College, Kingston ?

Mr. DICKEY. Fifty-four, one being reported on sick leave.

No. 3. BATTERY, QUEBEC GARRISON ARTILLERY.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Langelier) moved for :

Copies of all papers and correspondence in connection with the disbandment of No. 3 Battery, Quebec Garrison Artillery.

Mr. DICKEY moved that the words "not confidential" be inserted after the word "correspondence" in said motion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. DUPONT (for Mr. Lavergne) moved for :

Statement showing the gross earnings of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway since the 30th day of June, 1894. Also, a statement showing the total expenditure of said railway from said period. Also, a statement showing the total expenditure of said railway from the same period on the following accounts respectively :—(a). Wages and salaries of employees. (b). Payments to the president as such. (c). Payments to the directors as such. (d). Payments for other working expenses. (e). Payments on construction account not included in above.

Mr. HAGGART. I can only assent to the motion on condition that I can only be expected to bring down what information asked for is furnished to my department. Some of it may not be under my control and my officers may not be able to get it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the House understands that the hon. Minister will bring down only such papers as are in his department in connection with this motion.

Mr. LAURIER. That includes all departments of Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, under the control of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL CONTRACT—MR. JOS. LAMONTAGNE.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT moved for :

Copies of the contract made between the Postmaster General and Mr. Jos. Lamontagne, on 1st July, 1894, for carrying the mail between Lake Etchemin and St. Rose de Watford ; also, of all documents, correspondence, tenders and inspectors' reports in relation to the cancelling of the said contract, and of the new contract subsequently made by the Government, and of the tenders that preceded it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no objection to the motion, but I beg to move in amendment :

That the word "inspectors" in the said motion be struck out, and the words "other than confidential" be inserted after the word "reports."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THOUSAND ISLANDS—SALE.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Taylor) moved for :

Return showing the number of islands sold from the Thousand Island group, in the River St. Law-

rence, during the years 1874 to 1878, inclusive, to whom sold, the price at which each separate parcel was sold, and the average price per acre for the total acreage sold. Also, a similar return for the years 1879 to 1894, inclusive.

Mr. FLINT. I move in amendment that the return be brought down to 1895.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

HURON INDIANS AT LORETTE.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Superintedent of Indian Affairs, the chiefs of the Huron Tribe at Lorette, and Agent Bastien, since 1886.

Mr. DALY. I would say to the hon. gentleman that the compliance with this order would mean a great deal of work, as the correspondence is very voluminous, amounting to a thousand letters or more. If the hon. gentleman would indicate the particular correspondence he wants, there would be no difficulty in bringing it down.

Mr. LAURIER. As I cannot state just now what correspondence is required, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

DEPOSITS OF SAW-DUST, ETC.

Mr. FORBES moved for :

Return giving copies of all surveys and plans and reports of the Government engineers or officers, and including the report of chief officer Veith on any rivers in Nova Scotia, made with the object of ascertaining what rivers should be exempted from the operation of the Fisheries Act and amendment passed in 1894.

He said : This motion was put on the Order paper previous to the introduction of Bill No. 67 by the Minister of Marine for the further amendment of the Fisheries Act. My reason for doing so was the statement made in the Senate by the hon. Senator Angers, Minister of Agriculture, in answer to a motion of Senator Clemow respecting the same Act. Senator Angers said :

There was no objection to the motion being acceded to. And as it had been stated that interested parties, the mill-owners, had during recess been moving concerning the lumbering interests, especially at Ottawa, it was likely that some Bill would be introduced in this or the other House so as to modify the Act and save the lumbering interests in this section of the country, and also save some other interests on the St. John River.

It seems to me that since that statement the Government have introduced the Bill (No. 67), which practically repeals the legislation of 1894, in so far as that legislation took away from the Government the right to exercise their discretion in exempting certain rivers from the operation of the Act. The Bill now introduced really restores that discretion to the Government for the further period of two years. I think it will be necessary to have the documents for which I am now moving before us when discussing this Bill. It would seem that the Government intend only to exempt certain rivers, those in the vicinity of Ottawa and those near St. John, from the operation of the old Act prohibiting the deposit of saw-dust and other mill refuse in rivers. These returns will make it clear that there are other rivers, especially some in the province of Nova Scotia, entitled to the same privilege. I will not go into a discussion of the matter now, but would merely say that if the Government are going to make any exemptions at all, they should not show any partiality or favour. There are others rivers to which the exemption should equally apply as well as the rivers Ottawa and St. John. Especially is this the case in one or two rivers in Halifax and Lunenburg Counties, two in the county of Queen's, namely, the Liverpool and the Medway rivers, and one in the county of Shelburne. The two years notice that is to be given may be sufficient to enable the mill-owners to change their mills, but if any permanent exemptions are to be allowed, as indicated by Minister Angers, then, Sir, I claim that the above named rivers in Queen's and Shelburne must be exempt as well as the Ottawa and St. John. That is the notice given, as I construe section 2 and 3 of the new Act.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not discuss the Bill.

Mr. FORBES. I do not intend to discuss the Bill, Mr. Speaker, but to point out the effect upon the community at large of what I understand, from the newspaper criticisms, are the proposals of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I gather that notice will be given, and occupiers and users of the rivers will, to a certain extent gather the idea that the Government intended to exempt the St. John and Ottawa rivers only from the operation of the Act. Therefore it is that I want to impress upon the Government the necessity of gathering all the information they possibly can and of being safely guided in the course they are taking in introducing and carrying through this Act. The motion which I am now making will result in bringing before the House the report of chief officer Veith upon nearly all the rivers of Nova Scotia, except a few which, I think, I shall be able to show he was not instructed to visit. It may be, when the report is brought down, and if when the Government have made themselves cognizant of the details of that report there is not sufficient information to be found, that the officer may be instructed to revisit the province of Nova Scotia with the view to the investigation of other rivers than those reported upon, with the object to get further light upon this important question.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am very anxious indeed that the request that has just been made by the hon. member for Queen's. N.S. (Mr. Forbes), should be granted and that the inspector should be authorized to inspect some of the rivers in the maritime provinces, particularly the La Have, in the county of Lunenburg, and supplement the same in his report. The La Have River has been a bone of contention for many years, the mill-owners there contending that their rights have been infringed upon. They contrast the treatment that has been meted out to them with that meted out to mill-owners upon rivers that have been exempted. The fact that upon other rivers owners have been permitted to continue running the saw-dust into the rivers regardless of results, while they on the La Have have been prohibited from doing so, causes them to feel that they have not been fairly dealt with. Why the St. John and the Ottawa should be exempted, I know not. The Ottawa River has been exempted for a number of years, but, as I have before this stated on the floor of this House, it should have been one of the first brought under the operation of the Act as a navigable river and in view of Parliament buildings, as an example for others. The La Have has a very large number of mills erected on its banks, and the industry of lumbering has been prosecuted successfully, barring the intervention of the Government, and with credit by the firm of Messrs. Davidson & Sons. But their operation has been interfered with so materially and to that extent that they in despair were almost inclined to abandon the industry; in fact, several years ago they abandoned their operations on the La Have and went into the county of Annapolis. Since then they have been driven to erect a furnace, at a very large expense, for the consumption of the saw-dust. But I am sorry to say that since then they have been subjected to the ordeal of six suits, as I understand, being brought against each individual member of the firm—eighteen suits in all. To me this appears very hard, to say the least of it; and I understand there was something like a hundred and odd subpoenas issued. I may say all this was done without my knowledge and contrary to my wishes, and had I been consulted in the matter, I certainly would have condemned so rash an act. My reason for complaining in this way is that the small millers are unable, from the manner in which the old mills have been constructed originally, to gather their dust. In fact the difficulty with them arises that at present the logs on their limits are all but exhausted; and now, at this late day if they are called upon to put up furnaces or else abandon their operations it will be a serious question for them which to do, that is if the Government insist that the law shall be carried out to the very letter, which I hope they will not. I am pleading now for the small millers on the La Have River and those upon other streams in the county of Lunenburg, and I feel satisfied that in justice to them, the matter should receive the very careful consideration of the Government, and not allow them to be dealt with in the manner the Government would consider they ought to deal with them, as in the case of the action against the firm of the Messrs. Davidson & Sons. I would ask that the Government instruct chief officer Veith to visit that section of the country and report upon the operations of the small millers, so as to have it embraced in his return.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think I can say much upon this motion. There is no objection to its passing. Of course I am not in a position to discuss the Bill referred to by the two gentlemen who preceded me, but when the Bill comes up an opportunity will be afforded to discuss the whole question. It may be in order to submit copies of all reports that have been made. But I cannot say that the return will be delayed so as to have a new officer make an additional report.

Mr. TEMPLE. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has asked the question why the river St. John should be exempted from the law which was passed some time ago. I can tell him the reason. It is the boundary line between the United States and New Brunswick. The mills on the American side are allowed to throw all their saw-dust and other rubbish into the St. John, and therefore it would be useless to forbid our people on the river to throw their rubbish into the river the same as is done on the other side. If you allow one party to dump all their saw-dust and other rubbish into the river, there is no reason why others should not be allowed to do the same thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If that be the case, it is a reason for correspondence with the American Government on the subject. I do not think that the American Government can permit their people to throw saw-dust and refuse matter from the mills into the St. John River, and ultimately to destroy the navigation of the river, without any protest from the Canadian Government.

Mr. TEMPLE. Well, they do it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has not done his duty if he has not pressed the matter upon the attention of the Government, with a view to its being brought under the notice of the American authorities. I think it would be a proceeding altogether at variance with the comity which one civilized state owes to another, to permit a practice of that sort. If that be so, it is important to know whether the matter has been brought to the attention of our Government, and whether they have had any correspondence with the British Minister at Washington in regard to

this matter. Certainly, I think if we were to do anything on the great lakes which would affect their navigation or damage an American harbour, the American Government would not fail to protest against our conduct; and if the river St. John is being injured in the way the hon. gentleman has said, it is clearly the duty of the Government here to cause it to be brought under the attention of the British Ambassador, and to see what action the American Government are prepared to take.

Mr. GILLMOR. The truth is, that the saw-dust and other stuff that is thrown into the St. John River does not affect the navigation of the river at all, neither does it affect the fisheries. The St. John River is the boundary line only for a certain distance. Now, the St. Croix River is the boundary between the state of Maine and the province of New Brunswick, and the mill-owners on the American side have all along been in the habit of throwing their saw-dust and rubbish into the river. If there is any river in the Dominion of Canada which ought to be exempt, it is the St. Croix, because the mills on the American side have never ceased to throw saw-dust into that river, nor tried in any way to prevent it. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that if there is any reason for exempting any river, the St. Croix should be exempted rather than the St. John. The same argument would apply to any portion of the St. John River which is on the boundary; but it especially applies to the St. Croix River, which, from its source to the mouth, forms the boundary between the province of New Brunswick and the United States.

Mr. KAULBACH. I only rise to comment for a moment on the remarks of the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Temple)——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot speak again on this subject.

Motion agreed to.

SEIZURE OF THE FISHING FLEET OF NOBLE BROS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, letters, documents, papers, petitions, reports, commissions and evidence in reference to the withdrawal of the fishery license and the seizure of the fishing fleet and plant of the Noble Bros., on the Georgian Bay.

He said: In asking the House to pass this motion, I may be permitted to make a few remarks. I may say that I am not acquainted with the firm mentioned in the notice I have given; I have never seen them, I have had no communication with them at all. I am moved to ask for this address by what I have seen in the press, and by what I have learned from the evidence that was given before the commission that was appointed to inquire into the matter. I may state, however, that from what I have learned, the firm of J. & C. Noble have been engaged in the fishing business on the Georgian Bay between thirty and forty years. They have carried on a large business, and have been very successful in it. I understand they have something in the neighbourhood of $50,000 of capital engaged in their enterprises, consisting of tugs, vessels and steamers, such as are required for this service. I further understand that during all the years they have been in the fishing business there has never been a charge against them, a charge that was sustained. In carrying on their business they have always observed the fishing regulations, up to the time that this charge was laid against them.

Now, in 1894, some time in the middle of March, they applied for their license in the same manner as they have done in every other season. They sent in $280 to pay for their license, in order to enable them to carry on their business for the season. This is precisely what they did in every other season, as I understand, in which they were engaged in the fishing business. They had no intimation from the department that a license was to be refused them. They started out, as all the other fishermen on the Georgian Bay started out, in the pursuit of their calling, some time in the middle of April. They were fishing there as others were fishing, but the license had not yet been issued. They had not received their license, and no other fishermen in the Georgian Bay had received theirs. They considered that after their money was paid they could get a license. Another circumstance that made them more certain they would be granted a license was the fact that after they sent their cheque, the fishery overseer sent it back in order to get the bank exchange of $1.05. This was convincing evidence that they would receive their license, just as they had done before. But while thus carrying out the spirit of the law, and thus acting as other fishermen were doing, after they had started out to fish, the fishery overseer came along and seized four tugs belonging to them and, I think, nine skiffs; and at the same time there were thirty or forty vessels fishing near the same place, at Squaw Island and Byng Inlet. No other craft were seized at that time by the fishery overseer. All the crafts were allowed to go on fishing and the confiscation was confined to the boats of the Noble Bros., who had made application for license like the others had done. The tugs were seized and also the skiffs. They did not allow the Nobles to lift their nets, and which had been sunk in pursuit of their calling; the tugs were taken in charge by the fishery officer, and the skiffs were taken away. All the methods that the officer could apply to har-

rass that firm, which had always observed the law, seemed to be put in force. The officers seized the tugs and offered them for sale, and also the skiffs, to the number of four or five, and during the whole of last season the investment of $50,000 in plant by the firm proved unremunerative. They were not allowed to carry on their business, they were not able to use the capital invested in the enterprise, but their business was hung up for the whole season. Not only so, but the men engaged by them to carry on operations during the season were also thrown out of employment by this seizure.

After a short time, the fact that this firm had been selected out of all the firms carrying on operations was commented on by the press. The leading papers of Toronto and the locality took up the matter, and although a breach of the law in the letter, though not in the spirit, had taken place, the punishment inflicted was admitted to be far in excess of the offence. It appears to me, in looking over the information I have obtained from the parties and from evidence taken by the commission, in June the commission was issued, and notice was not sent until 22nd July to the Nobles at Killarney, that an investigation would be held on 29th July, one week afterwards, and that they must attend with their witnesses before the commission. I understand there is no telegraph communication with the place where the commission was appointed to sit. The consequence was that the Nobles did not get the notice until about two days before the commission was appointed to sit, and their witnesses were then at different parts of Georgian Bay, so it was impossible for them to appear with their witnesses and answer the charges made. I think it would have been better if the department, in appointing a commission, had named a judicial officer of the bay, even for nothing more than the sake of appearances. I am not going to impute anything to the commission, but it was an unfortunate circumstance that a judge was not elected to conduct the inquiry. I desire now to read the evidence in regard to the circumstances under which the seizure was made, and why the occupation of the firm was stopped during last season. I will, at the outset, read the evidence of Charles Noble, one of the firm :

Charles Noble, Collingwood, was the next witness. He swore that he had been in business in Killarney for seventeen or eighteen years, and had fished before that for about fifteen years. The firm of which he was the member owned many boats. They had never been convicted of an offence against the fishery laws prior to the trouble in connection with these seizures, in the whole course of their business. They were summoned to Little Current in 1893, and appeared before Messrs. Tinkus and Dawson, justices of the peace. When witness arrived at Little Current, he found Elliott there to try the case; there was no one else there. Witness asked if he could fetch in a magistrate. Elliott consented to this, and Messrs. Tinkus and Dawson sat on the bench. They opened the court with Elliott and the two magistrates on the bench. One of the magistrates wanted to know who was the prosecutor. Elliott went out to get his papers, and said that he was the prosecutor. The magistrate said that he could not both sit on the bench and prosecute. Elliott then declared the court adjourned for one week.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From what is the hon. gentleman reading ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am reading from the evidence taken before the commission.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It does not appear to be evidence the hon. gentleman is now reading. Perhaps I may be wrong.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am reading from the statement under oath made by Charles Noble.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It sounds like a narrative.

Mr. LANDERKIN :

When the case again came up, Elliott had brought Mr. Burden, stipendiary magistrate of Sault Ste. Marie with him. Mr. Burden proposed to try the case without the aid of the other two magistrates, but they pointed out to him that he had no jurisdiction in the Manitoulin district, and dismissed the action against the Nobles, with $12 costs on Elliott. They gave a formal dismissal to witness. On the following Monday, Elliott, Burden and a constable came to Killarney, and between twelve and one o'clock in the afternoon, summoned the Nobles to appear before the magistrate at four o'clock of the same afternoon.

Witness refused to appear on the ground that they had been already tried for the same offence and acquitted. He showed Mr. Burden the record of the previous trial, and they did not appear. Elliott said he would find a way to make them, but he did not do so.

A week or two afterwards they received a letter, notifying them a fine of $270, including costs, had been imposed. Payment of this fine was never enforced. They, the Nobles, saw a solicitor, and appealed the case to the department. They had no reason to suppose that this conviction would be brought up against them, as the reason for refusing their licenses, or that any one would take their licenses. Witness heard from Mr. Long, that there had been a refusal of their licenses. He immediately went to Ottawa to see about the matter, and finding that the licenses had been refused, he immediately telegraphed instructions to have all fishing on licensed boats stopped.

In all his experience, he had never known the enforcement of the regulation that the fishermen must have their licenses before starting to fish. The licenses never came in hand in time for this to be done. The early part of the season was the best, and the boats usually went out about the 1st of May. Last year it was June when the licenses were received.

Witness said that at the time of the seizure he did not think there was a single license from Killarney to Byng Inlet. Joe Herty, Vale and Murray were in the Midland district. The boats of Doherty and Vale were taken to French River. Doherty's boat and license were never returned.

Witness sent a cheque to Jackson on the 12th April. He did not get it back until a month afterwards, when, finding that Jackson was carrying it around in his pocket, he asked him for it. He got back the $270 that he sent to Elliott about the 1st May.

On 15th May witness had a conversation with Jackson, who had since run away. This was by telephone from Midland. Jackson said that he had received the letter from Elliott, telling him not to recommend the Nobles for any licenses. Witness asked Jackson if he could let him have letter. Jackson would not let him have letter, but said that if he (the witness) went to Jackson, he would let him see the letter.

The firm to which witness belonged had $45,000 or $50,000 invested in the fish business. The seizure had been a heavy loss to them. Material seized was worth $7,000 or $8,000. The seizure had hurt their business very much in many ways. One station with ice-houses, &c., had been tied up, some men had been discharged, and others, who had been employed by the year, had been paid for doing nothing. The ice was all gone. They had built a new steamer 115 feet long a year ago to carry their fish, but owing to the seizure they could not find work for her to do, and so ran her at a loss. If they had been notified that they would not receive their licenses, they would have tied up and hired no men, so that they would have lost much less. Their loss, directly and indirectly, owing to the seizure was, roughly speaknig, $25,000. That is, witness would not take that to have it done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the evidence of several other witnesses before that commission which I should read to the House, but which time will not permit. Mr. David Malcolm says:

David Malcolm was then called, and swore that he was captain of the fishing tug "Dalton McCarthy," and was fishing her at Squaw Island in May, when Elliott seized the Nobles' boats and those of men selling to them. The witness had no license either for the tug or for his own skiff, but he had instructed W. Clarke to apply for a license. He did not know of any licenses being in the party at Squaw Island. Elliott went on board the tug, and did not ask to see a license. Witness spoke to him about a license for his fishing skiff, and Elliott said he had one in the name of Matthew Bishop, which he could transfer to witness, and he transferred it to him. Witness had fished for sixteen or eighteen years, and had always gone out to fish before getting his license.

The following testimony was given by Mr. Albert Low:—

Albert Low swore that he was at Squaw Island at the time of the seizure. There were thirty or forty boats fishing there at the time. Of these, only five boats and two tugs were seized. The boats which were not seized did not all have licenses. Most of them, he thought, had. He knew that some of the Black Line boats had no licenses. Jack Malcolm stripped his boat because he expected it to be seized. The Black Line boats that had no licenses did not attempt to hide or go away. John McInness and John MacFarlane had told them that they had no licenses. He had heard that the Black Line boats had no licenses. He saw Dave Malcolm talking to Elliott in the fog-pilot house, and, when Malcolm came out, his brother Jack, who had stripped Dave's boat—which he was fishing—put everything back and went on fishing.

Dominic Rousseau swore that the boats went out this year about the middle of April. On the 4th or 5th of May, he was in Mr. Clarke's office in Collingwood, and saw the receipts for the money sent him with Clarke's applications for tug licenses hanging up, but saw no licenses.

Mr. Fee, Clarke's book-keeper, told him that he had no licenses, and that he wished Elliott would come up and give him the licenses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears that after this investigation the sale of the boats had taken place, but the sale of the tugs had not. It appears a decision was come to some time this spring to return the tugs to the Nobles, and I believe that was acted upon, and I believe that their licenses were renewed, although I have not any official information to that effect. However, I understand that they were again licensed. The Nobles gave, I am told, $7,000 bonds for the release of their seized property pending investigation; and when the Nobles went to look after this property in the spring, which had been in the hands of the Government officials all last season——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Which property? Do you mean the seized tugs?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes. The Government only returned two tugs and in a very damaged condition. Two compasses, value of each $50, were missing and several small articles. The Government sold five of their fishing boats, which, of course, were not returned. Two more fishing boats were detained at French River, and when application was made for these two boats, the customs officer said he had no orders to release them. Later on his store was burned and all the rigging belonging to these two boats was burned also. This officer permitted these two boats into strangers' hands during the season for trading purposes, and such little care was taken of them during the winter, that they are useless to the Nobles.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, is, I presume, stating this on some information?

Mr. LANDERKIN. On information I received.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On whose information does the hon. gentleman make that statement?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not in a position to make that statement. I have not got it from any of the Nobles, but from a party who appears to be thoroughly conversant with what he is talking about. Now, Mr. Speaker, it does seem singular that in this case, where these men were acting in good faith, and acting as all the other fishermen were: after they had made a deposit and sent in what was required in order to entitle them to have a license; it does appear

singular, I say, that if it was the intention of the Government not to license them that they were not informed of it earlier in the season. It does appear as if a trap had been set in order to catch these men, because in some of the affidavits it is sworn that the fishery overseer had stated that he would ruin the Nobles if he possibly could. I have an affidavit here in which that is set forth, and it does appear that the department concurred with the officer in effecting the ruin, as far as the year's business was concerned, of the Nobles. Here is an affidavit made by Mr. Thos. Boyter:

Canada, Province of Ontario,
District of Manitoulin.

In the matter of the seizure of the tugs and nets of F. and C. Noble, of the village of Killarney, in the district of Algoma.

1. I, Thomas Boyter, of the town of Little Current, and the district of Manitoulin, fisherman, do solemnly declare:

2. That I am well acquainted with T. H. Elliott, of Sault Ste. Marie, fishery overseer for the district of Algoma;

3. That in March, 1894, at Massey, in the district of Algoma, in Richard Boyter's shop, the said T. H. Elliott told me, when I asked him about a fishing license for fishing for myself and brother Robert, to apply for it myself direct to him at Sault Ste. Marie, saying as follows:—

"I will not grant any license through or to the Nobles, as I have been after the sons of B. S. for the last two years, and I have them where I want them now, and I am going to crack it to them."

4. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Signed) THOMAS BOYTER, Jr.

Declared before me at the town of Little Current, in the district of Manitoulin, this 5th day of November, 1894.

THOMAS C. SIMS, J. P.

There is another affidavit to the same effect signed by W. Peters, which it is not necessary for me to read. It does appear that a deliberate trap was set to entrap and ruin these men who had so much capital invested in their business. Why should this be done? Why, in this age of the world, should any department of Government be in a position to destroy such a firm as this, who, for thirty-five or forty years have carried on business, and have never been convicted of an offence until they were led into this trap? I will give you an opinion of these men held by a newspaper published in the district of Algoma, and I believe the organ of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell):

After reading, in its Tuesday issue, the "Globe's" article anent the Killarney fishery troubles, one can scarcely avoid the conclusion that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a shallow-pated fool, inspector Elliott a knave, his witnesses perjurers, the convicting magistrate an ass, the investigating officer Wilmot a lunatic, and Noble Brothers martyrs to a foul conspiracy. The promised investigation should be held soon at any place most convenient for the fishermen and the accused, and by an officer above suspicion of complicity. Better far that all the fisheries be destroyed than honest men so slandered and wronged without the least opportunity for defending themselves. Not being possessed of all the facts, the "Pioneer" is content to wait for the verdict of the court. The "Globe" appears to hold all the evidence. Now, Sir Hibbert, lay on, and confusion take him who first cries, "Hold, enough." The "Globe" has made a charge against the Minister and his officers which nothing short of the fullest and most thorough investigation can remove.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). May I ask the hon. gentleman what paper he is quoting from?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Algoma "Pioneer."

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I repudiate it altogether. It is not my organ.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have looked through its files, and it has not repudiated the hon. member, but, on the contrary, has been a very strong supporter of his during the present session. But I have no doubt that the paper will learn that it has been repudiated by the hon. member in this House. However, that was a very good article, and a very true article, if all the facts which I have gathered are to be verified by what we are yet to receive. Now, I move for these papers, believing that I am entitled to move for them. I move for them purely and simply on public grounds. I believe that if the departments have the power to crush out of existence men who are trying to do a legitimate business, that power should be taken from them. I think this act of the department can be said to be nothing less nor more than an act of despotism. I hope that many cases of this kind cannot be found in this country.

Having looked over the annals of the department, I do not know of any case in which a graver penalty was attached to a small offence. The Minister may plead that charges were made which were not investigated. If that is so, it is a reflection upon the Minister himself, and not upon the Nobles. If there was any charge against them, the officers of the department should have looked into it before. But when they could only find trumpery charges, they set a trap to catch them, and seize upon their tugs and vessels, while allowing other tugs to go on and do business in the same way. I feel it my duty to move for these papers, feeling as I do that if the Government possess such powers, they should be taken away from them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat expects the motion to carry or not, but I trust that the House will

not entertain it after I state that it would be quite irregular to bring down the papers.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh.

Mr. COSTIGAN. My hon. friend seems to be a little surprised at that, but he may not be after I state the reason. The hon. member speaks of an investigation having been ordered into this matter. That investigation has not yet been proceeded with, and until it is held, I think the case should not be dealt with here. In one respect I am sorry for that, because if I could deal with it I could answer many of the points raised by the hon. gentleman. I do not doubt at all the very deep sympathy of the hon. gentleman for these men. No doubt he feels that they have been very badly treated, and that the Government deserve very severe censure. That may be true, but I am not yet in a position to discuss the question, pending an investigation by a legal tribunal. The delay is not the fault of the Government or the Minister, or the department. The delay has been caused by the gentlemen with whom the last speaker has expressed such great sympathy, the Nobles themselves. After their vessels had been condemned, my predecessor listened to the appeal made by them, in which they assured him that if a rehearing were granted they could bring forward such evidence as would reverse the former decision, and induce him to restore the property. He consented to a rehearing, fixing the time and place. When the time for the rehearing was about to arrive, I was in charge of the department, and the legal advisers of the Nobles, Messrs. McCarthy and Osler, notified the department that they would advise their clients to appeal for a change in the arrangements for the rehearing. They took exception to the place, called Massey, as inconvenient to reach, and they also raised an objection that the rehearing was to be before a very prominent officer of the department. All these things were taken into consideration, and in order to give them every possible chance to make out their case, we agreed to a rehearing which they proposed should take place at Collingwood, perhaps before the county court judge. Where the rehearing will take place is under consideration by the Government, but I hope my hon. friend will not conclude that there has been unnecessary delay. We have another contention stating Collingwood would perhaps be a little inconvenient, because the fishermen who will have to give evidence live more in the direction of Killarney, which is a great deal further west. In view of the pending inquiry, Messrs. Noble Bros. asked us to release the property, pending the decision of the court, on their giving bonds, to the value of the property, to restore it should the court so decide. We thought that was a reasonable proposition. They gave bonds to the amount of $7,000, and the property was restored. Now, the evidence which the hon. gentleman read is not official evidence at all, but a statement of their case prepared by Noble Bros. They quote the evidence, and the evidence as quoted differs very materially from the official report. However, I do not want to discuss these matters now. I simply take the ground, which is just and reasonable, that as this rehearing will take place, and as the whole case must be decided by some tribunal, it would not be right or proper to publish any of the papers.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LAURIER. If I rightly understood the remarks made before six o'clock by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan), the Government refuse to grant this motion. The reason the hon. gentleman gave was that the matter was now pending before the department.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is pending before a court of inquiry.

Mr. LAURIER. Why then not give to the House now the papers? Why should Parliament, which is the great court of inquiry, be less privileged than any other court in the land? The court of inquiry which is now sitting upon the case is simply sitting upon the case of Noble Bros., to ascertain whether or not they have been rightly convicted, but there is more than that pending before the public. We ought to know in what manner the department is administered. This case has been before the public a long time. It has found its way into the public press. It is in evidence that a certain officer of the department—I shall not criticise his conduct at present—acting under the power vested in him by the Fishery Act, refused to issue the annual license which has been issued, year after year, to the Noble Bros. Not satisfied with that, but for certain alleged contraventions of the Fishery Act by that firm, this officer, who is clothed with powers which are not vested in the highest judges in the land—powers which I do not at all traverse or even challenge—found that the Noble Bros. had contravened a certain provision of the Act and proceeded to convict them at once and to enforce the convictions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the conviction was by a police magistrate, and not by the fisheries officer.

Mr. LAURIER. The conviction was by a police magistrate upon the complaint of the fishery officer, and therefore the Noble Bros.

exercised the right of appeal which they have under the Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They did not appeal. Instead of taking that course under the Act and appealing to the Minister, they did not question the legality of the conviction. What they did was to remonstrate against the severity of the department in holding this plant for that offence and proposing to sell it at public auction. They asked the Government to order an investigation into the reports of the officers, which, they alleged, had prejudiced the Government, and they asked this in order that the Government might be induced to lighten the severity of the sentence and enable them to get their property back. That investigation went on, and, as the hon. Minister stated, they did not appeal from the decision, and, as I understand it, at no stage of the proceedings did they question the validity of the conviction. They say the conviction was for a technical violation of the law, but a conviction legally made.

Mr. LISTER. Conviction for what?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For fishing without a license.

Mr. LISTER. Before whom?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the police magistrate. Before Mr. Burden if I remember aright.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But that was the year before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am aware of that. I have every confidence in my recollection of the facts; for I have had to read reams and reams of papers about the case.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, what kind of inquiry is going on now?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall be delighted if the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The case being as I have stated, the Nobles pressed upon me from every quarter that the offence for which they have been convicted, of which they were technically guilty, was a small offence for so severe a punishment. My answer was: Your record on the files of the department is so bad that we have been endeavouring to take you in some violation of the law, to make an example for those engaged in poaching, so as to deter all that we believe you have encouraged. My information was that where they had not themselves openly violated the law, they had supplied the nets and, in some cases, twine for the nets and supplies, for fishing in districts very difficult for our officers to get into in order to enforce the law; and that they had in every way possible offered defiance to our regulations. One of these gentlemen came to the department with Mr. Long, an acquaintance of mine, and they discussed the case, of course, from their point of view, while I discussed it from the record that was before me, and, with great regret, I came to the decision that, with the record that I had before me, it was impossible for me to take their protestations of innocence. I could not put them upon any other plane than that of ordinary fishermen. Indeed, I don't think they were entitled to any better treatment. I was obliged to hold that they had not made out a case which enabled me to overlook the reports which were placed before me by the officers paid by the country. Then they pressed upon me that there must be some way of redress; they still insisted that these reports were false, that they had not the character ascribed to them, that I was misled, and that, if they were given an opportunity, they could show that all these reports and all the bad opinions formed of them were without foundation. As soon as possible—there was some delay, and they have discussed that a great deal in the papers, but it is all capable of explanation—as soon as possible, the report which I promised to make was made, recommending that a commissioner be appointed to hear and determine this case; and, as the hon. Minister says, Mr. Wilmot was appointed. Mr. Wilmot proceeded with the investigation. He made a mistake in the conduct of it—I do not hesitate to say so—but it was a mistake for which he might be pardoned, for this reason, that a counsel was sent, and, instead of assisting in the investigation, by the line which he adopted, he made it exceedingly difficult for one not skilled in legal matters to keep the proceedings strictly regular. Still, a great deal of evidence was taken. The counsel for the Nobles then asked that I should myself go all over this evidence, and sit in the case and take evidence, and that kind of thing, a request which I declined to grant. After discussing the case with the late Minister of Justice, who was leader of the Government, it was decided that the Nobles should be given an opportunity of having the case re-heard by Mr. Wilmot, who should be instructed to enable them to do what he had refused them the opportunity to do before, thinking that his instructions would not permit him to allow it—that was to have a specific statement, an itemized list, of the offences that were reported against them. They were not satisfied with that. They objected to Mr. Wilmot personally, first, because he was an officer of the department, and then, if I recollect aright, on the ground that he was technically unfit for that investigation. The matter was discussed and, as a result, as the hon. Minister has stated, this investigation is now going on

before a judge. This is at the solicitation of the Nobles. As to bringing down the papers, a point was discussed this afternoon, and I would appeal to the hon. gentleman's sense of what is regular and right. The Minister tells me, since he has spoken, that, while objecting to bringing down the papers, the objection was based on the ground that if the order as it stands were complied with, the whole case of the department would be put in the possession of the parties who are proceeding practically against the Crown, and who, in case of a favourable outcome of the investigation, will no doubt make a claim for something. The objection to bringing down the papers will not cover all the documents. I ran my pen through a copy of the resolution, leaving it in the shape that would not be objected to. It would then cover Orders in Council, petitions, commissions and evidence, that is, the evidence in the unfinished inquiry. But the Government could not consent, at this stage of the investigation, that the "letters, documents, papers and reports" should be brought down, for the reasons I have explained.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the hon. gentleman objects to bring these papers down, but will he state his reasons for objecting?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought I had made myself clear. The reason is that we are in the middle of an investigation, and to comply with the order according to the terms of the motion would be to put in the possession of these parties the case for the Crown, giving them an advantage which justice does not demand and which would not be fitting. The case stands thus: As head of the department, I had formed a bad opinion of the Nobles as fishermen. I may be wrong; they say I am: they say: Give us an opportunity—and it is an exceptional opportunity to give—give us an opportunity to testify and bring witnesses, and we will show that your officers have falsified the documents, and that we are the victims of a conspiracy. With the opinion I have formed of their conduct, it is certainly wise not to make public confidential papers and other documents we have at this stage of the investigation, but only to bring them forward in due course as the judge may require—always remembering that we have offered, in this investigation, to give them opportunities to see the charges upon which these prejudices in the department exist.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the very reason the hon. gentleman has given why these papers and documents should not be brought down are the very ones why they should be brought down. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, the complaint made by the Nobles was that they were the victims of a conspiracy, that their record had been falsified by the officers of the department, that they had been charged by the officers with offences of which they were not guilty. If such be the contention of the officers of the department on one side and the Nobles on the other, it seems to me that the ends of justice would be prevented if the Nobles were not placed in full possession of the facts they stand charged with at the present time. They cannot enter upon their defence successfully, especially when they feel so strongly that they are blamed unjustly and they are the victims of a conspiracy. It seems to me that, under those circumstances, they cannot make their defence successfully, especially when they feel that they are blamed unduly and are the victims of a conspiracy. It must strike the sense of justice of my hon. friend that they cannot successfully vindicate their character unless they are placed in possession of everything which pertains to this case, and of all the charges laid against them. How can they successfully vindicate themselves in any case where they are charged with having violated the law, unless they have an opportunity to make a defence to each specific charge? The hon. gentleman himself says that whilst he was at the head of the department, by reports that came from his officers—and he could have no other source of information—he was placed under the impression that they were systematically violating the law, and were not deserving of any sympathy. Then I appeal to him, I appeal to his sense of justice, and I appeal to the sense of justice of the House, that it is impossible for these men, when they come to him and say that they are wrongfully charged, successfully to vindicate themselves unless they know all the items of the charges against them. It seems to me that the reasons which induce the hon. gentleman now to refuse an order of the House for the production of these documents, are the very reasons why these documents should be made public, in order that the Nobles may have an opportunity of rebutting the charge; and if they cannot rebut it, that the officers of the Crown may be put in a position to make their allegations against these men. But there is more than that. There is not only the case of the Nobles, however important it may be in itself, but there is a great public consideration which this case suggests. It seems to me that it suggests the very important question whether these special officers of the Fisheries Department are not vested with altogether too large powers. This case shows that it is possible for an officer of the Crown, even though actuated by good motives, and much more if he is actuated by spite, to ruin the industry of any man. In this case these men, I am informed, have been for many years prosecuting their avocations and by their industry have been able to build up a large

fortune. If we are credibly informed, they have invested, in that industry, in plant and vessels, no less a sum than $50,000. But by the action of an officer of the department, these men have been prevented for a whole season from pursuing their usual avocations, prevented from making use of the capital which they made by their own industry, and all this by the will of a single man. He may be wrong or he may be right, but it must strike my hon. friend that such an extraordinary power should not be vested in a single subordinate officer. There is no judge of a high court in the country who is vested with such power as that subordinate officer. The House has every reason to ask that the whole facts of this case should be put before us in order that we may be able to judge whether it is in the public interest that such extraordinary power should be placed in the hands of one individual, and whether the property and rights of any citizen should be at his mercy. I say there is reason to consider whether the power of these officials should be revised or, perhaps, abridged. Therefore, on the ground of public expediency, as well as on the ground of personal consideration to the Nobles. I say that the arguments which have been advanced why these papers should not be produced, in reality show clearly that they ought to be laid before the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I submit that the leader of the Opposition has totally misapprehended the facts of this case, although I attempted, but apparently without success, to correct him in regard to the facts. The hon. gentleman adverted to the large powers with which a fishery officer is vested, and alluded to the fact that these fishery officers can seize and hold property which is being used by a man who commits an offence against the Fisheries Act. My hon. friend seems to think, from the developments in this case and others, that there is great danger to be apprehended from too wide powers being given to these officers generally over the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a consideration wholly apart, I submit, from anything connected with the case of the Nobles, because the fishery officer in this case did not exercise any one of those great powers. He only did what an ordinary constable does in case of need, he made a seizure. But all the facts in regard to the seizure, and in regard to the offence for which these men were properly, according to their own admissions, convicted in a court of law, and the testimony of the officer, were duly submitted to the police magistrate of that district, who found these men guilty, fined the offenders, and from that decision these men did not dare to appeal. According to their testimony, partially taken, and which is in the possession of the hon. gentleman who made this motion, they had no case for an appeal. It was admitted that they had committed this offence; therefore, there is no danger, I take it, from the large powers exercised in the seizure. But what is the hon. gentleman's object in making this motion? What does the House of Commons want to do at this particular juncture, with the papers in this case? If the motion is made with no object, or an insufficient object, then I take it that the good sense of the House will not order the papers to be brought down. What is the object of the hon. member for South Grey? It cannot be to consider whether the Government, or the responsible Minister in that case, acted with due discretion, fairly or unfairly, or that his conduct should be considered in this House, because the time has not yet come when, in fairness to him, or in fairness to the Nobles themselves, that view can be considered by the House. The case is not ready for the House, and in this case, as in others to which I will refer, the time is not opportune for the production of these papers. Heretofore, when circumstances such as those to which I refer, have been mentioned in the House, it has not been unusual for the mover, unless he has some particular object which commends itself to Parliament, to ask leave to withdraw his motion, and bide his time, waiting till the whole subject has been threshed out. Now, these gentlemen have not indicated, my hon. colleague informs me, that they, who are the parties aggrieved, if any, are behind this motion. It is not suggested by the hon. gentleman who moves this motion that he is attempting to obtain discovery in this way so as to enable the Nobles to push their case in a judicial investigation. There is no other object apparent than that mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, who thinks that the powers of the fishery officers are too large; and, of course, the discussion involves the conduct of the Minister who was charged with the administration of the law in that particular case. As I say, the case is not in any sense ready for that consideration. If these papers were brought down showing an incomplete record, no one in this House would either condemn or approve the conduct of the fishery officer in this case. Now, I must say, without going into these papers, something in addition to the brief explanation I attempted to give the hon. leader of the Opposition, and which he kindly permitted me to do while he was addressing the House. I was met in the Fisheries Department by the difficulty that has met all my predecessors. If we were lenient, gross abuses occurred; and, as the fisheries showed signs of exhaustion in one place, the attacks were extraordinary in their number and their extent in other places. And complaint was made everywhere against the laxity and neglect of the de-

partment. Any one who has had much to do with efforts to keep in check the rapacity of some fishermen know how difficult the task is, and know the risk they will run. Unfortunately, I was brought into collision time and again, not with men who had accumulated $50,000 of capital, for I would have no hesitation in dealing with them, but with the poorest people of the community, fishermen possessing very little means, indeed, and whose living is most difficult to secure. Their boats and nets were destroyed, and reports were brought down time and again, showing that miles of nets in the Georgian Bay waters and in the western lakes had been seized, confiscated, and burnt. Boats belonging to the fishermen have been taken and destroyed, a steamer has then been put on, and, notwithstanding the severe methods adopted of necessity to prevent further violation and prosecution in connection with the Fisheries Act, months, even years have elapsed before I could ascertain that some effect was following a most difficult, and, I will frankly add, met a generally unpopular course. No pleasure was afforded the head of the department in showing severity in these cases. Rightly or wrongly, I believed it was my duty to act as I did, and I had the satisfaction of knowing that while the facts were notorious, and complaints were laid along that line, my action was not condemned in the House, but that among men engaged in the fisheries, and those who had studied the question, my conduct in that particular was highly commended. In the case of the Nobles I happened to have a little information on my own account. I happened to know this, for instance: If there ever was a reason which would have, in spite of my wish, somewhat changed my course, it was the fact that men of the highest position in the commercial world, in Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton—men who were advancing money to the Nobles, and were behind them—represented to me as strongly as possible facts brought to their notice which seemed to mitigate the offence of the Nobles, and suggest that the course of the department should be less severe. I do not hesitate to say that I struggled to reach a conclusion which would have met their approbation, and enabled me to treat with those parties in a different way from what I did; but I met with reports, statements and facts in the records of the Department of Marine and Fisheries which made it simply impossible for me to do anything of that kind. The Nobles not only had the advantage of the advocacy of the people to whom I have referred, but the press almost unanimously took up the side of those men and published article after article, written in the absence of information, with this conclusion, that a very severe penalty, and one unduly severe had been imposed, and that the action of the department was despotic. In regard to these reports I will tell the House why I believed, at the time, I acted properly in the matter, as I believe now, and that these gentlemen were guilty of a great deal more than hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken of them ever heard of. While one of the Nobles, in company with one of the Longs, of Collingwood, was discussing his grievance with me in my office, and having admitted to me that he did become aware of the fact that in recent years the department had become very stringent, indeed, in regard to the necessity of fishermen having first a license before they engage in fishing on the lakes, he stated that he and his partner only learned of that fact during the preceding fall. He represented that they supposed that the payment of the amount of the license fee, and obtaining a receipt for that payment, would be sufficient authority to go on with the fishing. While he was making out his case, I asked him particularly as to the month when he did become aware of it. He told me in November, I think, but, at all events, in the preceding fall. We were then in the spring of the following year, and while sitting there a telegram was placed in my hand from an officer of the department in the district, stating that the whole of the tugs belonging to the Nobles had just been caught out fishing without a license.

Mr. LISTER. They had paid their license fees.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but they had received no license, and the gentleman sitting in my office had just informed me the Nobles had become aware that a license was necessary and that a receipt was no good, in the fall; but, nevertheless, their boats had gone out without the owners having a license, but simply holding a bare receipt. Speaking frankly, I admit that that incident did prejudice me against them, and confirmed, if I wanted confirmation, the report in my hands in regard to their operations. Other means were taken to ascertain the truth in this matter, and with the means at my disposal I became confident that those gentlemen were guilty of all that had been charged against them, that they were poachers, and not fishermen, and had been engaged for years in setting at defiance our laws and regulations; and, under these circumstances, I would have been recreant to my duty, and, in every sense, unfit to discharge my duty if I had not held a firm hand. Even then, when those men persisted, against all the information I held, against the incident to which I have referred, in not seeking for an appeal from the conviction, in asking for an investigation, I did not hesitate to say that, under the circumstances, it could be granted, and I took the regular course

to have an investigation offered them. They have had eminent counsel, they have them yet. Those eminent counsel have made no formal demand for these papers, and they are not said to be behind this motion asking for the papers as necessary; but even if they pleaded for them, I certainly would say that, so far as I am concerned, guarding the interests of the department, and of the fisheries, I would submit to this Parliament or to any court or tribunal invested with authority, whether this was the time to produce these secret and confidential documents and papers that would afford assistance to counsel representing the parties. If the hon. gentleman wants to be seized of the facts, the Government will furnish all the papers with the exception of those documents which I may term confidential, the reports of officers, some of which are of the strictest confidential character, and should not, in the interest of the country be brought down at the present time. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries authorizes me to say that, in opposing the motion in its present terms, he had, as I have now, reference particularly to those documents which I have mentioned. That is to say, we are willing to assent to an address asking for copies of all Orders in Council, petitions, commissions and evidence in reference to the withdrawal of the fishery license. The word evidence, of course, there is referring to what we have said across the floor of the House to-day: that unfinished Wilmot investigation. I wish to leave out the words "letters, documents, papers, reports," because these are now in the hands of the counsel in the case. It is perhaps fitting I should make a passing reference to some of the authorities to show we are not departing from the practice adopted in this Parliament, and in the English Parliament. Dr. Bourinot, at page 337 of his book, says:

> There are frequent cases in which a Minister refuses information, especially at some delicate stage of an investigation or negotiation.

And again:

> Sometimes the Government may be obliged to withhold all information at the time, or they may be able to put the House in possession of only a part of the correspondence.

And then again, at page 341:

> A sound rule generally observed by the House is, that proceedings before a court of justice are not given except for public purposes, and still more is this the rule when a case is pending and the ultimate decision not yet reached.

Mr. LAURIER. He says for public purposes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. I take it that it won't be said here that there is any great public purpose involved, or that the case is ready for that. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment that the words "letters, documents, papers and reports" be struck from the motion.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the Minister of Justice being somewhat rejoiced at getting out of the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, from the story he has given to the House this evening. I have no doubt that the utterance of the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct, that he did administer his department with very considerable firmness, in fact a good deal more firmness than those particularly interested would have liked to have seen; and I may say that occasionally, the hon. gentleman, in his desire to enforce the law as he understood it, worked great injustice indeed on a great many fishermen of this country. The hon. gentleman tells us that he objects to bring down these papers because the case is sub judice, because there is an action pending and no decision has been arrived at, and that the production of the papers might prejudice the case for the Crown. I take issue with the hon. gentleman and say: that no action is pending at all. What is proposed to be done by the Government is, to reopen the investigation directed by the Government, before a commission to be appointed by the Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At the request of the parties concerned.

Mr. LISTER. At the request of the parties interested. As a matter of fact what is to take place here cannot be looked upon in the light of a trial in any way at all, and I am somewhat surprised that the hon. gentleman should have taken objection to bring down papers, that he would have been compelled to bring down under an order for discovery, had he been a party to a civil action in any court of this country. It cannot be pretended at all that if this was an action between individuals, that one party to the action could not compel the other party to produce every paper in any way relating to the subject-matter of controversy. So far as this matter is concerned therefore, the hon. gentleman wants to take the extraordinary position of saying: While we have acted in an exceptionally severe manner towards these men, while we have invoked the law in all its power—and it is powerful, and more than it ought to be in a free country, while we have almost ruined these men, suddenly seizing their fishing appliances, and prevented them following their avocations for a whole year at an enormous loss; while we have done all this injustice to these men, who have applied for a rehearing—and there must be good reasons for the application, or the Government would not concede to the request that they made that the case should be reheard—then, I say, in all honesty and justice to these men, every atom of evidence

that the Crown has in its possession affecting this case, should at once be laid upon the Table and be accessible to the Nobles, and to every person else. The Minister of Justice is, I think, taking a narrow position to say, that in a case between the subject and the Crown, the evidence which the Crown has in its possession shall not be seen by the person against whom the Crown is making the charge. Surely the persecution which has evidently existed in the past is not to be continued; surely these men are not to be pursued in the way they have been in the past. These petty officers throughout the country, clothed with a little power, use it in the most tyrannical manner possible. They go to work, and without a moment's notice they seize $20,000 or $30,000 worth of a man's property. They throw hundreds of men out of employment who are working for these people during the whole year. They deprived this company of the profits which they would have made if they were allowed to follow their employment. This officer does that, and the persecuted man says: Give me a fair trial, give me a fair hearing; and the Government send up, whom? An official from their own department, a decent man enough I have no doubt, but as narrow as a pine board. He goes up there, and the evidence will show what took place. The hon. gentleman says: These men have been convicted before; and remember he is the judge. No matter who was appointed to report, the Minister of Justice is the judge and the court of last resort, and he to-day admits that he has prejudged the case. He says that he has a bad opinion of the Nobles as fishermen, and that the Nobles have a bad record for poaching, and we may almost conclude that before the case is tried the court of last resort has decided that the me are guilty. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) tells us here that these men had been convicted. But the evidence before Mr. Wilmot shows that they had been summoned and that they had been acquitted, not convicted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I trust the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I was careful not to refer to a conviction.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, you did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I charged these men with having a bad record as poachers. The only conviction to which I referred——

Mr. LISTER. Was your own.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—no, but that of the police magistrate in this case, from which there was no appeal, and under which the tugs became the property of the Crown.

Mr. LISTER. Well, I hope that there is no Government which will enforce such a judgment as that. It is clear beyond peradventure that this petty fishery officer of the Government had differences with the Nobles for some time before. It is perfectly clear from the evidence taken before Mr. Wilmot, that there was anything but good feeling between these men and the inspector, and that the desire of the fishery inspector was to get these men out of the business. What does he do? He had a summons issued and they are called upon to appear before the magistrates; the fishery inspector himself, and two other magistrates, for by the statute he has the power of a magistrate. At all events, the trial took place; evidence was heard; and the result of that trial was that Noble Brothers were discharged and the prosecutor was ordered to pay $12 costs. What next do we hear? Remember, the Nobles had a right to suppose that having been once tried for this alleged offence and been acquitted, there could be no second trial. It is the generally received opinion that when a man is once acquitted on a charge, that ends the prosecution on that charge; and it is not pretended by the Government that any offence was committed between the time of the trial by the magistrates and the time the new information was laid before Mr. Burden. This man, however, goes quietly before Mr. Burden, the police magistrate, and obtains a summons calling upon the Nobles to appear again to answer to a charge upon which they had been tried and been acquitted. They did not appear, and the police magistrate imposed a fine against them in their absence. Now, what was the crime these men were convicted of? They did not imagine that the Government would think of enforcing such a penalty as that. The Government never attempted to enforce it, and nothing was done until the spring of 1894. Then, what was done? Why, these men did just what all the fishermen of this country have been in the habit of doing: they made application for their license in proper form; they paid their license fee to the fishery overseer; he gave them a receipt; after that the issue of the license is a mere matter of form.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. The hon. gentleman is wrong in saying that the subsequent proceedings is a mere matter of form. First, it is against the law, and second, it is against the written instructions.

Mr. LISTER. But as a matter of practice, I know perfectly well that in my own district when the fishermen receive the certificate of the fishery inspector, they consider the issue of the license a mere matter of form, and that it makes no difference whether it is issued in one month or in three months. Having paid their money and re-

ceived their receipt, they believe that they have the right under the law to go on and fish.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They have not, though.

Mr. LISTER. What did these men do? They paid their money, $280, to the overseer, and they received a letter which came through the overseer, no doubt from the department, telling them that they were $1.05 short: that is to say, that they ought to have paid $281.05 instead of $280. That was two weeks after they had paid their money, and received their receipt from the license inspecter. The inspector never intimated by a word or an act that they were to be refused their license. They paid the $1.05, received their receipt for that payment, and believed that they were authorized under the law to go on and purusue their avocation. Their fleet left. Hon. gentlemen must remember than in these northern lakes it is important to the fishermen to get their fleet out as soon as the season opens and they are entitled to commence fishing. With that object in view, two weeks after the $1.05 was paid to make up the deficiency these men went to the fishing grounds, with the full knowledge of the inspector and without one protest from him or any intimation that they would not be permitted to fish, or that they are violating the law in any way. No warning was given. They went out as they had gone out every year before; and what do we find? This precious inspector follows them up and seizes nearly all their property and fishing plant, amounting I believe to about $8,000 in value. What was the effect of that? These men were fishing themselves; they also employed men who fished and sold them the fish, and whose livelihood depended upon their carrying on their business. These men were all thrown out of employment. The Nobles' property was taken down to Collingwood or Owen Sound and tied up. Their whole operations were tied up for the year 1894. A harder case, a greater act of tyranny on the part of an officer, it is impossible to conceive. They applied to the Government. My hon. friend seems to think that every fisherman was trying to cheat the Government out of something. He constituted himself the custodian of the public rights, and looked upon every fisherman with suspicion. They came to the Government, but got no relief: the Government would not do nothing. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had made up his mind that they were a bad lot, that they were pirates and poachers entitled to no consideration. After a long time and much consideration, however, he sent the commissioner, Mr. Wilmot, up to hear these men's complaint. The evidence is there. It is a comedy on investigations; a more ridiculous proceeding it would be difficult to imagine. After he has reported, still nothing is done. The elections are coming on. It was thought they were going to take place this spring, just before fishing time. The Minister of Justice gets out of the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries and puts my hon. friend into it. Well, I am sure that while my hon. friend the present Minister of Justice may be rigid in his ideas of duty, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries will probably be the other way. What do we find? Why, Sir, as soon as the Minister of Justice leaves that office and takes another portfolio, they make up their mind to give these men another trial; and now they propose to appoint somebody, they do not know whether it is to be a county court judge or somebody else, to give the Nobles a re-hearing; and, in view of the fact that the case is to be re-heard, it is asked here that all the evidence and all the papers involved in that investigation shall be laid upon the Table for the information of everybody. This is a matter not affecting the Nobles alone. Yes. It affects every fisherman in this country, and we have a right to know whether the department, over which my hon. friend presided, acted honestly and fairly in the determination at which they arrived. But an election is coming on, hon. gentlemen are trying to make things sweet in a good many ways, and so they say to the Nobles: We will fix this all right for you, we will appoint another commission, and perhaps that may be more moderate in its report than the one which has taken place.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Did the hon. gentleman hear the statement made that this re-hearing was decided on long before I took charge of the department? It was agreed to before the change of portfolio.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The elections were not coming on then.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, they were, if you had had your way. At all events, this is clear, that whether it was before my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) left the Department of Marine or not—and he has not left it a very long time—it was decided that there should be a re-hearing of this case. That is not the only change my hon. friend has made. He has been constantly changing. He has been putting forward peculiar views as to the fisheries of this country. The policy of the department has been very uncertain and very trying indeed to the men who are engaged in the business. First, he says, pound-nets, are a bad thing, we will have no more; seine fishing is the right thing. Then the policy is changed. They say, seine fishing destroys the fish entirely; we must do away with it altogether; pound-nets are the right thing. Mr. Prince, in the department, advanced the peculiar theory that fish kept to their old run-ways, that Canadian fish

never went into American waters, and that American fish never got into Canadian waters. That was his view, and my hon. friend, when it was pointed out that American fishermen fished at all seasons of the year said : It makes no difference, Canadian fish never go over there ; all we have to do is to protect Canadian fish, and they will multiply and keep on our own side of the line. Acting under Mr. Prince's ideas, my hon. friend said : You shall not fish with seines, or pound-nets or anything in river St. Clair, Lake St. Clair, Detroit River, and a portion of Lake Erie. Now, the fishermen of that section, after being deprived for a full year of the means of making a livelihood —their net and seines soon destroyed ; themselves driven out of the business altogether —are told now that this policy of the past is all wrong and they may fish whenever and wherever they like, with seines or pound-nets or any other kind of nets, and there will be no more close season. That is pretty hard for these people whose nets have been destroyed. They may now enjoy the same rights as the fishermen in the United States ; they may fish the whole day and every month in the year. The Government have gone a-fishing. According to what has been published in the press, the Government imposed these regulations in the hope that they would get the Americans to fall into line and agree as to a close season and mode of fishing, but having failed to accomplish that, they will let our people fish just as much as the Americans.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would not advise my hon. friend to fish in the close season.

Mr. LISTER. Perhaps my hon. friend has changed the thing again. Very likely there has been a change in the last few days, but the news was different two weeks ago, much to the rejoicing of the fishermen on the lakes. They are buying new nets and getting ready to go fishing again, but it is quite possible that in the last few days the Minister has again changed the regulations. What is the position ? The department has deprived the Messrs. Noble Bros. for a whole year of their property. It has entailed an enormous loss upon these people, and the Government still harass them by holding these investigations, which ought to have been held long ago, and which, I really believe, amount to very little. These people were never convicted except on one occasion, and then when they were not present, and I say my hon. friend has no right to go back to the records. If they were guilty, try them ; but you have never tried them ex- except that one occasion and that should be the beginning of the evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They were guilty.

Mr. LISTER. But they were tried in their absence, without an opportunity of pleading ; and, as a matter of fact they had been tried before three justices of the peace and acquitted. If these men had been violating the law for all these years, surely it was the duty of the Government not to have let that violation go on. The Government should have prosecuted them. Having let them go on, the Government have no right to go behind the conviction and inflict unduly severe penalties for what occurred years beofre.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has several times said that the fine was imposed in the absence of these gentlemen. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman must be referring to another case. The fine was not $250. One part of their case is that the fine was only $5, and that therefore the magistrate took a lenient view of it. The fine that led to this confiscation was the fine of $5 by the police magistrate.

Mr. LISTER. There were two summonses, first when the inspector brought the charge and two magistrates dismissed it with costs against the inspector. Then another summons was issued before Mr. Burden, and I understand that summons was made returnable on the day it was issued. The defendants did not appear at all, and in their absence Mr. Burden fined them the amount I have stated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, I have in my hand the pamphlet which they have circulated, with the name of their counsel on the back of it. And in that they say :

> During the following month two charges were made against them for fishing without a license. They were brought before police magistrate Burden on or about 24th June, 1894, when one of the charges was withdrawn, and upon the other they were fined $5.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And confiscation followed the fine of $5.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes ; that is the bottom of their whole trouble.

Mr. LISTER. At all events, the amount of the fine is of very little consequence. The point I make is that the Government should not go back of the fact, that they should not use anything that took place anterior to the conviction ; that the conviction ended all wrong-doing up to the time it took place ; and that if these parties observed the law subsequent to being convicted, they should not be held answerable by the department for anything that occurred before the conviction. The hon. gentleman said in his speech that they were a bad lot, that they were poachers and all that sort of thing, and that he had formed a very bad opinion of them. The hon. gentleman himself is the court of last resort, and I think it is of questionable propriety for him to make a statement that he has prejudged the case. All a commissioner can do is to take the evidence and make recommendations and submit the whole to the Minister of Marine

and Fisheries, and that Minister, no doubt, will refer it to the Minister of Justice. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is whether these papers should be brought down. As I said before, all the fishermen of this country have an interest in this vote. We have a right to know in their interest, whether the law is fairly administered by the fishery officers and the department—a law that may be enforced tyrannically if the officers are not judicious and careful, a law which I have no hesitation in saying, within my own knowledge has often been harshly enforced. All that is asked for is that these papers shall be brought down, which can do the Crown no harm, which will give the House an opportunity of seeing what material the Crown has acted upon in ordering the investigation, and in bringing down which the Government will do no more than the humblest suitor would be required to do in an action against any other citizen.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat evidently rose for the purpose of saying one word for the "poor persecuted Nobles" and two for himself. In speaking of the elections coming, he evidently prepared his campaign material for the benefit of the fishermen of his constieuency.

Mr. LISTER. There are not thirty of them, so that does not amount to very much.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Sir, if the discussion ended here, no doubt the impression would be left upon the minds of hon. gentlemen on both sides that the Nobles were a very much abused and a very much injured people. The hon. gentlemen who have discussed the subject on the other side have not studied their brief as carefully as they might have done. The brief, is contained in a pamphlet issued by McCarthy, Osler, Hoskin and Creelman, one of whom appeared on behalf of the Nobles at the investigation which took place at Killarney before Mr. Wilmot, which has been so often referred to in this debate. No doubt every hon. member of this House, at least every hon. member from the province of Ontario received one of these pamphlets. If you will compare the speech of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) with the pamphlet issued by these gentlemen, you will find it almost identically the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If necessary, I will give you long quotations from the pamphlet that will appear in "Hansard" as spoken by the hon. member for South Grey. Do not let us lose sight of the fact—a fact which I am almost sure hon. gentlemen on the other side would have had the manliness to admit had it entered into their heads—that the desire—I will not say the desire but—the result of the discussion carried on by gentlemen opposite has been to leave on the minds of the members the impression that the Nobles were persecuted, that the department of Marine and Fisheries was defendant in a case, that a trial or action was pending. Now, Sir, I will venture to say without fear of contradiction, there is no action pending. As the Minister has shown, an investigation has been ordered. For what? Not to exonerate the Department of Marine and Fisheries from any blame in the matter, but to enable the Nobles—these "persecuted" people—to come forward and show why they should not be punished to the extent that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his judgment considered they should be punished. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just left the Chamber (Mr. Lister), made a few statements that are contained in this pamphlet that will be found to be not borne out by the facts, when the papers come before the House. With reference to the fishing in 1894, the statement was made boldly there that these men went on fishing with the full knowledge of the fishery officer. Sir, I deny that statement, and that statement cannot be maintained. I shall prove later on how the information came to the department, how the information came to the officer, and the result of the information that came. Now, Sir, with regard to the bad feeling alleged to exist between the overseer and the Nobles. I, for one, believe in giving every officer of a department of the Government, as he is not able to appear and defend himself, the benefit of every doubt until he is proven guilty. There is not one tittle of evidence, even in the garbled account contained in this pamphlet to show that there was any ill-feeling whatever between the Nobles and fishery overseer. Sir, the reverse is the case, as shown by a document which was seen by myself and which passed into the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from the hands of the Nobles, while they were in Ottawa, stating plainly that they had no fault whatever to find with the fishery officer, that they considered that he was only doing his duty. If I am not correct, when the papers come down, this document will not be there. I was shown it by a gentleman who had taken a great deal of interest in the matter on behalf of the Nobles, Mr. Long. Now, let us consider what led up to all this trouble. In 1893 the Nobles, as I say, were charged with aiding and abetting illegal fishing. The consequence was, as the hon. gentleman said, and as this pamphlet also states, in 1894 they sent an amount of money to the fishery overseer to cover the issuing of their license. That is the usual 'modus operandi' of geting licenses. He (Mr. Lister) endeavoured to make a point by stating the fact that they were called upon again to pay a small amount; that small amount was the bank discount on the amount. The fishery overseer does not keep that money. His duty, which is according

to the practice, is that when he receives money for licenses it is immediately forwarded, with the application, to the department of Marine and Fisheries, who acknowledge the receipt of the money. Now, I will venture to say this, that the fishery officer, of his own accord, never called upon them to augment the amount by $1.50, but the fishery officer was called to account by the department for being short of that much money, that should go to the department in full; in other words, he required to have the bank discount as well as the full amount of the license. Well, so far so good. That account came to the department. The licenses were not issued. The hon. gentleman from West Lambton was not correct in his statement about the number of cases tried. The first case was in 1893; the next two cases were in 1894. Now, the Nobles, instead of waiting to get their licenses—and I may say that it is not the practice, as stated here, that if a fisherman pays his money and gets a receipt for that money, he feels that he is justified in commencing to fish.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether others in that same district did not pay in money, and did not go to the ground and fish, after payment, but without receiving a license, and did not do so without being disturbed by the department.

Mr. MACDONELL. Not to my knowledge, in any part of the district. The hon. gentleman asks me, Did any others pay their money, and get their receipts who did not get their licenses, and went fishing, but were not fined? None that I know of. I was going to say, as the Minister of Marine stated this evening, that there has undoubtedly been a great deal of difficulty experienced in enforcing the fishery laws and regulations. Any hon. gentleman in this House who will take the trouble to read the report that was very carefully made, and the evidence which was very carefully collected by the commissioners in Ontario, and printed and distributed in this House, will find that invariably every honest fisherman gives his evidence against anything in the shape of illegal fishing, in the shape of fishing during the close season, or, in fact, anything that gives one fisherman an undue or unjust advantage over another. Now, Sir, the fishermen on Georgian Bay were all warned a year before this happened that until the licenses were issued by the department, they had no right to fish. Let me say here that the responsibility for issuing these licenses does not rest on the fishery overseer, but upon the department, and until the department sends that license to the fishery overseer, whose duty it is to endorse the license, showing that he received it, unless the fisherman has got that license, the receipt is not worth a cent. Now, these licenses were not issued. But did they fish? Now, there is no question but that they did. In fact, before the seizure took place, on the 6th or 8th May, 1894, one of the Nobles came to Ottawa in company with Mr. Long to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to his license. He came to me and asked if I would assist him with the Minister, and I offered to do anything I could to, smooth the matter over. Now, at this time there had been no seizure made. The gentleman was here a number of days, and during the time he was here, let me mention this fact to show that you are pleading for men that are not at all innocent, that when you are making a plea for these people you must recognize the fact that they went into it with their eyes open, knowing perfectly well what they were doing, knowing perfectly well what the result would be; but they did not know the extent to which the Minister was likely to punish them—at the very time we were begging these men off from the pains and penalties of their offences committed the year before, this gentleman told individual members of this House that their boats were out fishing, that they were going to fish anyway, and they did not care for the department. Well, what was the result? When we tried to assist them we were met with just what the Minister stated this afternoon, we were met with the statement that notwithstanding the fact that we came here to beg these men off for what they did, their boats were actually out fishing then in Georgian Bay.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And everybody else?

Mr. MACDONELL. I say that throughout the whole constituency, the rule is just as I have stated, and if any man fishes otherwise than according to the rule, he is liable to be punished any minute; and I venture to say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not let his officers off very easy if they fail to enforce the law. Now, Sir, if these men knew that they were doing wrong, what is the howl from the other side for? Would you come to this House and ask to have the papers laid on the Table with reference to a criminal trial that was pending in the country? Would you ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to bring these papers down and lay them on the Table, including reports that he had received from his officers? Now, in dealing with this question, let me say one word with regard to the so-called new trial, as one member spoke of it, or an action pending. What is that? That is merely to enable the Nobles to come forward and show that they have not been guilty of offences in the past, that they are not guilty of any offences before 1893 and 1894. Now, to my mind, that is a leniency, it is a concession on the part of the department, to grant such an investigation.

That was the investigation that Mr. Wilmot was sent to hold; that is the investigation that took place before a judge. It was for the purpose, not to exonerate anyone from blame, but to enable the Nobles themselves to show that they were not guilty previous to this time, and that consequently the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be more lenient with them than he intended to be in the first place for having committed a flagrant act for which they were prosecuted and convicted, and for which they have suffered pains and penalties. Now, I do not think any hon. gentleman would ask to have the papers brought down if they referred to any other subject. But the subject of the fisheries is a favourite one for hon. gentlemen to blow themselves on occasionally. It is also a subject upon which there is a good opportunity to find fault with the Government, to find fault more particularly with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, let me say that personally I would have been most happy to do anything I could for these men. All this fishing took place in my own constituency; although the Nobles lived at Collingwood, they were fishing there, and I would have been most happy to do anything I could for them, particularly when I heard that they pleaded guilty and threw themselves upon the mercy of the court.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONELL. Pardon me, you refer to an entirely different plea altogether. The case the hon. member for South Grey speaks about when they threw themselves on the mercy of the court, was an entirely different thing. He refers to a statement in this pamphlet that the police magistrate induced them to plead guilty with the promise that if they did so he was going to recommend the Minister to fine them slightly. They go on to say that the magistrate deceived them, and the consequence was they got the full benefit of the law. What I refer to is where they pleaded guilty before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in Ottawa, and threw themselves on the mercy of the Minister, and made the statement in writing that the officer, who is so much abused in this pamphlet, every page containing, I am ashamed to say, if not a falsehood, a very serious misrepresentation of the facts, only did his duty, and they had no fault to find with him. All the fault found cropped up afterwards; it cropped up afterwards, when they were fined for fishing without a license in 1894, and their plant was seized and tied up, as has been stated in the House to-night. With regard to the whole case, no doubt an effort has been made in a certain portion of the press to create sympathy for the Nobles. There has not, in any one paper, appeared an article explaining the true facts of the case. The statements made by the "Collingwood Enterprise," for instance, a quotation from which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) read, and which were copied into a paper in my constituency, I repudiate entirely, irrespective of the paper's policy. But could we for one moment upon the evidence offered by a newspaper condemn an officers conduct, because, let me remind the House that this fishery officer cannot rush into print to defend himself, he is an officer of the Government, and has to bear the abuse heaped on him, undeserving though he may be of that abuse. If there is any responsibility resting on the shoulders of any individual, it is on those of the individuals who have been punished for the offence of illegal fishing. The officer only carried out the orders of the department; he had nothing to do with inflicting pains and penalties on the Nobles, that responsibility rested with the Minister. As the Minister of Justice has said, he was determined to stamp out illegal fishing, and he took effective means of doing it, because, since that time I have not heard this year, nor during the latter half of last year of one case where it was necessary to prosecute any fisherman for illegal fishing. It is not always fishermen who fish illegally—every man feels he has as much right as another. It is a question of policy with respect to the fisheries. If we are going to destroy an industry, which brings into my constituency half a million dollars, by throwing open the fisheries at all times and seasons, and to every one who chooses to come there and fish, well and good. If that is going to be the law of the land, it is only a question of time when the Great Lakes of the west will be as much depleted as Lake Ontario is to-day. In the interest of our own people, the fisheries should be protected, and illegal fishing should be stopped, whether it is illegal for the parties not taking out a license, or whether it is from fishing in close season, the latter being by far the worse of the two, but if individuals are guilty of these offences, they should be punished. There is a law to punish smuggling, another to punish illicit distillation of spirits, and also a law to punish illegal fishing, and any one found guilty of the last-named offence should be punished; and it is not the part of members of this House, whether they sit on the right or the left of the Speaker's Chair, to show sympathy for individuals who have been punished for an illegal or irregular offence.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I dissent from the course taken of mixing up the general question of the protection of the fisheries with the particular action taken with regard to the Nobles. There is no member in this House who stood by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his attempt to protect our fisheries in the Georgian Bay more faithfully than myself, and I say, with a

full knowledge of the circumstances, that as regards the vest extent of coast with which I am concerned, so far from having been harsh or severe in dealing with the fishermen, the hon. gentleman endeavoured to carry out the law in a spirit which I think under the circumstances, was most creditable to his heart as well as his head, and the instances in which he dealt with the parties with severity, if he ever did deal with them severely, were cases where severity was certainly necessary. But the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Macdonell) has entirely destroyed the whole case which the Minister of Justice built up, because the Minister said he could not produce certain papers because this case is 'sub judice' and a prosecution is going on. The hon. gentleman for Algoma says there is no prosecution whatever; and, of course, if there is no prosecution, the reason given by the Minister for the nonproduction of the papers cannot exist. I am not going to enter into the vexed question of the rights or wrongs of the Nobles, I am only going to say this, that, having a very friendly feeling towards the late Minister of Marine with respect to the administration of his departmental affairs, having watched his course in the past, which I believe generally was one most useful to the country, and, knowing also the very great personal unpopularity which was cast upon him, in view of the statements of the hon. member for Algoma that there is no case to be tried, it would be better in the interest of the public, of the country and of the fishermen, that all correspondence in relation to this matter should be made public. If it was a case where there was criminal prosecution going it would be improper for this House to constitute itself a court, and to a certain extent try the case before it was submitted to a jury. But that does not appear to be the case. It appears that these men asked for an investigation in their own interest, and, therefore, it cannot be said that the Crown has any case to defend, and, therefore, the rule that would apply to the one case does not apply to the other, and so I would be very much pleased if the Minister of Justice would allow the papers to be laid before the House. Such a course could not prejudice the case of the Crown, because it has no case; it could not benefit the Nobles, because if their contentions were not valid, the production of the papers would do them no good. Such a course would, however, tend to clear up a vexed question and put an end to all this discussion and recrimination, and the public would then understand whether the action of the officers of the department was correct or not. I should, therefore, be exceedingly pleased if the Minister would agree to produce the papers; if not, I shall feel bound to vote against the amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot understand the view of the case taken by the member who has just taken his seat (Mr. O'Brien), because it is quite clear that if the papers were produced and the Nobles were able to prove that they had not in any way violated the law, or, at all events, not to an extent which would justify the seizure of their property, the natural result would be—and I am creditably informed that such is their intention—to enter an action for damages against the Crown. That, in my opinion, is a very strong and justifiable reason why the Government should not give away their case at this stage by supplying the papers.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is no question as to the guilt of the parties, and, therefore, how can there be a case against the Crown? The question is simply whether the Nobles were dealt with severely or not; there can be no technicality as to their guilt.

Mr. SPROULE. Their aim is to enter a case against the Crown for compensation.

Mr. LAURIER. Why cannot we have the evidence?

Mr. SPROULE. With equal justice the evidence in every case before the court might be asked for. If it is submitted in this case, why should it not be submitted in any case brought against the Crown. It seems to me the same rule should apply in both cases. I am surprised that the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) should have made this motion, because I am told by friends of the Nobles that it is not done at their instance, and that they do not want it done. They believe that the course of justice is being pursued at the present time, and that ultimately they will get redress so far as the circumstances will justify it. I presume that the action of the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is taken for the purpose of making political capital out of this matter, and of drawing to his side the friends of the Nobles who feel that they have been injured. There were a great many men employed in these boats who would have gone out fishing had the licenses been given, and they feel aggrieved no doubt that they were thrown out of employment and deprived of their means of earning a livelihood. It was a great hardship to them, and although they are not responsible for the acts which prevented these persons receiving their licenses, still all the same they feel aggrieved. I do not think that the interest of the Nobles can be best served by the course of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin). In fact I am creditably informed by their friends that they are against it, and that they have counselled the hon. gentleman not to push the notice as he has done to-night. With one or two remarks of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) I cannot agree. He said, that when these men paid their money

and got their receipt they believed that they had a perfect right to fish, as the licenses would come afterwards as a matter of form. Now, Mr. Charlie Noble himself, admitted in the presence of the Minister that he did know that the regulations had been changed. Up to a certain time the practice had been that when the money was paid, they commenced to fish when the season opened, although they might not get a license until June. The department changed the regulations and made it compulsory on each boat to carry its license when fishing, and the Nobles were notified of that, and they have admitted they knew it. That being the case, I cannot see that there is any reason for the statement that they went out ignorant of the regulations, and that there should be more leniency shown them on that account. Mr. Noble admitted himself in the presence of the Minister that he knew of the change in the regulations the fall before. He admitted also that after he paid his money, that he was told before his boats went out that he was not likely to get his license. When that information came to his knowledge he came down to Ottawa to intercede with the department in hopes he might induce them to give him his license, and on the very day he was here, and when we were pleading on his behalf in the office, a telegram came from the fishery overseer saying that his boats were out fishing in the Georgian Bay. He could not have done it in ignorance, because he admitted that he knew it. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) said that Mr. Noble should not be held answerable for anything that was done before the act upon which the conviction took place. Is that the course followed in a court of justice? When a judge is passing sentence on a prisoner with a very bad reputation, does he not take that into account, or does he make his sentence less severe on account of it. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) who is pleading before the courts every month in the year; would he not insist upon that consideration being taken into account, if he were prosecutig on behalf of the Crown, as he does from time to time, and would he not insist upon the bad record of the prisoner being placed before the judge before sentence was rendered.

Mr. LISTER. The sentence was given.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) say, as he said a few moments, before that the court should not take cognizance of the previous record of a prisoner whether it was bad or good.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me for interrupting him. What I say is, that the sentence was imposed—that was for the judge who tried the case—and now you have no right to go back on it.

Mr. SPROULE. The words of the hon. gentleman were: They should not be held answerable for anything done before the act upon which the conviction was had, and that the courts should not take cognizance of it. As one who lives on the shores of the Georgian Bay, and as one who has had a good deal to do with the fishermen for the last fifteen years, I know that I have been spoken to dozens of times by fishermen with regard to the reputation of the Nobles, and I merely give this as a justification for the seeming harsh course which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries adopted in this case. When I have been endeavouring to get these men off time after time, it has been said to me: Why take the Nobles part, they are perfect outlaws; they fish with nets that are larger than the law allows; they fish out of season, they violate the law in every way. They say: You cannot prosecute them because they are so strong and have such powerful influence at their back, the department is afraid to prosecute them, but they pile on to us because we are individually alone, and we cannot bring that force to bear against the department which the can. They will punish us severely as they have done time after time but on the other hand these influential men are let off. The Nobles were said to be guilty of violating the law almost every month in the season. I am not saying that it is a fact, but is was alleged to be a fact that they were perpetually violating the law, and that punishment was not meted out to them the same as it was to small offenders. The fishermen on the Georgian Bay spoke of it as a common thing when they had any dealings with their members. When we interceded in their behalf we have it constantly thrown in our faces, that these men were so strong, that they intimidated the inspector, that if the inspector dared to enforce the law they would get him out of the way by affidavits or complaints against him, or in some other way they would dispose of him. I am told by fishermen in the Georgian Bay that they threatened to intimidate the inspector, and they also told me that the inspector dare not do so and so, because these men were too powerful and would insist on him being displaced if he did his duty. I have had a little to do, Sir, with pleading in the interests of the Nobles. I feel still that the measures taken in the case were perhaps harsh, not so far as they affected directly the Nobles themselves, because I believe that the offences demanded severe punishment, but on account of the fact that so many innocent men who had not violated the law, but who were fishing in their boats, were punished, by being deprived of the means of earning their living. I did everything I could in their behalf, and when the Minister of Marine refused to give back these boats I carried the case to the late Premier, Sir John Thompson. I asked him to go over the papers in the department, and if possible to find some reasonable excuse for at least making the punishment less severe. The late Hon. Sir John Thompson

at my request went over these papers. He sat up from early one night until 1 o'clock in the morning examining them, and he promised to give me a reply, and after a close study of the case he said: I do not see how any man at the head of a department, having regard to the proper discharge of his duty, could have done otherwise than what the Minister of Marine has done. I cannot, nor would not, recommend any other course than what he has adopted, and he concluded by stating; I am ashamed to say that their record is a very bad one, and I cannot recommend the Minister of Marine to do otherwise than what he has done. That statement coming from the source it did, coming from a man who was disinterested, from a man who was always ready to meet us half way so far as he could and to show leniency and mercy where there was any justification for it; I say that the statement coming from that source made me feel like not pressing the case as strongly as I had done before.

Mr. LISTER. It was a very improper thing for you to do.

Mr. SPROULE. What was improper?

Mr. LISTER. To appeal from the Minister of Marine to the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose I have intelligence enough to do what I was sent here to do by my constituents without any advice from the hon. member for Lambton, notwithstanding that he may imagine himself a great authority. I say I did it in the interest of those parties who were not guilty of any violation of the law, but who were dependent for their living upon the parties who were charged with violation of the law; and I did it with the consent of the Minister of Marine, who said he was perfectly satisfied that I should appeal to any authority and if any authority connected with the Government thought he was dealing harshly or unfairly with them, he would be willing to reconsider the case; and I believe it was largely through the intercession of friends of the parties that the Minister decided to reconsider it. It was reconsidered. The Nobles asked to have the venue changed, and to have the case tried at Collingwood. I understood that that was granted, and no change more favourable to them could have been made, because Collingwood was the base of operations of the business men who handled their product, and the place where the men lived who were thrown out of employment. But even after that request was granted, I believe it was not satisfactory to them. They then asked that the case be tried at Killarney, I believe, because that was their home. I do not say that it would have been wrong had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries granted that request. I only state these facts to show that he was disposed to do what was fair in every step he took in this matter, and was not disposed to be arbitrary or overbearing or tyrannical, as the hon. member for Lambton alleges. I have read that pamphlet bearing the name of the firm of McCarthy, Osler & Creelman, and it appears to me to be a curious document, because, while that name of the firm is printed upon it, it is not stated that the pamphlet is endorsed by them or that it is their plea: but it appears to me to be intended to carry the force of the firm's name without the firm being responsible for what is contained in it. From my own personal knowledge, I can state that many of the things stated there as facts are absolutely incorrect. Therefore I do not set as much weight by that pamphlet as some hon. gentlemen who may not be so well acquainted with the facts as I am. Now, I do not want to urge a rigid application of the law to these men. I still feel in their behalf, and I am sorry that the matter has been brought before this House, in a way that may prejudice their case, in view of the fact that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries is going on, with the best intentions in the world, to have a re-examination, and to give the accused every opportunity to bring forward all the information they can to justify or condone what they have done, or to prove that they are not as bad as they are represented to be. No doubt full consideration of the case will take place in the department, and justice will be done to them; but I believe that everything would have gone on more in the interest of justice and the interest of the Nobles themselves if this motion had not been made. I cannot see why the department should, in the interest of justice, give up the papers, nor do I believe that to do so would serve the purpose of the Nobles; but I believe that justice would have been done without this row being made in this House, and without this attempt to make political capital by the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say a few words. The Minister of Justice did not appear to understand what I said about the object I had in moving for these papers. I told him that I was not moved by the Nobles, for I did not know them; they were no part of my concern in the matter. I merely wanted to find out, when a simple fine of $5 was imposed on them—for it must have been a small offence that carried so small a fine—whether the Department of Marine and Fisheries had the power to confiscate the property, the vessels and the plant of those people to the extent of $8,000 or $10,000 and throw them out of employment, and other men with them. I thought on public grounds that it was my duty to bring the matter up. I was not thinking of the Nobles; I was thinking of the principle involved. The hon. Minister of Justice told us of the difficulties he had while in

that department. He said that he had to meet influences all round opposed to him; he said he had the press against him. But the hon. gentleman told us a little while ago that he did not believe in the press; and he naturally thought that when the press was against him, the press was all wrong and was making false representations of the case, so he could not be governed by the press. Well, hon. gentlemen opposite get up and make charges in the House against the Nobles. They say the Nobles are pirates; the Minister of Justice said that. They said they were poachers; the Minister of Justice said that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not say that they were pirates; I said they were poachers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the press it was said that he spoke of them as pirates; it was a Conservative paper in Toronto, the "News," that said that. It appears that they can make these statements against the Nobles, and when we ask for the papers on which they base these allegations they decline to give them to us. If they want to abuse and blacken the Nobles, let us know on what grounds they do it. If spies and informers are brought up there, and lay before the department reports against the Nobles, they have a right to know it; they want to know those by whom they are slandered. Let them know the charges; and then they can face them. I do not think the hon. gentlemen who have made charges against the Nobles in this House have acted as they ought to act. They should bring down the papers and let us see on what they base those statements. I know nothing against those men. It appears from what the hon. member for Algoma says that he has seen some of these papers; he made the statement that he had seen them.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I stated distinctly that I saw them with the Nobles themselves.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood that the hon. gentleman stated that he had seen a paper containing some allegation against them, and that it was in the department.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Pardon me. I did not say I saw a paper containing an allegation against them. I stated that I saw a paper in which they stated that the fishery officer was not to blame, and that they had really had no cause of complaint against him. I stated that in answer to the charge made against the fishery overseer of being overbearing and tyrannical.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Justice says that he is satisfied that they are guilty, from reports that he has received. It is not from evidence taken from the department, but from reports carried into the department, perhaps by rivals in business. The hon. Minister of Justice knows that in business you oftentimes meet men who do not act fairly. There is another company which, I understand, was carrying reports to the detriment of this company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What company?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it is the Black Line.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I never heard of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I had the name in the reports. It may be the blackmail company for all I know, but it is a company with something black about it apparently, and it may be sending in these stories to the department. I do not know anything about that personally, but I have seen it stated in the papers which were given to me. If the Noble Bros. are poachers, if they are guilty, if they are criminals, as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) say they are, why did the Government renew their licenses? Is there any evidence in the department to show that they are criminals, poachers and pirates? Are they the kind of men to whom the department grants licenses? When the department grants a license to them, that must be an evidence that the department does not believe in these charges. It must be an evidence that the Minister of Marine does not believe the charges.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is no evidence at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is no evidence?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is no evidence.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If there is no evidence, what ground can there be for refusing to give us all the papers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no use in answering the hon. gentleman when he misconstrues.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. members for East Grey and Algoma can stand up and make charges against these men.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make a single charge against them to-night. I said it was alleged—that is the hardest word I used—and therefore it is not to be wondered at that the Minister of Marine assumed there was something wrong.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You said you knew the men.

Mr. SPROULE. But not that they violated the law.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). What I said, and I said it so distinctly that all could hear, was that they were guilty of illegal fishing and punished accordingly.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that when he found out that they were criminal he rushed to their rescue, he took them to his bosom, and they found in him a friend. It is singular, if those men were so bad, that so much influence should be brought to bear with the Minister of Justice to have the case dropped, and let them go on with their business. They cannot be so bad as they are painted by hon. gentlemen opposite. They seem to have friends and to have done a square business with the people, or they would not have respectable men backing them. I have brought this matter up because I do not think the department should have such large powers. I do not think the department should have the power to lock up any man's business as they did the business of this firm. The action of the department did not apply only to the Noble Bros., who were large dealers, but to some others who were small dealers—those who had skiffs; I think nine of them—and they lost the skiffs that belonged, not to the Noble Bros., but to themselves. The evidence shows that every one fishing at that place on that day was in the same position as the Nobles. I read an affidavit to-day, and there are five other affidavits of the same nature—and according to it all those who were fishing at the same place—some thirty tugs and skiffs—were in the same position. This shows there was an invidious distinction, and a desire to injure the Noble Bros., and let the others go. I brought up this case, as I do every case in which I think an injustice has been committed against anybody. It is my duty to do so, whether hon. gentlemen opposite like it or not. I have thought it my duty to move in this matter with the view, if possible, of lessening the penalty that may be attached to the offence, which, after all, was not an offence against the spirit of the law, even if it were against the letter. I therefore have moved that all the papers be brought down.

Sir JAMES GRANT. I cannot allow the present opportunity to pass without offering a few observations on this very important subject. I have listened to the statement of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell), and I must say that a more succinct, comprehensive statement could not possibly be made. I have no desire to re-discuss the question, inasmuch as it is so clear now that we should lose no time in coming to a positive decision. During the past two years I have taken a considerable degree of interest in the whole question of the fisheries of Canada, inasmuch as I believe there is no more important department under the control of the Government. We know perfectly well that our fisheries are very extensive and important, and growing in importance, and that the great aim of the Department of Marine is to guard and develop the best interests of the country by exercising strict supervision over individuals who are violating the laws of the country. With reference to this question of the Noble Bros., I know perfectly well that these gentlemen have carried on a very extensive trade in the upper lakes, having had, in fact, free access to those lakes for many years, without any particular care being taken as to the means by which they were acquiring a large fortune in the fisheries of western Canada, in which they are so largely and deeply interested. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that at no time in the history of our country have we had a gentleman in Canada with more comprehensive knowledge, both practical and scientific, as regards the fisheries, than Prof. Prince, who was brought in here, after the most careful inquiry in Great Britain, as to who was the individual most desirable to bring into Canada to look after our fisheries. Lord Kelvin, the present president of the Royal Society of Great Britain, Professor Huxley, and other gentlemen who know the great importance of this department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada strongly advised the appointment of Professor Prince. Since that gentleman came to Canada, in every subject he has investigated for the department he has been the means of advancing most materially the best interests of this country. I have no desire to detain the House by going into details, but we know that in the lobster fishery, in the oyster fishery, in the question of the use of seines, in the St. Clair fisheries, in every single, solitary instance his labours have been of great material benefit to the people of Canada. If we turn to the fisheries of Scotland, we find that under the laws made by the British Parliament, and carried out by their officers, the salmon streams are a source of large revenues. That may well be a lesson to us; and we must all know the importance of guarding our fisheries. If people are to be allowed to fish when the fish are spawning, the injury will be a great and lasting one to the whole country. The law must be enforced, those who break the law must be fined in order to protect the fisheries of the Dominion. I am very glad, indeed, that this discussion has taken place. There has been a full expression of opinion. This is not a matter of politics, but of right and justice. I, for one, do not think that any members of this House have a right to make political capital out of our fisheries. We want right; we want law; we want justice. We know the energy that is displayed by the gentlemen who preside over the interests of this country in guarding the great revenue accruing to us through those fisheries; we feel confident that they exercise a just discrimination in the administration of the law, and they have a right to expect our sup-

port in carrying out the laws in their entirety.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened to this discussion with considerable interest, and have come to the conclusion that our fisheries regulations have been carried out with a great deal of laxity. From what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) it is quite clear that for years and years the fishery regulations have been carried out as he says he knows, so far as the Georgian Bay is concerned, with a great deal of indifference. I have been asking myself who was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries prior to the gentleman who now occupies that position? It seems the Minister of Justice filled this office for a short time. It appears that he undertook to enforce the law, rightly or wrongly. If he undertook it with the desire to punish those who were guilty, he deserves credit. But the hon. gentleman who was his predecessor must have winked at the illegal fishing, he must have allowed the law to be violated, and these abuses to accumulate for years. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is a repetition of the Fredericton bridge experience? I wonder if it was under the management of the same individual that all these wrongs were allowed to go on from year to year, with nothing done to enforce the fisheries regulations, until the present Minister of Justice happened to be appointed Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has virtually confessed that this trouble has been in existence for many years. He says that those who were doing a smaller fishing business pointed to the fact that the Nobles were permitted to fish in violation of the law, that they were fishing as they pleased, and had never been interfered with and never punished. For what reason? Presumably because they had influence at court. It appears that they were related to men who happened to have a good deal of influence, and I suppose that influence was exercised. Well, Sir, this is another evidence of incapacity of hon. gentlemen opposite in the management of the affairs of the country. Every department shows want of efficiency. This is only another case added to the list. Here in the Department of Fisheries we find abuses that have been in existence from month to month, and from year to year, affording the clearest evidence of the inefficient manner in which affairs have been managed. This case undoubtedly evidences want of proper action on the part of the Government. The Minister of Justice says that a commission was appointed to take evidence. When the commissioner went into the case, he proceeded wrongly. His report and the evidence submitted were virtually of no use. The hon. member for East Grey evidently lost confidence in the department. He himself, by the statements he made, vitrually corroborated my conclusion. He says that he himself was in such doubt with regard to the capability of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to handle this affair that he took it out of his hands and went to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. I made no such statement. I said that the Nobles, believing that the Minister was prejudiced against them wished to have their case presented to the Premier, and I did it at their request and with the consent of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite prepared to accept the statement the hon. gentleman has made. The statement the hon. gentleman has made is this: The matter had been before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who had given it his best time and spent his best ability upon the consideration of it, and yet had been unable to reach a decision satisfactory to the hon. member himself and to the Nobles; and the Minister was so willing to get rid of the trouble which he did not feel capable personally of handling that he said to the hon. member: Take it to the First Minister and see if you cannot get some solution from him. This goes to prove the statement that I have made that incapacity rules in every department; that there is not a man capable of performing the duties of his position.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) agreed to on division; and motion as amended, agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing: 1. The quantity of binding twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary during the year 1894. 2. To whom the sales were made, and how much was realized per pound by the Government.—(Mr. Grieve.)

Correspondence between the War Eagle Gold Mining Company, the sub-collector of Customs et al, and the Hon. Controller of Customs, relative to placing a customs officer at Rossland, British Columbia.—(Mr. Mara.)

Return showing the amounts collected for customs duty on the printing, lithographs and scenery of all dramatic companies visiting Canada during the twelve months ending 1st April last; specifying the total amounts collected on each of the three items.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Papers and correspondence relating to the purchase or lease of the property knows as the "Old Carling Brewery" and situated in the city of London, on Waterloo and Pall Mall streets. Also copy of lease, if any.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copy of the letter addressed to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the local agent Bastien at La Jeune Lorette, province of Quebec, of date January, 1894, concerning the case of Picard vs. Picard.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Statement showing the various amounts paid by way of bounty on pig iron made in Canada from Canadian ore, the quantities produced, the parties to whom the bounties were paid, and such other particulars as tend to show the effect of

such bounties, since the date of the last return. Also a statement showing the same particulars as to bounties paid under the Act of 1894, 57-58 Victoria, chapter 9, upon iron puddled bars, and upon steel billets.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Orders in Council in any way affecting or relating to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal.—(Mr. Lister.)

Orders in Council affecting or relating to the Sheik's Island Dam.—(Mr. Lister.)

Petitions, letters and papers with reference to a daily mail service between Matane, in the county of Rimouski, and Ste. Anne des Monts, in the county of Gaspé.—(Mr. Joncas.)

Return showing: 1. The names of the several railways in the Dominion to which Dominion aid has been granted, except the Canadian Pacific main line. 2. The province within which the said railway, in whole or in part, is located and, if in two or more provinces, the number of miles in each. 3. The county or counties through which the said lines run in each province. 4. The amount of money actually paid to each up to the 1st January, 1895. 5. The railways built in the Dominion by the Dominion since confederation, excepting the main line of the Intercolonial and main line of the Canadian Pacific. 6. The province within which built. 7. The entire cost of each line built or assisted by the Dominion in each province, including equipment. 8. The entire sum spent up to the 1st January, 1895, last, on the construction of Dominion roads in each province, except the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway's main line.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all correspondence and reports in reference to the condition of the breakwater across the Yarmouth Bar at Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, and a statement of the original cost and subsequent expenditure on the same.—(Mr. Flint.)

Return of the manifests of the cargoes carried by the several steamships, "Duart Castle," "Taymouth Castle," and "Alpha and Beta" for the past twelve months ending 30th April last, subsidized to run between St. John and Halifax and Cuba and Jamaica and other ports in the West Indies. Also, statement of the subsidies earned or paid to each of such steamships during such time. Also, the names of all the shareholders in such steamships or in the company or companies entitled to receive such subsidies.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all correspondence between H. Langevin, Félix Pilon, Alexander Théoret, and others, concerning claims against the Federal Government on account of damages caused to their properties by the ss. "Ocean" breaking through lock No. 12 on the Beauharnois Canal in the spring of 1894.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Return of all subsidized contracts made during the past twelve months relating to the running of steamships between ports in the maritime provinces and ports in Cuba, Jamaica or elsewhere in the West Indies.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Statement of the number of cheese factories in Prince Edward Island operated under the direction of the Dominion Dairy Commissioner in the season of 1894. The gross product of those factories. The amount, per pound of cheese, advanced by the Government to the patrons. The cost of delivering the milk. The cost of making, per pound of cheese, as well as the total cost. The names of the markets where the products sold, and the date of sales. The names of the purchasers; the quantity sold to each, with the price in each case. The total cost of making sales, and the sum, per pound of cheese, finally paid to the patrons.—(Mr. McMillan.)

Return of the expenses of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, including the cost of printing the evidence and report of the Commission.—(Mr. Flint.)

Return showing the amount paid in each department of the Government for temporary clerks during the several years from 1st July, 1880, to 30th June, 1894, separately in each department for each year.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all petitions, letters and other documents exchanged with or addressed to the Postmaster General in reference to savings bank stamps.—(Mr. Lepine.)

Copies of all returns made to the Government of Canada by the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company, of receipts and expenditures of said company during the period from October, 1888, to 30th June, 1889, and the years ending 30th June, 1890-91-92-93 and 1894.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing all correspondence, reports, tenders received and contracts entered into for carrying mail matter between Battleford and Saskatoon, in the North-west Territories, during the past three years.—(Mr. Martin.)

Return of all correspondence and petitions from the council of the municipality of Morris, in the province of Manitoba, in reference to the taxation of unpatented lands held or occupied by settlers, within the limits of their municipality.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CRIMINAL CODE, 1892.

Mr. LAVERGNE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: The object of this Bill is first to amend section 3, to change the numbering and lettering of paragraphs in the French version, to make them correspond with the English version. Curiously enough, there are about 50 paragraphs in the clause, and no two as regards numbers and letters in the French version corresponding paragraph B is a definition of the words 'Attorney General' in the English version; in the French version it is a definition of an indictment. Paragraph C in the English version is the definition of 'banker'; in the French version it is a definition of

a 'testamentary instrument.' Paragraph D is a definition of 'cattle' in the English version; in the French version it is a definition of an 'officer of the peace.' In fact not two out of these 50 paragraphs in the French version correspond with the English version. This clause is one which is very often cited, and if the judge and the parties in the case have not in their hands the same version it is very misleading. The object of the amendment is simply to carry into effect a comparison of the two versions and make them identical. The second clause which is proposed to be amended, and it is a most important one, is section 785. This section gives jurisdiction to certain magistrates in the province of Ontario—for instance, to the police magistrates and stipendiary magistrates in that province to hear cases which come under the jurisdiction of the court of the general sessions of the peace. The amendment I propose is to give the same jurisdiction in the province of Quebec to the district magistrates and to the police magistrates. The court of the general sessions of the peace in the province of Quebec only sits in Montreal or Quebec, and when we require to have such court sit in any other district a proclamation is required, and the court of general sessions of the peace in those districts is to be presided over by a judge of Superior Court, or by two justices of the peace. These justices of the peace are never qualified and never sit. These proclamations, in fact, have never been issued. The object of the amendment proposed is that that clause 785 should apply to Quebec as well as to Ontario. This gives the option to the accused or defendant to take his trial before the sitting magistrate in summary trial, or for an offence over which the court of general sessions of the peace has jurisdiction. This proposed amendment is very important in this way, that it will remove a great many inconveniences and save much expense. We are obliged in some of our districts, not having this proclamation issued or any qualified justice of the peace, to take a jury trial in these cases, which is very expensive, and moreover sometimes when the calendar is not very heavy we have no criminal term for one year or eighteen months, and the accused have to be kept in jail or bailed, sometimes for a period of over twelve months, and sometimes after being admitted to their personal bail they are released without trial; whereas if they were able to obtain prompt trial, with their consent, before a district magistrate or a police magistrate most of the business could be done in this way to the great convenience of all the people. There are also two other amendments proposed in this Bill, which are of a somewhat more technical character. I propose to amend section 195 so as to make it correspond with section 783 (f). The same applies to section 263 (b) so as to make it correspond with section 783 (e). Section 783 gives certain jurisdiction over certain offences. We propose to make this section correspond with section 263. The Minister of Justice, I think, will agree with me that this will prove very useful legislation. Section 785, if amended so as to place the province of Quebec on the same footing as Ontario, would effect a large saving, and this interpretation clause to which I have referred is a necessity. This amendment should be carried out at once.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That Government Orders have precedence on Thursdays for the remainder of the session, after questions to be put by members; and that the Order of Thursday be made the Order for Wednesdays; the hour for Private Bills from half-past seven to be continued.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest to the leader of the House that on this occasion we adopt the same course that has been pursued heretofore, namely, make the order of business for Thursday apply to Wednesday. If this is not done, Public Bills and Orders will have a very small share of the time of the House; but if this is carried out, then Public Bills and Orders and Notices of motions will have their fair proportion of the time. This course was followed last session and the previous session.

Mr. LAURIER. Before this question is put, and before the House is called upon to decide to give an additional day to the Government, we are entitled to receive from the Government some information which has not yet been given to the House. The motion proposed is the usual one when we have reached a certain stage of the session, and it is submitted with a view to hasten the day of prorogation. But on this occasion, before the House is asked as to whether or not the time has come to give the Government this additional day; the time has come also when the Government should tell us whether or not they are to introduce new legislation, or whether we have now before this House all the legislation which they intend to bring forward. It is time for the Government to tell the House whether or not we are going to have the grant to the Hudson Bay Railway. An Order in Council was passed about three months ago, and after three months' deliberation over it, and after the House has been for six weeks in session, we are entitled to know whether the Government is to ask the House to concur in that undertaking. The hon. gentleman must admit himself that the demand which I now present is not at all unfair or unreasonable. Nay, more, I think the House, at this time, has a right to know what are the intentions of the

Government, before we can be asked to depart from the usual method of proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman gives a novel reason as to why he would be inclined, on certain conditions, to refuse to give the Government an extra day; the reason being, so far as you can infer it, that if we do not have very much more business than is now on the Order paper, he would be willing to grant an extra day to the Government: but if we did have more business, he would feel disposed to deny the extra day to the Government. Thus, his conclusion would be that the less business we have the more time he would give us, and the more business we have, the less time we should get. I am able to satisfy my hon. friend's curiosity in part. Looking over the Order paper, I think I may say that nearly all the important ordinary legislation that the Government has proposed is now on the Order paper, and before the cognizance of the House. There may be one, or two, or three, minor amendments to Acts which are yet to be brought down. Under the notices that are on the paper for the Bills which are before the House for second reading, I think I may say that all the important ordinary legislation that the Government proposes is there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And about the extraordinary legislation?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to some matters which have been discussed, particularly in the House, I am not prepared to give definite information with regard to all of them. I may say, however, with regard to one, that the Government does not propose to place any proposition before the House involving legislation with reference to the Chignecto Ship Railway. With reference to the Hudson Bay Railway, I am not in a position to definitely say what particular course the Government will recommend. Outside of that, I think my hon. friend's curiosity is entirely satisfied, and having gone so far, I am sure he will not be unreasonable in dissenting to the Government taking an extra day. We have not pushed this matter unduly. I find that last year the House met on the 15th of March, and the Government took Thursdays on the 3rd of May, forty-nine days after the opening. This year it so happens that if Thursday is granted, it will be exactly forty-nine days since the commencement of the session. In 1893 the House met on the 26th of January, and the Thursday was taken on the 2nd March, a period of thirty-five days intervening. Under all these considerations, I am sure that we have not unduly pressed for the extra day, and the state of business is such as to warrant the Government in asking for it. I have no hesitation in adopting the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), as it will give the Public Bills and Orders a better chance.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. SPROULE. If the House grants this motion, there ought to be something done to dispose of one or two Bills on the Order paper. There are now twenty-eight Bills on the Orders, many of them very important, and which ought to be passed, but which clearly will not pass if the Government take another day in the week, unless something is done. The Sunday Observance Bill and the Seduction Bill of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) are the first Orders on the paper. I have been here for many years and the general custom has been that at the commencement of the session these two Bills are put first on the Order paper, and they stand there, week after week, consuming the whole time of the House. Every day we reach Public Bills and Orders the whole time is taken up by one or other of these Bills until the session is so far advanced that the Government take an extra day, and the rest of the public Bills must stand. I think those Bills ought to be disposed of in some way, so as to allow us to deal with other public Bills which are of quite as much importance to the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman's strictures on those two Bills are most unfair and unwarranted by the facts. The Bill which stands first upon the Order paper this year stood there first last year, but the consideration of that Bill was interfered with in consequence of the rule of the House which permits a notice of motion to take its place at the head of the Order paper, under certain circumstances. Last year a notice of motion usurped the place of this Bill for six or seven sittings, and the Sabbath Observance Bill scarcely received the consideration of this House at all. This year the Bill has not taken up more time than it is fairly entitled to, and it is now practically out of the way, because it is placed under the care of the Minister of Justice, who is to give the first and second sections, which passed the committee, his consideration, and propose them as amendments to the Criminal Code.

Mr. SPROULE. It is on the Order paper yet.

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the rule I have referred to, the notice of motion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) takes the first place on the Order paper, and that motion has already consumed two or three sittings. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) wishes to make any regulations which will facilitate the consideration of Public Bills and Orders, let him move that the notices of motion should be put in their proper place on the Order paper. The second Bill of mine on the Order paper is a most important Bill, but it has not yet received any consideration at all. I have suggested to-day that the order of business for Thursdays should be applied to Wednesdays, so as to give Public Bills and Orders more time.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that was quite unnecessary, under the circumstances.

Mr. LAURIER. Coming back to the question which I put to the Minister a moment ago, I must say that for my part I am greatly disappointed at the answer he has given. He has told us that he does not propose any legislation in connection with the Chignecto Railway this year, but I submit that it is time we should know whether or not he is going to proceed with the Hudson Bay grant. Until he gives us that answer, I am not disposed to agree to any relinquishment of the rules of the House.

House divided on motion of Mr. Foster:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Belley,
Bergeron,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hazen,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McKay,
McKeen,
Madill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncreiff,
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pridham,
Putnam,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—87.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowman,
Brown,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies,
Dawson,
Edgar,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Harwood,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Legris,
Lister,
Lowell,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Vaillancourt,
Welsh, and
Yeo.—55.

Motion agreed to.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY—STATE FESTIVITIES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to make a suggestion. Their Excellencies proposed to dispense very generous hospitalities on the Queen's birthday, largely amongst the members of the House on both sides, and, owing to the holidays that came at that time, they were postponed. As they are to take place to-morrow evening, I would like to make a suggestion, and put it in the form of a motion:

That when Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair at six o'clock to-morrow, Wednesday, the House shall stand adjourned until the following day at three o'clock.

If this motion carries, it must be by general consent, as notice has not been given of it.

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF TOBACCO.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to remind the Controller of Inland Revenue that last session I drew his attention to the fact that foreign leaf tobacco was entering Canada without paying duty. The hon. Controller stated that during the vacation he would look into the matter and be ready to give an answer this session. I want to know what steps the Government have taken, or what decision they have arrived at?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The only answer I can give to the hon. gentleman is that the Government are still considering that question. I may say further, that while the Government are pretty strongly committed to the doctrine of protection, the Canadian producer of tobacco is protected to the extent of 400 per cent as against im-

ported leaf; and, so far as I am concerned, though very strongly in favour of the doctrine of protection, I am not disposed to give any further protection to that article.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to answering the question.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to ask the hon. Secretary of State when the return ordered by this House in 1893, in 1894, and again in 1895, in regard to the industries of the counties of Queen's and Shelburne, N.S., will be brought down?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Two men in the Department of Agriculture are working all the time preparing these returns, and there will not be a moment's delay in bringing them down. I shall have some returns this week, and some more next week.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to inquire when the report of the Dairy Commissioner will be brought down. I thought it was going to be included in the report of the Experimental Farm, but I see that the two reports are to be published separately again.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not very long.

SUPPLY—PERSONAL EXPLANATION—FREE LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a matter that once engaged the attention of this House, and has provoked considerable discussion in the country. It is a matter pertaining largely to myself; and, but for the attention that has been given to it by Ministers, by Conservative members of the House, and by the Conservative press, I should not have felt warranted in obtruding it upon the attention of the House at this time. But, under the circumstances, I feel bound to take the course I am taking at this moment. About one year ago, on the 13th June, last year, a very bitter attack was made upon me, without notice, by a member of this House. I was called upon, on the spur of the moment, to refute, to the best of my ability, that attack. Owing to certain circumstances, my course in doing so was, to some extent, embarrassed and constrained. The Wilson Bill, which placed Canadian lumber upon the free list, was, at that time, pending before the United States Congress, and, owing to that fact I, perhaps, withheld some statements that I might otherwise have deemed it proper to make on that occasion. After stating the circumstances, I take this opportunity—the first one that has occurred since the opening of this session—to refute some of the charges that were made upon that occasion, and previous to that occasion, and that have been subsequently made against me. The Conservative press has paid me a good deal of attention. Conservative members have also paid me a good deal of attention. Allusions have been made to the circumstances by members of this Government since the opening of the session, and not many months ago a member of the Government—not at that time a member of the Cabinet, but one who has subsequently become one—within my own riding, at the town of Tilsonburg—I refer to the Secretary of State—made an attack upon me. I was not present, but I am informed that he assured my constituents that I was a traitor, that I was unworthy the confidence of any constituency in Canada, and that there was not another constituency except the one I represented which would so far disgrace itself as to choose me for its representative. Under these circumstances, I ask the indulgence of the House while I now refute some of the charges made against me in connection with the long struggle to secure concessions from the United States Government with regard to their lumber duty; and I propose to make some statements which, I think, will exonerate me from the charges that have been made against me.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have always been in favour of reciprocal trade with the United States, that I have always considered that question the most important fiscal question which could engage the attention of the Canadian people. I have always felt that if we could not get a broad, comprehensive measure of reciprocity, we should be thankful if we could obtain a portion of it. I have acted upon the assumption that any citizen of Canada who was able to use influence, directly or indirectly, in the direction of securing trade concessions which would be beneficial to this country, and who did so, was acting in a patriotic manner that ought to commend itself to all his fellow-citizens. Now, whatever action I may have taken, the purpose that I have had in view has always, I imagine, been apparent, and the result of that action has in no case been detrimental to the interests of this country,; and if, in connection with the negotiations for free lumber, I have been able to make use of the argument that a concession on the part of the Canadian Government of free logs and the abolition of export duty was a matter of sufficient importance to induce the American Government to place upon the free list the long list of articles now put upon that list under their wood schedule, I hold that the arguments used for that purpose, resulting in the practical exchange of free logs or free lumber, were something very greatly in the interests of this country.

The conditions of the McKinley Bill, some five years ago, were accepted by this Government; but although the conditions of that Bill was accepted by this Government, obloquy was thrown upon me because it was asserted that I had some connection with the negotiation of those conditions. The conditions of the Wilson Bill were accepted by this Government; and yet, although the Government gladly accepted these conditions, an attack was made upon me less than a year ago in this House, and I have been attacked by Conservative newspapers and orators since for having been the instrument of obtaining the very thing which the Government were glad to accept. I feel a deep sense of injury and wrong in connection with the course which the Conservative press and Conservative politicians have taken towards me.

The existence of an export duty on logs excited a very strong feeling of hostility in the United States. That feeling was attributable to several causes. The Americans are not in favour of export duties primarily; their constitution prohibits such duties. Every American believes that an export duty is a bad kind of fiscal policy 'per se.' The export duty on logs, it was discovered by Americans, some years ago, was most unfair in its application, for the reason that while they were debarred by their constitution from imposing an export duty on logs, Canada was imposing an export duty, and during the time that was being done, while we were exporting at the rate of 3,000,000 feet to the United States, we were importing at the rate of 8,000,000—or, our exports were only three-eights of our imports. When the Americans discovered that the balance of advantage from the importation of logs and their manufacture into lumber was so largely in favour of Canada, that was an additional reason for dissatisfaction on their part with the existence of the export duty; and in consequence of that dissatisfaction, those who sought to obtain free lumber found standing, as a lion in their path, this feeling of resentment on the part of those specially interested in that trade, because of the imposition of a duty which every American conversant with the matter felt to be in the highest degree unfriendly and unfair. When the Mills Bill was under consideration in 1888, the condition made in the Bill was that lumber should not be placed upon the free list in the case of any country that imposed an export duty. I have always believed and acted upon the conviction that an export duty, that discriminating duties, that such a motion as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) has now on the Notice paper to compel the Americans to peel the bark from their logs in order to increase the cost of getting them out—I have always been convinced that all such restrictions were calculated to promote nobody's interest particularly, except a few parties directly interested, and were calculated to put the two countries further asunder, and render more difficult the securing of any trade concessions from the United States. For that reason I have always been opposed to an export duty. I first began to operate on this question by endeavouring to convince my fellow lumbermen that an export duty was not in their interest. Time was when an export duty was asked by the great majority of lumbermen. I believe that some three or four years ago a delegation of Ottawa lumbermen waited upon the Minister of Finance and asked for an increase of the export duty. Gradually these men came to see that the imposition of this duty stood as a bar against their obtaining from the United States that which we all desired, namely, the free admission of Canadian lumber, and, consequently, the lumber trade, of Ontario, at least, was opposed almost to a man to the continuance of this export duty. This better state of feeling having been obtained among the lumbermen, the road was open for negotiations that might be prosecuted with the certainty that our own people were prepared to recommend the removal of this obnoxious impost.

The McKinley Bill was under consideration in the year 1890. In the House of Representatives it was proposed that any country which imposed an export duty upon logs should have the amount of that export duty added to the import duty upon the lumber received from that country. The condition of affairs as relating to our obtaining concessions was in a most unsatisfactory shape. I was in Washington during the discussion of that measure. I am perfectly free to confess, that I went to Washington, to see if anything could be done on behalf of the lumber interests of Canada. I sounded many members of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees of the Senate and the House as to their views on this question, and urged the advisability and propriety of freer trade relations and more friendly trade conditions between the two countries; and I assured these men that, in my belief, the export duty, which was universally cited by those in favour of high duties as reason for refusing the demand for free lumber, could be made to stand aside. Well, an arrangement was made; and, so far as I know, I was the only Canadian connected with that arrangement. I was directed to Senator Philetus Sawyer, of Wisconsin, who, I was told, was the authority in the Senate upon all lumbering matters. The result was a suggestion that if the Canadian Government would promise to remove the export duty, the American Government would reduce the lumber duties from $2 to $1 per thousand; and I was authorized to say to the

Government here in Canada that if that promise were made a reduction in the lumber duties would take place when the McKinley Bill left the Finance Committee of the United States Senate. I came to Ottawa and saw Sir John Macdonald and placed this proposition before him. He looked upon me, evidently, with some little distrust——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some hon. member says "hear, hear"—and failed to realize that this proposition covered something of very great advantage to Canada. I then looked around for some Conservative member conversant with the lumber trade and of high respectability and great influence, and I naturally, Mr. Speaker, selected yourself. After a conference we arranged an interview with Sir John Macdonald. The subject was presented to the right hon. gentleman by both yourself and myself, and Sir John Macdonald, after hearing the case stated, fell in at once with the idea, said that it was a good one and would redound to the advantage of Canada. He said also that Canada would agree to it, and he suggested that you, Mr. Speaker, should put a notice of a question upon the paper, and it would be answered. And here is the question on page 616 of the Votes and Proceedings of 1890, under date of 7th May:

Mr. White (Renfrew)—Inquiry of Ministry—Whether, in the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber to $1 per thousand feet, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs?

That question was asked in due course, not by yourself, Mr. Speaker, but, in your absence, by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), and here is the report in "Hansard" of 1890, vol. 2, page 4662:

DUTY ON SAWN LUMBER.

Mr. BRYSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, with the permission of the House, I would like to ask a question which has been put on the Notice paper by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). The question is this: Whether, in the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber to $1 per thousand feet, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs? It is very important that this question should be answered at the present moment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will answer that question. In the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duties on sawn lumber, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs. I will take an opportunity of conveying that decision to the proper quarters.

Now, Sir, there was a culmination of negotiations originated at Washington. It was a proposition, in point of fact, of the American Government, an informal proposition, which was laid before the Government by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and answered by the Prime Minister, that the United States Government would reduce the duty on sawn lumber to $1 per thousand feet, on condition that Canada should repeal the export duty on pine and spruce logs. When the McKinley Bill became law it was found that the duty was removed from pine lumber only, but the same condition was attached—that the export duty should be removed from pine and spruce logs so that we could not be required to take advantage of it, as the terms of the arrangement had not been fully complied with. I felt not a little incensed at this result; I felt that the American Government had not kept faith, and I withdrew from the whole affair and had nothing more to do with it. But Sir John A. Macdonald was interviewed by lumbermen of the Ottawa valley. I do not know whether you took any part in that, Mr. Speaker, or not, but he was interviewed by Mr. Booth I believe, and also by Mr. A. H. Campbell, of Toronto, a prominent lumberman and a prominent supporter of his own, and pressure was brought to bear upon him to accept the proposition even although the duties upon spruce lumber were retained, and to accept the condition made under the McKinley Bill and remove the export duty upon both pine and spruce logs for the consideration of $1 per thousand feet reduction upon pine lumber. Sir John Macdonald decided to do this and the export duty was repealed. This incensed the representatives of the spruce interests, who felt that the pine interests had sacrificed them for their own advantage. But the trouble was that the American Government had not carried out the agreement, while the Canadian Government had seen fit to accept the half loaf and remove the export duty. As to this McKinley concession, whatever it amounted to, I freely acknowledge I was connected with the matter. In all human probability, so far as the initiation of these negotiations was concerned, I alone was connected with the matter. I accept all that responsibility. But when the Government accepted the proposition they assumed the responsibility and I must be exonerated from blame, and they are estopped from calling me a traitor because I was found in Washington seeking to advance Canadian interests.

Then with regard to the Wilson Bill. We remained under the McKinley Bill from October, 1890, up to last year. The Wilson Bill was introduced late in 1893. That Bill received exhaustive discussion and consideration in the Ways and Means Committee. It finally emerged from that committee and was referred to the House of Representatives, and passed that House early in February, 1894. It then went to the Senate. It was under consideration in the Senate, when I happened to be in Washington. I arrived in that city on the 25th day of February, 1894, and I remained there until the 1st of March. I found after my arrival there that this measure, which, in its provisions, as it left the House, was in the highest degree favour-

able to Canada, was in danger, in consequence of some mistake, or some disagreement, or some bad feeling about the export duty proviso. Now, Sir, here are the articles from which it was proposed to remove the duty, and when I read the list hon. members may judge whether it was or was not an advantageous thing to Canada to seek to secure the passage of that Bill and seek to retain the list of these free lumber provisions. These provisions are contained in the Wilson Bill, paragraphs 673 to 683, and they are as follows:—

673. Firewood, handle-bolts, heading-bolts, stave bolts and shingle bolts, hop poles, fence posts, railroad ties, ship timber, and ship planking, not specially provided for in this Act.

674. Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and for building wharfs.

675. Timber, squared or sided.

676. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of cedar, lignum vitae, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

677. Pine clapboards.

678. Spruce clapboards.

679. Hubs for wheels, posts, last blocks, wagon blocks, oar blocks, gun blocks, heading, and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn or sawed only.

680. Laths.

681. Pickets and palings.

682. Shingles.

683. Staves of wood of all kinds, wood unmanufactured: Provided, that all of the articles mentioned in paragraphs six hundred and seventy-three to six hundred and eighty-three, inclusive, when imported from any country which lays an export duty or imposes discriminating stumpage dues on any of them, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this Act.

Now, here was a list of Canadian dutiable exports, that amounted annually to over $13,000,000; and the proviso that it was intended to put in with regard to this matter, in the House, was the same old proviso that had been contained in the Mills Bill, that any nation that wished to avail itself of the privileges gained by this exemption from duty of this list of articles, should be debarred from imposing an export duty upon any of them. That was the provision which it was intended to incorporate in the Wilson Bill. By some clerical blunder, the Bill left the Committee of Ways and Means and went through the House with the provision, that if any country imposed an export duty on any article in that list, then the United States should restore that article to its original condition under the previous law, the result of this would have been that farcical condition of things which I have described, that in case of an export duty on logs being imported, all the United States Government would be able to do would be to restore the logs to the position they occupied before the passage of this Bill, which would debar the United States from reaping any of the advantages whatever which it was designed to reap with reference to the export duty proviso. This Bill came to the Senate; and, as I say, I reached Washington on 25th February. The Democratic caucus of the Senate commenced on the 26th February, and it continued until the first day of March. The Michigan lumber interest had supposed that it had secured its purpose in the provision of this Bill as it left the Committee of Ways and Means; but that interest had discovered that it was mistaken. The Bill was under discussion in the Senate caucus, and the Michigan influence, which was a potent influence in this respect, was in a state of dissatisfaction, and the suggestion was made to strike out the whole free lumber schedule altogether, and to leave the matter to be adjusted by subsequent negotiation. The Senate was in this position: While there was an overwhelming Democratic majority in the House, there was a very narrow Democratic majority in the Senate, I think a majority of four only; and the various interests, such as those opposed to free coal, those opposed to free sugar, those opposed to free iron ore, and those opposed to free lumber, if they combined in what the Americans term a log-rolling arrangement, could carry any arrangement they pleased. On Tuesday, the day after the Senate caucus met, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, who was a member of the Behring Sea Commission, and is a very influential member of the Senate, made a speech against free lumber, and it was evident that while Michigan was wavering, and just about to veer round and throw its influence against free lumber, the lumber states of the south were only seeking an excuse for throwing themselves against this feature of the Bill of their own party, and of their own Government. Now, the states opposed to free lumber were Maine, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; the other lumber states of the union were North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and Arkansas. All these stetes were interested in lumber, all these states were large producers of lumber, all these states naturally were not well affected to the free-lumber provision of the Bill, and the same was true with regard to Oregon and Washington. Well, Sir, the position of the matter at Washington was one where the free-lumber provision of this Bill was in the most critical position, and the prospect was that it would be thrown out; and as free coal, free iron, and free sugar were thrown out, it seemed almost certain that this feature of the Bill, in addition, would be sacrificed by the combination of a portion of the Democratic members of the Senate opposed to these provisions. Now, Sir, the Michigan members, as I said, were wavering as to the position they would take in regard to this matter. One thing was certain, that they would require ab-

solutely that that Bill should be amended in such a way as to protect them in the way that is was supposed it did protect them when it left the Committee of Ways and Means; and without the insertion of the last of the paragraphs that placed the various articles of lumber upon the free list, without the insertion in that paragraph of a proviso satisfactory to the Michigan men, the fate of the Bill was a foregone conclusion. If they pronounced against the Bill, if their demands were not satisfactory, if their wishes and their views were not met, their hostility would settle the fate of the Bill; and, in order to secure the passage of the free lumber provisions of the Bill, it was necessary to incorporate in that Bill then and there an export duty proviso, unequivocally positive, that could not be mistaken, that would assure the Michigan men that if these $13,000,000 worth of lumber products were placed upon the free list, their interests should be protected by making it contingent upon the definite provisions that logs should be exempt from an export duty. Now, what was to be done? There was the position of the matter, there was this caucus in progress, there was the certainty that negotiations were going on in that caucus of the Democratic party with a view to purge the free lumber provision. It was known then that sugar, and free iron ore, and free coal had gone; it was supposed that lumber was almost certain to share the fate of these other three articles. Something must be done then and there, or free lumber, and the privilege to import $13,000,000 of our products into the United States market free of duty, was gone. Now, what would the Minister of Finance have done under the circumstances? Would he have refused to make a suggestion that would secure the passage of these free-lumber provisions? Would he have refused to make a suggestion that would have averted the disaster that threatened this country in the prospect of this provision being lost? Well, if he would not have done so, he would not have acted very much in the interest of Canada, I imagine; and what I did do, Mr. Speaker, was to suggest to some members of Congress that this difficulty could be averted, that there was no necessity for standing that matter aside, that the United States Government could just leave the articles enumerated in these eleven paragraphs, from 673 to 683 inclusive, upon the free list, and they could insert a proviso providing for the placing of these articles upon the free list, under conditions that either would secure from Canada the free exportation of logs, or would leave with the Canadian Government the choice of putting on an export duty and losing the free-lumber provision. That was done, and I do not deny it was done. I do not deny that I had something to do with the arrangement. I do not deny that I talked this matter over with members of the Committee of Ways and Means. I do not deny that I talked this matter over with a sub-committee of the Finance Committee of the Senate, Senators Voorhees and Vest; I do not deny that I was instrumental in getting that proviso so amended that we saved free lumber. It was all referred to the Government of Canada. That Government was free to approve and accept the arrangement, or to disapprove and reject it, and if they had not approved it, but had rejected it, there would have been reason for casting obloquy upon me. But when the arrangement was made, when the proviso was accepted, when the proposition was endorsed by this Government, who gladly accepted the arrangement, and not only gladly accepted it, but subsequently made sacrifices to retain this very arrangement that was made upon that occasion, I hold that no blame can attach to me for having been instrumental in making the arrangement. I might go more exhaustively into this matter, I might explain the various steps in the laborious efforts I made to save this free-lumber provision, in going from one member to another, interviewing this man and that man, and seeking to impress the Treasury Department in favour of that view. I might do this, but it is unnecessary. Suffice it to say, that the proposition was adopted by the Senate Committee of Finance, and the adoption of that proposition secured the retention in the Wilson Bill of the paragraphs that place the articles I have read upon the free-lumber list. Now, Sir, free lumber having been saved, the essence of the arrangement having been free logs on the one hand, for free lumber on the other, and that arrangement having been accepted by Canada, as it was subsequent to this time—it was not until some time in August when the Bill finally passed—I think that if all the circumstances had been known, all impartial men upon the opposite side of the House would have said that the attack made upon me in this House on the 13th June last, was unwarranted and unfair. And it did strike some individuals as unwarranted and unfair. I will take the liberty of reading some letters I received not long after this time from men conversant with all the circumstances connected with the insertion of the free-lumber clauses in the Wilson Bill, in order to show the House and the country what opinion is held by men out side of the House, and by those in influential positions, and best competent to judge. The first letter I will read is from a gentleman who appeared before the Privy Council in this city in December last, in relation to the boom duty question, and urged that question here, and I think impressed the Privy Council with his absolute and eminent fairness—I refer to the Hon. Thomas A. E. Weadock, mem-

ber of Congress for one of the Michigan districts, and a resident of Bay City, who wrote on 20th June, as follows :—

Washington, 20th June, 1894.

Mr. John Charlton, M.P.,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—I notice that the Conservative press of Canada has been severely criticising you upon your alleged course in regard to free lumber. I am very certain that without the export duty proviso in the Wilson Bill, lumber ought not and would not be free. Without the reciprocal arrangement of free lumber for free logs, that is free of export duties, a feature of the Bill, Michigan members would have opposed it, and it would not have passed the committee. The lumber states would have preferred retaining at least half the present duty, and with the parties so nearly tied in the Senate, you can see how close a call free lumber would have had. As it is, I think Canada has the best of it, and in rendering any service toward securing free lumber, you have done your people a service. It may not be perceived, however, by those who will not see.

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,
THOMAS A. E. WEADOCK.

I desire next to read a letter from the Hon. J. R. Whiting, a member of the Committee of Ways and Means, and a member of Congress for Michigan. It is as follows :—

Washington, D.C., 21st June, 1894.

My dear Sir.—I note a disposition to criticise you because of the clause in our Bill to require free logs from Canada as the price of free lumber. I can say this : A free lumber Bill was defeated in the last Congress through Michigan's protests, joined to those of California and the South. Michigan interests in free logs from Canada reconciled her to free lumber, deny this and her opposition will be aroused at once.

Yours truly,
J. R. WHITING.

To Hon. John Charlton.

This letter was written when the Bill was pending. The next letter I read is from Senator Voorhees, chairman of the Senate Committee of Finance, as follows :—

Washington, 13th July, 1894.

Dear Sir,—My attention has been called to some attacks upon you in the Canadian journals, based upon the assertion that you suggested the export duty proviso in the wood schedule of the Wilson Bill. The attack seems to me so unfair that I take the liberty of writing to say that the proviso is understood to have secured the support of the Michigan members for free lumber. It is not unlikely that the active hostility of Michigan would have defeated free lumber, and without the export duty proviso, that hostility, there is little reason to doubt, would have been vigorously applied.

Very respectfully,
D. W. VOORHEES.

Hon. John Charlton, M.P.,
Ottawa, Canada.

One other letter I desire to read, and it is from a gentleman very largely engaged in the lumber interests, whose responsibility will be vouched for by the fact that he was Democratic candidate for Governor of the state of Michigan last year—the Hon. S. O. Fisher, former member of Congress, who is also conversant with this matter. It is as follows :—

West Bay City, Michigan, 20th June, 1894.

Hon. John Charlton,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I notice that the Conservative press of Canada is engaged in criticising you in a manner which evinces, either ignorance of the question under consideration, or a desire to place your alleged course on the export duty question in a false light before the people.

There are two or three points in the free lumber question that should be kept in mind when dealing with the matter. One of these points is, that if Michigan had joined its forces with those of Maine, the lumber states of the South and other lumber states, free lumber would have been lost in the Senate ; just as free coal, free ore and free sugar were lost. Another point is, that unless proper provision had been made for making free lumber depend upon the absence of all export duties in Canada upon logs or other forest product, Michigan would have thrown its entire influence against free lumber, and would have secured its defeat in the Senate. Such being the case, whoever can claim the invention of the export duty proviso of the Wilson Bill, can logically claim the credit for free lumber ; for, without that provision, free lumber could not have been carried. If the Wilson Bill carries and the Canadian Government believes that Canada is not getting enough under the reciprocal arrangement, which practically offers free lumber for free logs, it will not be necessary to accept this, for they are quite at liberty to impose as heavy an export duty as they please, surrendering in doing so the privilege of free entry into the United States for all kinds of lumber and forest product.

Very truly yours,
S. O. FISHER.

There are some other matters referred to in this letter of a personal character which I do not read. On the 19th July, while the Wilson Bill was still pending and while the attack on me was still being carried on in the press of the country, the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley held a meeting, which I attended, and I laid before my brother lumbermen a full and frank statement of all I had done in regard to this matter. They understood my motives perfectly well ; they understood the value of the consideration obtained in the Wilson Bill for free logs, and in the course of that meeting the following resolution was adopted—I may say that the chairman of the meeting was Mr. Booth of this city, one of the most prominent Conservatives of this country, and a good many attending the meeting were Conservatives :

Resolved, That this meeting is of opinion, that a fair measure of reciprocity in the trade relations of Canada and the United States would be in the interest of both countries ;

That, in the matter of the lumber trade, if such an arrangement should embrace the reciprocally free exchange of logs and lumber between the two countries, it would be of mutual benefit ;

That, in so far as Mr. Charlton has been able to contribute towards the securing of such legislation, he has acted in the commercial interests of Canada.

This was the deliverance and decision of the meeting of the lumbermen held in Ottawa on 19th July last.

I will not trouble the House any more with documentary evidence, but I will go back for a few moments to an episode which will throw further light on this subject—I refer to the log boom, and chain duty, which had been imposed, I think, in the fall of 1893, and which upon the representation of the Michigan lumbermen had been set aside with the understanding that the Michigan lumbermen would provide themselves with Canadian booms and chains in the winter of 1893-94. Those lumbermen knowing that lumber was placed on the free list in the Wilson Bill and having good reason to believe that the Bill would pass, did not desire to incur the very large expense necessary to throwing away the American booms and chains and substituting Canadian articles in place of them. On 10th May, an order was issued from the Customs Department here, informing the collector at Sault Ste. Marie that this duty was to be enforced at all the outports under his jurisdiction. I received word of this order having been sent, and the same afternoon I made an arrangement with the Controller of Customs to have an interview with him on the following day. I saw that the issuing of that order was made at a most inopportune time, that its influence on the fate of the free lumber provisions of the Wilson Bill could not be otherwise than unfavourable. I saw a few of my lumbermen friends in Ottawa and they all agreed that it was a matter of the utmost importance that this order should be set aside, and that the interpolation of this vicious duty at a time when the free lumber provisions of the Wilson Bill was struggling for existence in the American Senate, was something to be deprecated. A large delegation of the most influential lumbermen in this city had an interview with the Controller of Customs, but they could do nothing with the hon. gentleman. He in effect told us, that the Americans always put the knife into us when they had the opportunity, and he was going to put the knife into them. He could not see any reason for withdrawing the order, and he stood upon his right to issue it. I told him that we would take occasion to have an interview with the Premier, and he said we had better do so. That same evening I arranged an interview with Sir John Thompson for the following day, Saturday, May 12th, and Mr. Booth, the Hon. E. H. Bronson and myself, called upon Sir John Thompson and took pains to set before him very fully, the effect that we thought this inopportune order would have, and the necessity for its removal. We had a long talk about the general character of the export duty provisions, and about the export of American logs to the Canadian mills at St. John, and the fact that the balance of export had been, and was still, on the side of Canadians. The Premier seemed very much impressed with our representations. He said he would refer the matter to Council that afternoon, and we left with the impression that the boom duty was to be rescinded. On Monday morning I received in my mail a letter from a friend in Bay City, Michigan, saying that a deputation consisting of S. O. Fisher, ex-member of Congress, and subsequently a candidate for Governor of the State, Col. Bliss, also an ex-member of Congress, General Alger, ex-Governor of the State, and of other leading capitalists, was leaving for Washington the Sunday night following the date of the letter, and without using the somewhat vigorous language of the letter, the object of their visit was stated to be an attempt to break up the free lumber provisions of the Bill and have done with the whole thing, so much were they incensed at the issue of the Canadian order. I intercepted Sir John Thompson on his way to his office that morning, and I showed him the letter and stated that it was of the utmost importance to the lumber trade of Canada that prompt action should be taken. I told him that the Michigan delegation would not reach Washington until that afternoon, and that if they could be met with a telegram from Ottawa, that this order had been set aside, the mischief they would otherwise do might be averted. Sir John Thompson said : I will see you when the House meets and let you know whether or not to send the message. After prayers, on Monday, May 14th, Sir John Thompson crossed the floor of the House and asked me, if I would be kind enough to send the message to the delegation at Washington, that the boom duty would be left in abeyance : or rescinded, as I understood it. That message was sent. It was not sent by me. It was sent by the Customs Department at my suggestion and request. It was sent to one gentleman belonging to this delegation at Washington, in care of Thos. A. Weadock, of the House of Representatives, and another telegram was sent to the president of the Michigan Log Towing Company, of Bay City, Michigan. Another message was sent to the collector of customs at Sault Ste. Marie, and the Government used the utmost haste, and took the most effective measures to convince the Americans that this obnoxious duty, which the Controller of Customs had sprung upon them, was set aside.

Mr. WALLACE. It was not set aside.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, it was set aside for the time being. It was left in abeyance. The impression conveyed to them was, that if this matter was left in abeyance, when the Wilson Bill became law the trouble was ended. I learned afterwards, Mr. Speaker, that the delegation at Washington received this telegram, through Mr. E. T. Corrington, one of its

members and that they were not fully satisfied with its purport. Through some delay the telegram was not received until Tuesday morning. In the meantime they had assembled the Michigan delegation of the House of Representatives, and of the Senate, who all agreed in determining that they would sweep free lumber from the Wilson Bill, that they would have no more tinkering with the Canadian Government which had shown such bad faith in the matter, and that they would leave Canadians to pay duty on lumber, and they would pay the duty on the boom sticks. They had gone to the State Department and had requested the authorities to procure an interview between themselves and Sir Julian Pauncefote, and after some little hesitation, Mr. Adee, one of the assistant secretaries of state wrote a carefully worded note to the British Embassy. In the course of three-quarters of an hour Mr. Goschen came to the State Department from the Embassy and expressed regret that Sir Julian Pauncefote was indisposed and not able to meet the delegation. They discussed the matter, and the Michigan delegation found Mr. Goschen quite capable of understanding the whole question. If their statements are correct, he pronounced it a worse than absurd order, and he went back to Sir Julian Pauncefote, and returned in the course of an hour and stated: that although it was not an ordinary course to pursue, yet the British Embassy would wire the authorities at Ottawa, that that order had better be set aside. That is what is stated by the Michigan delegation. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) or the Secretary of State ever received such a telegram from the British Embassy or not. That was the nature of that feature of the boom duty impost. The Government left the duty in abeyance. They did it at the solicitation of the Ottawa lumbermen of whom I was one, and the Government employed me.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, sir, and I have a copy of the telegram here. The Government employed me to communicate with the Michigan delegation at Washington to avert the evil consequences they feared would result from their visit to that city, and which might upset the free lumber arrangements. Matters ran on without a hitch, and the boom duty was not imposed until after the passage of the Wilson Bill. When the Wilson Bill had become law, and when we had secured the great advantages that that Bill conferred upon us, by the comparatively paltry concession of refraining from putting an export duty on logs, then this magnanimous and chivalrous Government, imagining that the danger they would bring upon their head by unfriendly action, was passed, proceeded to enforce this order again. They were not aware, I presume, that the Michigan delegation had received the pledge of the United States Treasury Department, that if the Canadian boom duty were imposed, it would be considered pro tanto an export duty, and the whole of the advantages secured by the Wilson Bill would be swept away by one stroke of the pen. They thought that they might then with impunity impose this duty on booms. A Michigan delegation came down here about the 1st of December, and their spokesman, Mr. Weadock, pointed out to the Government that this duty might be—he knew it would be—considered pro tanto an export duty, and that the consequences might be most serious to the Canadian lumber interests. After due consideration the Government made up their mind to back down and in order to cover their retreat, they had a series of negotiations by which they professed to be very anxious to have the American Government declare they would not impose an export duty upon boom sticks, a duty which they had never imposed and which they never thought of imposing at all. This is the history of the transaction up to the final removal of this pet boom duty by the Government, a duty which they had clung to with much tenacity. They imposed it in May and dropped it because of the serious consequences that threatened them. They dropped it under the advice of a level-headed, common-sense Premier. They resuscitated it again by the action of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, and they ignominiously backed out of it afterwards, when they ascertained the serious consequence likely to attend it.

Now, Sir, let me, in conclusion, ask what I have done—where the Government have availed themselves of the fruits of my efforts? They condemn me without stint; their press has condemned me; their orators upon the stump have condemned me. They have rung the changes upon me as a Yankee, as an annexationist, as a traitor——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says, "Hear, hear"; and what have they taken at my hands? They have accepted the proferred reduction in the McKinley Bill to $1 a thousand upon condition of their giving up the export duty. That arrangement, which I initiated, they accepted promptly, and then they called me a traitor. They accepted the provisions of the Wilson Bill, made in February, 1894, which I had more or less connection with; and having accepted those provisions, with all the conditions attached, and having accepted them thankfully, they set aside the boom duty order in May, 1894, for fear that they would lose them; and all the while they called myself, who had been instrumental in getting them the concessions, a traitor. They accepted the privilege, and sacrificed their boom duty, knowing that it would tend to save the free-lumber provision; but

they could not forego the opportunity of putting the knife into a hated political rival. They then asked my services to avert the hostile action of the Michigan delegation at Washington; and there are two telegrams in the hon. gentleman's department, of which I have copies in my hand, practically sent by myself, which were sent on the 14th of May, 1894, to secure the object which the Government sought, namely, the averting of the disaster which would have been the result of the Michigan delegation in both Houses of Congress going against the free-lumber provision of the Wilson Bill; and then, after waiting until the Wilson Bill became law, they, with infinite meanness, came around and put into force again that boom duty order. Had they adhered to that position, the whole of the advantages that were secured to Canada under the Wilson Bill—the free admission of the articles which it took eleven paragraphs to enumerate, and which covered $13,000,000 worth of products—would have been swept away by a Treasury Department ruling because their boom duty order would have been ruled by the Treasury authorities at Washington to be 'pro tanto' an export duty. After having been instrumental in securing these things, and having the fruits of my efforts appropriated by the Government, I have been persecuted, maligned and traduced by that Government and by their followers; and I here record my assertion that in all the discussion relating to this matter, the course of the Government and its supporters towards me has been unfair, petty and malignant and utterly devoid of the first principles of political honesty.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the address of the hon. gentleman reminds me very much of the play of Hamlet with the principal character stricken out of the play altogether, in this, that no charge has ever been made against the hon. gentleman, so far as I am concerned, or so far as I have heard by any one else in this House, or by a Conservative speaker outside of the House, in reference to any part taken by the hon. gentleman in securing the free admission of lumber into the United States. The charge against the hon. gentleman was in reference to another point which he has been very careful to avoid to-day, and which he avoided in the debate which took place on this matter last year. Now, what is the position of matters in reference to lumber? Previous to the passage of the Wilson Bill, there was a duty chargeable against sawn lumber going from Canada to the United States of $1 per thousand; and hon. members of this House, I myself among the number, asked from day to day that the Government here should place an export duty on logs, to prevent the export of the large quantity of logs, valued by the hon. member for North Norfolk at some $5,000,000 a year, that were being taken from this country to the United States, so that the manufacture of them might be carried on in this country. I believe that the time had been reached in the history of Canada when the Government had almost decided that an export duty should be imposed so that the manufacture of those logs should be confined to this country. The Government, I believe, had very serious doubts as to whether or not that duty should be imposed. At that time the Wilson Bill was being formulated in the United States, and it was, I will admit, a most favourable Bill for the lumber interests of this country, in this, that it afforded the people of this country an opportunity of exporting not only their lumber, but other products of the forests, to a very great extent, and on much more favourable terms than had theretofore been the case. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk was interested in the export of logs. In the first place, he was not the owner of a saw-mill in Canada. He was the owner of a mill in the United States, not a saw-mill, I grant, but a mill which made it vastly to his interest that saw-logs should be taken to that part of the country. He was the owner of and interested in tugs towing logs from this country to the American side; I think he will not deny that. He was also interested in timber limits on the north shore, the logs from which were being sold in the United States; and it was for that reason, and that reason alone, I claim, that the hon. gentleman took the stand that he did. It was not the first stand he took on this question, because four years ago he went to the United States and impressed upon the lumbermen there the duty and necessity of the American Government placing such a high import duty on lumber that it would terrify the Canadian Government against placing an export duty on logs. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will not deny that, because he was reported at the time. At a meeting held, I think, in Buffalo, he said this:

> It is the addition of the log export duty to the lumber duty our American lumbermen need to bring about.

There was then a duty of $2 on lumber going from this country to the United States, and the hon. gentleman wanted to have the United States statutory enactments so framed that, in the event of an export duty being imposed on logs going from Canada, the United States import duty on lumber should be increased by the amount of that export duty. That was the stand the hon. gentleman took then.

Mr. CHARLTON. If I may be permitted to make an explanation, I would like to say that I never attended a meeting in Buffalo, and that I never advised such a course as the adding of the export duty on logs to the import duty on lumber. I may have referred to it as something talked of or pro-

bable ; but the hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that I advised it.

Mr. BENNETT. It was at Tonawanda. I have not the report by me, but I have it in my possession, and I think the hon. gentleman will not deny that he attended a meeting at that time. If it is simply a question of the place, that does not matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, it is not only a question of place. I deny the gravamen of the charge. I never gave any such advice.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hear, hear ; take it back.

Mr. BENNETT. No, I do not take it back ; and in proof of the assertion, I may say that I made the charge here two years ago, and the hon. gentleman did not deny it then. This was the point at which he arrived last year. The Wilson Bill was being framed, and it was, as I say, a measure most favourable to the interests of Canada—not only to the exporters of white pine lumber, but the exporters of spruce, wood pulp and other articles produced from the forest : and it was when the Wilson Bill was about to pass that the hon. gentleman made the interference, the wrong and bad interference, so far as Canadian interests were concerned, that he was charged with last year, and that he denied having made. This circular was in the possession of the Treasury Department of the United States, and when the hon. gentleman was charged with it last year, he had not even the frankness to admit that he was the writer of the article addressed to Secretary Carlyle. I do not know whether he proposes to admit it to-day or not, but this I do say, that there was an article written by one John Charlton, of Michigan, and I charge the hon. member for North Norfolk with being the writer. If he wishes to deny it to-day, then he will go a step further than he did last year. If he admits it, well and good. But whether he denies or admits, the public will believe that he was the writer. What was the position of the Wilson Bill as it stood ? It contained the provision of the Mills Bill, according to the letter written by John Charlton, of Michigan, to Secretary Carlyle :

> Provided, that if any export duty is laid upon the above mentioned articles, or any of them, by any country whence imported, all said articles imported from said country shall be subject to duty as now provided by law.

Then John Charlton, of Michigan, goes on to say :

> The McKinley Bill also contained, as above mentioned, a similar proviso, under the operation of which a removal of the export duty by the Canadian Government was secured. The Wilson Bill is supposed to follow in the same line, but the proviso contained in that Bill will not reach the purposes intended, but if the interpretation of your memorialist is correct, will result in the imposition of American duties upon the article only that Canadian export duties are imposed upon, thereby supplementing the Canadian export duty and furthering the purpose of the Canadian Government. It is respectfully submitted that this proviso should read as follows :—Provided, that if any export duty be laid by any foreign country upon any of the articles mentioned in paragraphs 672 to 683, inclusive, then all said articles imported from said country shall be subjected to the duties existing prior to the passage of this Act.

What did the hon. gentleman mean, because in the same article he makes use of this remarkable statement—and it is remarkable to see a Canadian legislator endeavouring to frame safeguards in the tariff of any other country which will militate against the interests of the country he is supposed to represent. What did he say ? He said :

> A large trade in the supply of American saw-mills from the Canadian forest now exists. The saw-mills of eastern Michigan at Saginaw, Bay City, Tawas, Alpena, &c., are largely dependent upon the Canadian forests north of Georgian Bay for their log supply. Canadian logs are also furnished to mills in northern Ohio and western New York. This trade last year amounted to, in round numbers, $5,000,000. The Canadian Government have shown hostility to the exportation of logs, and an export duty was first imposed in 1866.

What was the proviso that the Wilson Bill contained ? It contained the proviso that in the event of the Canadian Government placing an export duty on spruce, white pine lumber should not be exported by Canada to the United States free of duty, and if the Canadian Government placed a duty upon white pine lumber, spruce could not be exported. Further on the hon. gentleman, in his memorial, states :

> There should be a provision, that if the Canadian Government should place an export duty on any article in the wood schedule, then the United States Government should levy an import duty on every article in that schedule.

What was the result of that ? That is the whole point in the charge, and the hon. gentleman to-day, in his lengthy remarks, has not dared to contradict that he was the author of that iniquitous document, for it is iniquitous, so far as Canadian interests are concerned. The hon. leader of the Opposition did not dare to defend the hon. gentleman's conduct, nor did any hon. gentleman on that side dare to defend it, and I am bound to say that not one will dare to rise in his place and defend it to-day. What is the position to-day ? Under the clause of the Wilson Bill, prompted by the hon. member for North Norfolk, should we impose an export duty on any one article in the wood schedule, the United States will impose an import duty on every article in that schedule. Take the matter of pulp. At all points easily accessible to the United States, vast quantities of pulp wood are being exported. But as soon as we place an export duty on white pine logs, the United States will impose a duty on pulp wood.

Again, if we put an export duty on pulp wood, the United States would retaliate by imposing a duty on white pine lumber and every other article in the schedule. No one will pretend that the hon. gentleman did wrong in endeavouring to bring about the free importation of lumber to the United States, and I give him credit for his efforts in that regard, but I blame him for having been the main mover in that retaliatory clause of the Wilson Bill. Had it not been for his disloyal interference and mercenary motives, that clause would never have existed in the Wilson Bill. Its presence there is due to the conduct of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and I invite the hon. gentleman to come to my constituency at any time and place and discuss the iniquitous part he took in that matter.

PROFITS ON WHEAT.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call the attention of the House to something which I consider at least of equal importance to the matter we have just been discussing. There is at present a deliberate and apparently organized attempt being made to persuade the farmers of Canada that on account of the passing scarcity of wheat in this country, he is receiving a largely increased price for what he has to sell, and that he has a considerable amount of wheat yet left to sell. The statement has been freely made in the public press that the farmer is receiving 15 cents a bushel more for his wheat than he would were it not for the National Policy. The statement has been also made, on the authority of a firm of millers of Montreal, that the farmers of Ontario have one and a half to two million bushels of wheat still in their hands. I want to call your attention to some alleged facts from Montreal which have appeared in the Toronto "World" and a large number of Canadian papers, and apparently have been telegraphed far and wide, and which contradict this assumption and show in the strongest manner the hollowness of the contention referred to. In the first paper I took up, this telegram was headed "Fortunes in Wheat—the recent rise has made many wealthy—one man has made a million dollars—Montreal grain and flour men benefit by the increased price—a list of the individual increases—W. W. Ogilvie, the miller, the luckiest of the lot." The telegram, which is dated Montreal, 1st June, goes on to say :

> There are happy faces on 'Change these days, and your correspondent has been enabled to give the names of the men who have made their piles in the recent rise in flour and grain. It is no secret that the chief of Canadian millers, Mr. W. W. Ogilvie, has made more than a round million, while his neighbours, the Lake of the Woods people, Mr. Robert Meighen, being the central figure, count their profits at $500,000.

The list of those who have made fortunes in wheat, as stated by this telegram, is as follows :—

Mr. W. W. Ogilvie made over "a round million," say.....	$1,000,000
Robt. Meighen	500,000
Hugh McLennan	150,000
Bob Esdaile	75,000
Alex. McFee	75,000
A. C. McBean.....	100,000
Crane & Baird.....	100,000
Harry Raphael	75,000
Jake Hunsiclar	50,000
Adam Thompson	50,000
Evan McLennan	50,000
Jim Carruthers	75,000
Robt. Peddie	75,000
Jas. Campbell	40,000
Ed. Craig	40,000
J. McShane	50,000
T. L. Smith & Son.....	75,000
Edgar Judge	50,000
Geo. McBean & Co.....	50,000
R. E. Wright.....	40,000
Outsiders	500,000
	$3,220,000

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a statement of the facts by an apparently well-informed newspaper man in Montreal, who speaks with authority and who, no doubt, has got his figures from the operators of that city. Who, then, are the persons making money out of the scarcity of wheat in Canada at the present time ? Certainly it is not the farmers ?

If it were true that the farmers of Ontario still had in hand a million and a half or two million bushels of wheat and that Mr. W. W. Ogilvie knew that fact, we cannot imagine that the price would have gone up in Montreal to such an extent as to allow these large fortunes to be made by the sharp speculators of the Corn Exchange. It may be that Mr. Ogilvie and these other gentlemen, having unloaded in this eminently satisfactory manner, find that it would be very convenient for them to have the price of wheat fall temporarily in Canada, that it would be very convenient for them to have the fact—or rather the statement, for I cannot call it a fact—sent abroad in Canada that the farmers still hold a million and a half or two million bushels, so that they might be able to buy at a lower price and afterwards be able to unload with the same success that they have experienced in their last unloading. It might be very advantageous to them to bear the wheat market by producing the impression that there is still a great deal of wheat held by the farmers in Canada. But if they knew that that wheat was still in Canada they would not have been paying the prices they have been paying for wheat. A million and a half or two million bushels held by the farmers of Ontario would have been sufficient for local consumption till after harvest, and it is only by a reduction of supplies as compared with the demand for home consumption that the duty

can have the effect of raising the price. I can easily see the object of men like Mr. Ogilvie in having this statement published, as it has been published by the Conservative press throughout Canada.

But the facts that prices have gone so high and that such profits have been made by speculators prove that the wheat does not exist in Canada. They show another thing, to which I must call the attention of the House and of the farmers of this country. Hon. gentlemen must know that the National Policy can have no effect upon the prices of wheat or other grains——

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are opposed to it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman asks if I am opposed to the National Policy. I was opposed to the National Policy before he knew anything about it. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that under ordinary circumstances the National Policy cannot affect the prices of farm products, that is to say, as long as we have a surplus for export the price is fixed in the great markets of the world ; when we have a scarcity, then the duty does begin to raise the price. But who gets the benefit ? Is it the farmer ? No, Sir, in spite of all the telegrams from Mr. Ogilvie that were published, in spite of all the allegations that were ever made, here is the proof that these speculators and monopolists, the men of capital who can buy up and hold the wheat, are the ones who make a profit out of the National Policy. It was for speculators and monopolists of all kinds that the National Policy was made and not for the farmers, and the gain to the speculators proves that the National Policy has had the desired effect. It is alleged in the public press that if that two millions of bushels were still in the farmers' hands, the farmers would make $300,000. Why, Sir, here is the statement that these few operators in Montreal have already made $3,220,000 out of the rise in wheat—more than ten times the amount the farmers would have made, even if Mr. Ogilvie's statement as to the quantity they held were true.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). Did not the farmers get the extra 15 cents a bushel ?

Mr. CASEY. No, or there would not have been these great fortunes made by the advance in price. My hon. friend from Ontario is evidently in the dark as to the method of a commercial transaction. These gentlemen named in the list I have given, bought this wheat when it was worth 50 cents a bushel or thereabouts—they bought it at the lowest price they could—and they bought flour at corresponding prices and coarse grains at corresponding prices in sympathy with the low price of wheat. Then, when the local scarcity began, when the duty began to have effect in excluding foreign wheat from Canada, these gentlemen who had bought wheat were the ones who made the profit, and not the framers of Ontario, either the county or the province. Let the hon. gentleman go and ask his constituents whether they sold to Mr. Ogilvie at 15 cents per bushel advance. There are always in every neighbourhood a few farmers who are so blindly optimistic that they insist upon holding wheat for sometimes two or three years. But I think that their experience is that nine times out of ten, after keeping wheat for two or three years, they sell at a lower price than they could have sold for just after harvest, to say nothing of loss of the grain and loss of interest on the money.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Loss through rats.

Mr. CASEY. Yes. There are various sorts of rats living on the farmer's crops. If I were to say that 1 per cent of the farmers held their wheat, I should be making a very high estimate ; the great majority of farmers have been compelled to sell as early as they could in order to meet their obligations. Only the capitalists and a few highly optimistic farmers have made money in this case. A few farmers have made, most of them have lost. But I am willing to assert that ninety-nine bushels out of a hundred have been sold, or at all events, that ninety-nine farmers out of a hundred had sold their wheat, before the change of prices took place, and that it is the grain speculators of Montreal who have made the profit. Taking even the Ogilvies' assertion, supposing there were 2,000,000 bushels still left, the farmers would only make $300,000 out of it, and the Ogilvies and their friends have made $3,220,000 out of it. The fact is with regard to our wheat market, as every business man knows, that last fall there was an over-exportation, even at the low prices, both of Manitoba wheat and of Ontario wheat ; and when that over-exportation was discovered, when it was found that more wheat would be necessary for local use, the price went up temporarily, and the price will stay up until the next harvest in Canada comes into the market. Then, again, as it has been during the past winter, when the farmer has wheat to sell, the prices will go down, as opposed to the present condition of things, which is that when it is the speculator who has the wheat, and not the farmer the price goes up. I appeal to members of this House, and I appeal to the Government press throughout the country not to aid the speculators by publishing any wild-cat information of the kind to which I have alluded ; not to help the speculators to put down the price of wheat for the little that is remaining in the farmers' hands, by publishing any such sensational statements as to the amount of wheat still left in the Canadian market.

SUPPLY—PERSONAL EXPLANATION—FREE LUMBER AND EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to say a word or two in regard to the matter brought be-

fore the House concerning the connection of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) with the removal of the export duty on logs. I regret that I did not understand that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) was going to allude to another subject, or I would have asked to take his place. It strikes me that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has been very unfair to the hon. member for North Norfolk in this matter. He made last session a most bitter attack upon the hon. member for North Norfolk, and accused him of disloyalty to Canada in connection with the stand that he had taken in regard to the matter that has been under discussion. Now, to-day, after the hon. member for North Norfolk is in a position—which he was not in at the time on account of the negotiations being pendent—to show that his action has been most honourable to himself, and most beneficial to this country, the hon. gentleman for Simcoe again makes an attack upon him. In the first place, he charges the hon. member for North Norfolk with being personally interested in this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that anything against the hon. member for North Norfolk? Would you yourself, being interested in the lumber business, hesitate to use your position as a member of this House, and as a supporter of the Government, to do all in your power, legitimately, to further the interests of lumber? Would the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) hesitate to do so? Has not the hon. member for Pontiac, in fact, taken advantage of his position in this House in every legitimate way, to advance the lumber interest of this country? Is there anything dishonourable in that? Is it not highly honourable to any hon. member to advance the interests with which he is personally engaged, in a legitimate way, in this House, by attempting to direct the public policy of the country in such a way as to benefit that interest? That is the first charge made against the hon. member for North Norfolk. Why, the hon. member for Simcoe comes forward, and, after making this very strong attack upon him last session, he now admits that his action has been of the greatest advantage to the lumber interests of Canada, by obtaining free entry into the American markets for that lumber. He admits that, and he thanks him for it; but he says, I condemn the hon. gentleman because he has been the means of so arranging the law in the United States that an export duty placed upon any one of the articles in the wooden schedule, is to be followed by import duties upon sawn lumber. Sir, the hon. gentleman is entirely inconsistent. He has thanked the hon. member for Norfolk for his action in the matter. The hon. member for Norfolk has shown clearly to this House that he could obtain what he did obtain only in one way, and that was by having the Wilson Bill so modified that the export duty being placed upon these articles would result in the reimposition of the import duty upon sawn lumber. The hon. member for North Norfolk has made it, I think, abundantly clear to this House that although he may have an interest, he has no desire whatever in having the laws in the United States depend upon the export duties being put on by Canada; but he has shown very clearly that it was utterly impossible, in the way things were in the United States, to prevent free lumber following in the course of free iron ore and free sugar in the Senate, had it not been for the influence of the Michigan lumber interests. The Michigan lumber interests had the matter in their hands absolutely, because, although the Democratic party were in a large majority in the House of Representatives, their majority was so small in the Senate that a combination between those Democratic Senators who were against free ore, and those Democratic Senators who were against free sugar, and those Democratic Senators who were against free wool, along with the Democratic Senators who were championing the Michigan lumber interests, could prevent the free provisions of the Wilson Bill being applied to all these articles. Now, that was the position, which the hon. member for North Norfolk has made clear to this House. The Michigan lumber interests had, at Washington, a delegation who had entire charge of the matter, and full power to deal with it. How was it possible, then, to influence that delegation? The hon. gentleman had intimate knowledge of this question, his knowledge of the bearings of the lumber trade, and the views of the American lumbermen, enabled him to see that there was only one possible way of obtaining free lumber for Canada, which the hon. member for Simcoe has admitted to be a great boon, and which it is admitted on all sides to be a great boon for Canada—and that was to prevent the Michigan lumbermen from insisting upon free lumber being taken out of the Wilson Bill. The hon. gentleman made his suggestion, he worked with the Michigan lumber interests, and, by showing them that it was to their interest to allow free lumber provided the export duty upon logs was not imposed by Canada, he succeeded, and the hon. member for Simcoe has thanked him for that. Now, how can he thank him for accomplishing what he did accomplish, and, at the same time, condemn him for the method that he followed? If he accomplished something in an improper method, he should not be thanked for it. If it is improper, if it is not good policy, if it is disloyal to Canada to ask that Canada should refuse to put an export duty upon logs for the purpose of gaining the entry of sawn lumber into the United States, then it is not a question of the hon. member for

North Norfolk at all, it is a question of the Government of the day. The Government of the day have no hesitation in taking the responsibility of refusing to put on the export duty, in view of the strong pressure that is brought to bear upon them by the lumbermen of this country, and by their supporters; and after the matter was placed before them, as it has been placed before them through the efforts of the hon. member who gave them to understand that by refusing to put an export duty upon logs, he could obtain this great boon for Canada, the free entry into the United States of sawn lumber, they have not hesitated to adopt the course of refusing to put an export duty upon logs. Now, it is well known that the hon. member for Simcoe desires an export duty upon logs. Every session we have heard him and other members from the Georgian Bay district, speak in favour of an export duty on logs. But that, Sir, should not warrant him in attacking the hon. member for North Norfolk. He has no right whatever to impute disloyalty to the conduct and actions of the hon. member for North Norfolk, because, incidentally, the question of the export duty upon logs is involved. If it is a mistaken policy for the Government to impose an export duty upon logs, then let the hon. gentleman attack the Government, let him call the Government disloyal. They are disloyal, according to his idea, to the interests of the Georgian Bay district in refusing to impose an export duty upon logs. But I think it must be plainly seen that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had no desire whatever that there should be in the Wilson Bill a clause of this kind. What he did desire was free lumber, just as you, Mr. Speaker, desired it and as the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) and other hon. members in the House and men outside of the House who are interested in the sawn lumber trade, desired it, their only market being practically the United States. All these men, as well as the hon. member for North Norfolk, were interested in obtaining that great boon. My hon. friend accomplished his end, not perhaps alone, but his efforts were in that direction, and they were successful, and it was the only way possible to secure the result, as has been pointed out most conclusively to-day, by the letters read by him to the House, to enable the Michigan delegation to see that it was to their interest to allow free lumber to remain in the Wilson Bill, provided that export duties were not to be levied on articles in the wooden schedule. The Ottawa Lumber Association, composed of members of both sides of politics, but nearly all its membership consisting of Conservatives, and very strong Conservatives, thanked the hon. member for North Norfolk in very strong terms for his action in this matter. Does this not show the absurdity of the action of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in rising, and on his responsibility as a member, openly making charges of disloyalty against the hon. member for North Norfolk for doing something for which the large body of men interested in the material welfare of the lumber industry thanked him. How inconsistent are the two positions? I have no hesitation, without knowing very much about the question, except from hearing it discussed this year and last year, in designating as absurd and ridiculous this effort made to place on the Liberal party a charge of disloyalty because they are in favour of securing in every possible way freer trade relations between Canada and the United States. This is simply a part of that policy. Such a charge levied against the Liberal party is ridiculous. They are in favour of reciprocity with the United States and in favour of extending trade in every possible way with them, consistent with the honour and dignity of Canada, and I spurn such an attack made on the Liberal party. This is not a question affecting the hon. member for North Norfolk alone, for his position in connection with a policy of reciprocity is well known, and he has constantly urged the adoption of the widest possible measures of reciprocity, and he has in this particular matter secured a measure of reciprocity which is a great benefit, day by day, to Canada; and it ill becomes an hon. member to rise in his place, and because it does not suit the particular interest of his constituents, to attribute disloyalty to the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has avoided the question at issue and the charge made by the hon. member for East Simcoe. The charge made by the hon. member was that when the Wilson Bill was brought into the United States Senate it included articles mentioned in paragraphs from 672 to 683 inclusive, for the free admission of the lumber of other countries, and it contained a reciprocity clause that Canada should admit those products free of duty. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was charged with having written a letter. He does not deny the paternity of the letter, as I understand, and that letter is not one from a man who is loyal to the Dominion, but is the letter of a traitor. What does that letter say? It makes it more onerous for Canada, not more easy, as regards those twelve items, and it compels any action taken as regards any one of them to apply to the whole twelve and make them all dutiable.

Mr. MARTIN. What was the purpose?

Mr. WALLACE. To do as much injury as possible to the interests of Canada.

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Mr. WALLACE. No intelligent or loyal Canadian will say otherwise. If it was the interest of Canada to impose a duty on one of those articles, according to this memorial inspired and instigated by the hon. member for North Norfolk, that disloyal memorial to the United States Senate, it could not be done. The hon. gentleman is responsible for that memorial. What does it say:

The McKinley Bill also contained as above mentioned, a similar proviso, under the operation of which the removal of the export duty by the Canadian Government was secured. The Wilson Bill is supposed to follow in the same line, but the proviso contained in that Bill will not reach the purposes intended.

To defeat Canadian interests. And to work for the assistance of men on the other side of the line, American mills and millers. That was the object of it:

But if the interpretation of your memorialist is correct,——

Who is your memorialist? The hon. member for North Norfolk?

—is correct, will result in the imposition of the American duty upon the articles only that Canadian export duties are imposed upon, thereby supplementing the Canadian export duty, and furthering the purpose of the Canadian Government.

That is what he proposed should not be done—"furthering the purpose of the Canadian Government," and in that way the interests of the Canadian people. Can any member in this House or any man in the country believe that these utterances are not disloyal? They are not the utterances of a Canadian who is seeking to promote the interests of Canada, but they are the utterances of a man who is looking after the interests of the people on the other side of the line, and of the manufacturing industries on the other side of the line.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he promise them substantial aid?

Mr. WALLACE. He accomplished his purpose by giving them very substantial aid. The hon. gentleman told the House about going down there to look after the interests of Canada. Why, we repudiate him—we always have done so, and always will.

Mr. MARTIN. We do not on this side of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the reason you are on that side. That is the reason why hon. gentlemen will continue to sit on that side.

Mr. LANDERKIN. For what purpose did the Controller go there himself?

Mr. WALLACE. I never went on a disloyal trip in my life, and that is more than some hon. gentlemen opposite can say. The hon. gentleman said he took this course because he found the lumbermen of other districts and other states, Georgia, Florida, Alabama and the South, represented by Democrats in the Senate, were becoming hostile to having free logs brought in from Canada, and they might vote the other way as regards lumber. What did the hon. gentleman tell the House he did? He tells us, Sir, that he went down to get all these men into line. How did he do it? He did it by getting their business rivals in Michigan free logs to compete with them. He says he got these men reconciled to injure their own interests by having logs come free from Canada to compete with the lumber of these southern states. Sir, that was not his idea at all. His idea was to accomplish what he laid out for himself to do, and he accomplished his purpose only too well.

An hon. MEMBER. To get free logs at any price.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, to get free logs at any price. Then, Sir, he tells us, with reference to these boom logs, that he was employed as an agent of the Canadian Government, and that he dictated those telegrams. Well, he came over to my office to-day to get these telegrams, but he was afraid to read them in the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will read them.

Mr. WALLACE. I will read them myself for you. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) said that he got these regulations set aside, but as a matter of fact they were not set aside, and I told him that, when he made the remark this afternoon. The telegram which was sent by the acting Commissioner of Customs, by my direction, was as follows:—

Have wired instruction Sault Ste. Marie—collection duty American boom logs and chains to remain in abeyance pending receipt by him further specific instruction from this department.

The regulations were not set aside at all, and they were only set aside when, at a later period, we had the assurance of the United States Government that they would permit Canadian boom logs to go in free of duty, and we adopted the principle of reciprocity.

Mr. CHARLTON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman what was his object in sending that telegram to E. T. Carrington in Washington?

Mr. WALLACE. I will tell the hon. member. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) came around with a delegation, brought over by him on purpose to make threats to Canada, that if they did not remove the duty on boom logs that there would be trouble, and that they would do their best—as we know they were doing their best—and as the Premier of that day, Sir John Thompson told me, to injure Canada. He said to me:

Charlton has brought over these men to try and do their very worst against Canadian interes s in connection with these boom logs.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The coon came down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. The coon did not come down. These gentlemen opposite laugh, and think it is a great joke because there is a traitor assisting to injure his country, and who partially succeeds in his purpose. They think it is a great thing to have a joke about it, but it is no joke.

Mr. MARTIN. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. MARTIN. I should think that hon. members on the other side ought to know the rules of the House by this time, and ought not to try to interrupt a new member when he is in order. My point, Mr. Speaker, is, that the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) cannot call the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) a "traitor."

Some hon. MEMBERS. He did not; sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. Controller of Customs refers to the hon. member for North Norfolk as a traitor, or characterizes him as a traitor, that certainly would not be in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. WALLACE. Take what back?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The expression "traitor."

Mr. WALLACE. I will conform with the rules laid down by the Speaker. I have not contravened these rules, and I do not intend to.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated a few moments ago, there is a traitor in Canada, evidently referring to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Did the hon. gentleman say that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not to assume that the hon. Controller of Customs has accused the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) of being a traitor, unless the allusion is so perfectly direct that there is no mistaking his meaning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He referred to the letter which he read——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am in order. He referred to the letter which he read as a letter written by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and he said that was the action of a traitor.

Mr. SPEAKER. All through the discussion that has taken place to-day with regard to this particular letter. I have not understood the hon. members who have quoted this letter to state in specific terms that the gentleman, Mr. John Charlton, who wrote that letter, was the member for North Norfolk. They have not stated it in such specific terms as to justify me in assuming that these hon. gentlemen were accusing the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) of being a traitor.

Mr. LAURIER. They dare not assert it.

Mr. WALLACE. When I was interrupted by hon. gentlemen on the other side, I was referring to the question of boom logs, and the fact that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had come to me, and had also come to the Premier (Sir John Thompson), to get that order held in abeyance. I did not consent. He said to me: We do not care, if you enforce it the day after the Bill passes through, but just now they were playing their game.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to inquire if the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to inquire if the hon. gentleman accuses me of having sent the Michigan delegation to Ottawa? I understood him to say that the Premier accused me of having a gang here trying to force the Government out of their position.

Mr. WALLACE. The Premier found out the influences that were at work trying to injure Canada. He knew who were inspiring these men, who were bringing them over from Michigan and sending them down. As the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us, they should arrive in Washington on the 1.40 train. Everything was well known about the Michigan lumbermen, even to the hour of their arrival in Washington.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to know if the hon. gentleman accuses me of sending that deputation to Washington? I want no evasions, but a plain denial or avowal of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down. Answer the question.

Mr. WALLACE. Sir, that was the reason I sent that telegram to Sault Ste. Marie, and wired Mr. Carrington, and I think I am safe in saying that nobody instructed the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in the matter. He said that he dictated the telegrams. Why, he never saw them until to-day, and when he saw them he would not read them to the House, because they did not bear out what he expected they would. These telegrams conveyed exactly what we desired to convey; not that the order had been rescinded or set aside, but that it was to remain in abeyance,

and it did remain in abeyance. We made the boom logs free of duty, when we had received a certified copy from the United States Government of the fact that boom logs there were made free of duty, and we entered into reciprocal arrangements with them. In all this matter we acted in the best interests of the people of this country. So far as I was concerned I was simply carrying out the law of the land. I ask the hon. gentleman to point out one step which was not for the best interests of Canada. The only fault we find is, that men who had not the interests of the country at heart, succeeded in inducing the American Government to put the same clause in the Wilson Bill that was in the McKinley Bill, and which was injurious to Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has said that the writer of the letter which he has read was a traitor to Canada; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) denies that he says the writer was a Canadian.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not deny anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman affirm that he was?

Mr. WALLACE. I said nothing about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, I want to know what relevancy that letter has to this discussion?

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is your opinion about it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I mean your opinion as to the writer?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman wanted to speak before me he should have taken the floor, but I wish to reply to the observations of the Controller of Customs, and not to the interruptions of the Secretary of State. The Controller of Customs has spoken of that letter as if it were the production of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has not the courage to say that the hon. member for North Norfolk was the author of that letter. The hon. gentleman insinuates that he is the author; and he assumes that the writer of the letter cannot be a man loyal to the best interests of Canada. Let us suppose for one moment that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or whoever the writer of the letter might be, was anxious that lumber should go free from Canada into the United States. Let us suppose for a moment that the hon. gentleman knew that the lumbermen of Michigan had sufficient influence to prevent lumber being put upon the free list unless the Government of Canada abandoned their course with regard to these boom sticks; what would he do? He would undertake to meet the views of the lumbermen of Michigan as far as he could for the purpose of preserving that which he thought would be in the interests of the people of Canada; and, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself does not deny that the arrangement which he says the hon. member for North Norfolk, if he is the author of that letter, is a traitor for making, is one that the Government of Canada have accepted in the interests of the people of Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk might have been anxious to go much further. He might have been anxious to see the principle of the free interchange of products between Canada and the United States extended very much further. If the hon. gentleman opposite could have had his way he would have permitted no reciprocity in the matter at all, and he was willing to take the risk of preventing lumber being placed on the free list in order that he might keep the duty on the boom sticks. If the hon. gentleman puts that question before the lumbermen of Canada, they will decide who was the traitor in this matter, my hon. friend—assuming him to be the author of the letter—in undertaking to secure the free admission of lumber into the United States——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I say assuming that, because the whole argument on the other side has been based on that assumption.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman might get the hon. member for North Norfolk to make an affidavit in regard to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Sir, I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman did make an affidavit, he would state the truth. But that is beside the question. Let us look for one moment at what the hon. gentleman's colleagues, members of the Government, who were leaders of the Conservative party a few years ago, did with regard to the relations between Canada and the United States. I remember on one occasion, when the Government of Canada proposed to take over a certain portion of the Grand Trunk Railway to the eastern extremity of the line; what condition did they attach to that arrangement? That the moneys which the Grand Trunk Company received from the Government of Canada for the abandonment of their interests in that portion of the line, should be expended in the construction of a railway in the state of Michigan. I want to know whether the Government, in thus insisting that the money of Canada should be expended in the United States, were acting in the interests of the people of Canada? Let me cite another case. When the Government of Canada, in promoting railway connections between Canada and the United States, provided that a large sum of money should be spent in the state of Maine, were

they serving the interests of Canada ? Suppose the Opposition undertook to deal with the conduct of the Government in these matters as the hon. gentleman has undertaken to deal with the conduct of the hon. member for North Norfolk, in what light would he stand before the people of this country ? The hon. gentleman will remember that a few years ago the Government declared that no man could be loyal to Canada who was not in favour of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway around the coast of the St. Lawrence, in order to keep it as far as possible from the American frontier ; and, after they constructed the road, they declared that it had no commercial value to the people of this country, and spent millions of the public moneys of this country for the construction of a short line across the state of Maine. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite have spent the money of the people of Canada in the neighbouring republic ; and having done that, they come forward and attack the hon. member for North Norfolk because they say he undertook to prevent, and succeeded in preventing, the Michigan lumbermen having lumber taken off the free list of products imported from Canada into the United States. The hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches had better adopt a more consistent and more dignified course. They undertake to single out for destruction the hon. member for North Norfolk and have him hunted down by those who engage in the chase on that side, both in the press and in Parliament ; but I can tell them that they have undertaken a difficult task, and the people of this country will understand the object they have in view.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member who has just taken his seat, for the purpose of building up an argument, made a number of suppositions, most unnatural, most unreasonable and most unlikely in their nature. One was : Suppose that the members of Congress from the South, who were interested in lumber, would associate themselves with the members from Michigan ! That was unlikely. Then, he asked : If the hon. member for North Norfolk knew that this amalgamation was going to take place, was he not justified in doing what he did ? Well, there is nothing in the disclosures made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, nor in the letters, which, I believe, were invited from the parties themselves, to support that supposition from first to last. In the Wilson Bill were provisions admitting every article of lumber or wood free of duty, and, so far as we know, those provisions would have passed had it not been for the hon. member for North Norfolk, who saw the opportunity, in the interest of himself and his favourite lumbermen of Michigan, of whom he was one, of binding Canada down to a provision that was very much against her interest. Now, we are entitled not to divorce the men from their surroundings, if we want to understand the situation. If the history of the past had shown that the interests of the hon. member for North Norfolk were invariably in Canada, then it would be improper to assume that he was a traitor to Canada ; but when we know that his interests lie in Michigan ; when we know that his firm at Tonawanda have been carrying on extensive operations there for the last twenty years, and that they get their supply of lumber from Canadian forests, is it to be wondered at that his loyalty should be questioned and that we should assume he is working in the interests of himself and partner rather than in the interests of Canada ? The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), coming to his defence, said : If you were interested in the lumber business, would you refuse to use your influence in the promotion of its interests ? Certainly not, and if these interests were identical with those of Canada, it would be all right. But if the interests were those of the Michigan lumbermen exclusively, it would be all wrong for Canada. What is the hon. gentleman ? He is a Canadian, whether by naturalization or birth, I do not know. It is unfortunate he is not one by both.

Mr. BENNETT. He is a Canadian by chance.

Mr. SPROULE. His interests, so far as we know, lie with the men of Michigan who cut Canadian lumber and have the advantage of the American market. Our interests lie in cutting that lumber here and sending it over to the United States market as sawn lumber. The hon. gentleman's interests lie in the opposite direction, and we have the right to assume that he is guided by those interests and not by an unselfish loyalty to Canada. But the hon. gentleman is selfish enough to work for these interests alone, just as he does his interests in connection with tugs and other lines which he operates in Canada. With regard to those letters, I have listened to them carefully, and I firmly believe they were indited by the hon. gentleman himself. If he did not outline every word, he suggested what should be put in the letters for the purpose of enabling him to lead a defence here and rehabilitate his political character for loyalty, which is at a very low ebb at present with the Canadian people. If he had read the whole of the letters—he said there was something personal which he would hold back—but if he would give the whole of the letters and the history connected with them : if he would state who invited the people to send them, we would be in a better position to express an opinion.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman wants the whole of the letters I will give them to him.

Mr. SPROULE. I hope he will do more, I hope he will read the letters which he

sent those parties when he asked them to send the letters, and then we will have the whole inwardness of it. I am told he frequently invited the department to allow him to negotiate on behalf of Canada, but the department would not. They believd he was not the right man. He spoke of the resolution of the lumbermen of Ottawa valley. What did these lumbermen say? They said that in so far as he has been instrumental in doing anything, we thank him. They did not say he had been instrumental. No doubt he helped to make that resolution himself. It would have been much better for him if he had not revived this question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that the members on this side are attacking him. Who invited the attack? We have rather been defending what we said before and believe to be correct. It is the hon. gentleman himself who brought forward this subject.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before this question is put to the House, I desire to offer a few remarks which are called for by some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially by the hon. Controller of Customs. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said that the Wilson Bill, as it left the Committee of Ways and Means with the proviso attached to it at that time, was good enough for Canada, and ought to have been let alone. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman, in making this statement, evinces a want of knowledge of the position of matters, or to what to attribute the mistake he has made; but he ought to be aware that the Wilson Bill, as it left the Committee of Ways and Means and the House of Representatives, was in a position, as regards the export duty proviso, that was not acceptable to its friends, and that it had arrived at that stage where, if it stood with that export duty proviso, as it left the House of Representatives, the free lumber provisions of the Bill would have been lost. So when the hon. gentleman tells this House that the Bill ought to have been left in the state in which it left the House of Representatives and that meddling with it resulted in striking out a provision eminently satisfactory to Canada and putting in its place a provision less satisfactory, the hon. gentleman has, unconsciously no doubt, mislead this House, because that proviso was not satisfactory to the friends of the Wilson Bill in Congress, and had that proviso remained, these free-lumber provisions would not have been in it at all. So that the question to be faced on that occasion was what to do in order to secure the retention of the free lumber provisions of the Bill. It was not that the proviso attached to the Bill with regard to the export duty was not satisfactory to Canadians who wanted free lumber, but because the Bill with that proviso could not pass the Senate, because with that proviso everything we desire in connection with that Bill was lost as a foregone conclusion. The hon. gentleman wants to know if I had anything to do with this matter, if I was in Washington at the time, and why I did not let that Bill alone. Simply because I did not like to see the free lumber provisions expunged from the Bill. If I had let the Bill alone, and if no attempt had been made to allay the hostility that was aroused against that Bill in consequence of the defective character—in the estimation of those who wanted free logs—of the export duty proviso of the Bill, and if no attempt had been made to arrange the export duty proviso to the satisfaction of those whose friendship was essential to the passage of the Bill, the free lumber provisions would have been lost. That is why I felt called upon to make an effort in Washington to secure provisions in that Bill that would be satisfactory to those gentlemen upon whose good or ill-will the fate of free lumber in that Bill exclusively depended.

With regard to the Controller of Customs, that hon. gentleman, Sir, very gravely informed this House that the Premier of this Dominion had informed him that I was engaged in a conspiracy with an American delegation that had gone to Washington for the purpose of forcing this Government to do something that they were reluctant to do, and that I had marshalled the forces of the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley who held an interview with him and with the Premier of this country. Certainly I must be a potent individual to marshal the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley and to compel them to act unconsciously in conjunction with this American delegation for the purpose of embarrassing the Government and wrecking certain interests in Canada. Why, the thing is too absurd to make as a statement seriously before this House. What I did, Mr. Speaker, was this: When I was informed by a friend of mine that this delegation was about to depart for Washington, acting on that information and not because I had the direction of that delegation as the hon. gentleman intimated, but knowing from that information when that delegation proposed to leave Bay City, Michigan, and when it would probably reach Washington,—for I knew the route they would probably travel by——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear,"—I went to the Premier of this Dominion and informed him that such a delegation was on its way to Washington. I showed him the information I possessed in

the letter that had been written to me by the friend I referred to. I intimated what I feared would be the effect of the work of that delegation if their operations were not check-mated. I asked the Prime Minister of this country to have an intimation sent to these men that the order complained of, the order that had started them upon their mission, the order that threatened the loss of free lumber in the Wilson Bill, had been rescinded or set aside. That was the proposition I made to the Prime Minister of this country, and that gentleman deemed the matter of sufficient importance to authorize telegrams that he had caused to be sent orders to the collector of customs at Sault Ste. Marie and the outports that the order was rescinded or set aside.

Mr. WALLACE. No. no.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, Sir, here is the telegram. This telegram was sent by the hon. gentleman to E. T. Carrington of the American delegation and to Mr. Young, president of the Michigan Log Towing Company of Bay City, Michigan. The hon. gentleman himself says that he sent these telegrams. Why did he send the telegrams to the gentleman in Washington whose name I furnished ? Why did he send a telegram to a gentleman in Bay City whose name I furnished ? Why did he cause telegrams to be sent to the collector at Saulte Ste. Marie and the outports that the order was to be held in abeyance until further instructions ? Was it because I was engaged in a conspiracy ? Was it because the Prime Minister of this country, as the hon. gentleman alleges, said that I was a traitor and the manager of a delegation sent to Washington, and that I had been marshalling the lumbermen of the Ottawa valley to assist my traitorous designs ? And was it to check-mate me that he sent these two telegrams to parties I have named ? A pretty way to check-mate treason, a pretty way to rebuke a man who is engaged, according to his own statement, in endeavouring to injure the interests of this country, to follow the very course he suggested and readily comply with his suggestions. The assertion is simply preposterous and the hon. gentleman knows that it is totally destitute of truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I cannot say they were true, at all events, but I withdraw the other assertion. Here are the telegrams :

E. T. Carrington, Esq.,
c-o Thos. A. Weadock, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

How did the hon. gentleman know this Mr. Carrington ? How did he know that a telegram addressed in care of Congressman Weadock would reach Mr. Carrington of Bay City ? How did he know that Mr. Carrington was there at all ? What led him to suppose that it was necessary to send a telegram to that gentleman ? What was his object in sending that telegram ? Was it to tell Mr. Carrington to do some business for him that he afterwards went on to Washington to attend to himself ? Was it to ask Mr. Carrington to procure him some books at Washington ? He knew from the information furnished him here that Mr. Carrington was a member of the delegation that had gone to Washington for a specific purpose. He knew what that specific purpose was. He sent the telegram from the Customs Department to divert these men from the purpose they went to Washington to carry out. That was the object for which I waited upon the Premier, and that was the object the Premier had in issuing the instructions to the hon. gentleman. And the hon. gentleman was carrying out the instructions when he wired to Mr. Carrington as follows :

Have wired instructions collector Sault Ste Marie. Duty American boom-logs and chains to remain in abeyance until further instructions.

He sends the same telegram to Walter Young, a leading gentleman in Bay City, engaged in the business of towing logs, one who could furnish to parties interested in sending down the delegation, information calculated to allay the feeling of hostility to Canada that had led to the sending of the delegation to seek to defeat free lumber. I have never seen in this House in my twenty-five years' experience, a more brazen instance of an attempt to deny what was true——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON—a more brazen attempt to throw discredit upon an hon. gentleman of this House, falsely and unfairly, than that made by the hon. gentleman to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is surely aware that he is out of order in making these statements with regard to another hon. member. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the words.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I will withdraw them, but I shall be sorry if the rules of this House compel me to say they are not true. I withdraw them in a parliamentary sense. Then the hon. gentleman asks what was the purpose of this export proviso ? Did the hon. gentleman listen to the statement made as to the various circumstances that led up to the necessity of suggesting this export duty proviso ? Did he hear the statement made that when the Bill left the House of Representatives with the proviso fixed by the Committee of Ways and Means that proviso was inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended ? Did he hear of the hostility aroused against the Bill in consequence, hostility threatening the existence of the Bill so far as free lumber was concerned ? The hon. gentleman says

it was preposterous to suppose that the southern lumber states would make common cause with Michigan and seek to help them to get free logs, because that would serve to make more effectual Michigan competition against themselves. Why, Mr. Speaker, what they were afraid of was the competition of the Canadian mills, the sending of free lumber from Canada. They cared nothing for the competition of Michigan, for they had had that competition for generations; but they had a suspicion that the enacting of the free lumber provisions would interfere with their business by lowering the price of Canadian lumber in the American markets. Consequently, though this was a part of the Democratic scheme, these states looked upon that feature of the Bill with disfavour. They had in their hearts a desire to see that feature of the Bill eliminated, and they ask only a good and suitable excuse to array themselves against that feature. As I told the hon. gentleman this afternoon, Senator Morgan, the most influential of all the Senators from any southern lumber state, had spoken against free lumber in the Democratic caucus on the 26th February. I considered that an indication of very grave import so far as the propspects of free lumber was concerned. I knew if Senator Morgan's influence was cast against free lumber, the game was up. When the hon. gentleman asked, What was the purpose of the export duty proviso, I tell him that he must have very little discernment, indeed, if he does not see what was the purpose of that proviso. The purpose of that proviso was to allay the hostility that existed against this free lumber provision in that Bill; the purposes of that proviso was to secure the influence of Michigan, which was being withdrawn; the purpose of that proviso was to set aside the hostility of all the southern lumber states, represented in the Senate by at least fourteen Democratic Senators, while there was in the Senate only a Democratic majority of four, if my memory is not at fault. That was the purpose of the export duty proviso. I have laid before this House the absolute certainty of the statement I have made, that the proviso put into that Bill with reference to export duty, alone saved the free lumber provision of that Bill. Now, if that is true, and I affirm it is true, how utterly unjustifiable is the conduct of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and of all the members on that side of the House, in pursuing the course they have pursued towards me with regrad to this matter; in seeking to cast discredit upon me, and in the very next breath turning around and accepting thankfully the fruits of the arrangement that was made late in February, for which they condemn me. Free lumber was saved, it was saved through this export duty proviso of the Wilson Bill, that was effectual for the purpose for which it was intended; and free lumber being saved, the Government of Canada was at liberty to put on an export duty, or it was at liberty to abstain from doing it. They were not obliged to accept this proviso that was made by the American Congress. They could have put on an export duty, they could have raised it, or they could have done anything else they chose, and, in doing it, they could have allowed free lumber to go by the board. They did not do it, they thankfully accepted the arrangement, they did not restore the export duty, and they removed the boom duty. First of all, they put the boom duty in abeyance, then they put it in abeyance again last December, and then they totally removed it; and they did all this for the purpose of securing the advantages that the export duty proviso of the Wilson Bill, arranged in February, 1894, secured for the lumber men of Canada. Now, it is said that I went and made representations as a Michigan man. I suppose if I had gone to the Secretary of the Treasury and said: "I am a Canadian lumberman, and I want this and that," I would probably have had a great deal of influence in that quarter. When in Washington, I did what was necessary to avert this disaster.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You would not deceive him?

Mr. CHARLTON. I would not deceive him, I did not deceive him, but I would not foolishly give away the chances I had for the object I had in view. That would not have been diplomatic, and I would not have thrown away recklessly the chances that were laid before me, as my hon. friend's colleagues did when they were in Washington as a reciprocity commission, by refusing to consider a scheme that would include an agreed list of manufactures, and by imperiously presenting their own terms of reciprocity in natural products as their ultimatum. I was after free lumber, and I was going just as far, in my judgment, it was necessary to go in order to secure my purpose; and I was working in the interests of the lumbermen of Canada, and for the good of my fellow-citizens. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that he repudiates me, that his Government repudiates me as an envoy looking after Canadian interests in Washington. I never asked them to authorize me to look after Canadian interests. I never acted as their agent, and I never desired to do so. I went down to Washington, and I acted in the capacity of a private citizen of Canada, I acted in the interests of Canada. I tell the hon. gentleman that if what is said with regard to this export duty proviso being attributable to me, is true, I did more for the interest of Canada in Washington than in all his genius, and

tribe, and associates, and party have done since 1866; and I am not sure but what that is what is the matter with the hon. gentleman and his friends. They knew how barren have been the results of their trips to Washington, and they are displeased that a private member of the Liberal party has been instrumental in securing the abrogation of the duties upon products of Canada, the export of which to the United States amount to $13,000,000 a year, and which the hon. gentlemen have seized upon as a hawk seizes upon chickens, and having seized upon the advantage that has been presented to them, they now find fault with the man that secured it, if these allegations concerning him are true.

The hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) tells us that the proviso, as it left the Committee of Ways and Means, would have passed but for me. That hon. gentleman can hardly be accepted as an authority upon American matters. He was never in Washington. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is entirely misinformed, that he knows nothing about it. That proviso was submitted to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury at Washington, having charge in lumber matters, and the Assistant Secretary gave a decision with regard to the interpretation of that proviso, which at once arrayed the hostility of the Michigan men against it. He gave the decision that the proviso was only applicable to saw-logs, that if a foreign government put an export duty on saw-logs, all the remedy the United States would have under that Bill, would be to put a duty on saw-logs also; and when that authoritative exposition of the meaning of the proviso, was given by the Treasury Department, every Michigan man in the House, or in the Senate, was at once arrayed against the Bill, as it then stood. The hon. gentleman talks about my interests in Michigan. I am interested in Michigan, and I am interested in Tonawanda. My interests in Michigan consist of a few acres of stump lands, as they are termed, stripped years ago, and I will sell them to the hon. gentleman for 50 cents per acre. My chief interests are in Canada. My desire was to benefit those interests, my desire was to benefit the interests of those who, like myself, are engaged in lumbering. I wanted to remove from their shoulders the onerous burden that rested upon the lumbering industry. I wanted to secure this concession to the Americans with regard to the export duty that was an advantage to them. I wanted to secure one advantage by granting another concession, which was also really an advantage to us; and if I was personally interested in this matter it does not militate against me at all. If I was acting in the interests of the country, if I was acting in the interests of the large class of people in this country. The resolution of the Ottawa Valley lumbermen with regard to this matter makes it pretty clear, I imagine, that in doing this I was acting in their interests, and if I was acting in the interests of the lumbermen, I was also acting in the interests of the commercial classes of Canada at large.

Now, I shall say but few words more. I will call attention again to two of these letters. I do not suppose it will be asserted that in addition to directing the Michigan delegation that went to Washington, and in addition to running the lumbermen interested in the Ottawa Valley, I was likewise dictating the course that should be pursued by the Committee of Ways and Means, and by the president of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, and by a candidate for the governorship of Michigan, and pretty much everybody else in the United States. I hardly desire to aspire to the credit of having such wide-spread influence as that. Here are letters from gentlemen whom I could not influence, whom no individual in this House could influence. The letter of the president of the Finance Committee, Senator Voorhees, I will read again, in order that the House may understand what that gentleman says with regard to this very matter, and may appreciate the necessity that existed for securing an arrangement with regard to that export duty proviso that would allay the opposition of the Michigan men to the passage of the free-lumber clauses. Senator Voorhees said:

> My attention has been called to some attacks upon you in the Canadian journals, based upon the assertion that you suggested the export duty proviso in the wood schedule of the Wilson Bill. The attacks seem to me so unfair that I take the liberty of writing to say that the proviso is understood.

Senator Voorhees would be very apt to understand this matter.

> To have secured the support of the Michigan members for free lumber. It is not unlikely that the active hostility of Michigan would have defeated free lumber, and without the export duty proviso, that hostility, there is little reason to doubt, would have been vigorously applied.

That is the statement of Senator Voorhees, president of the Finance Committee. He states explicitly that this proviso is understood to have secured the support of the Michigan delegation. He states further that otherwise Michigan would have defeated free lumber; and he states still further that there is little reason to doubt that the hostility would have been actively applied if this export duty proviso had not been made. Mr. Whiting, a member of the Committee of Ways and Means is a prominent and weighty man in Michigan, he has represented a congressional district of that state for many years as a member of Congress, and occupies an influential position. He writes:

> I note a disposition to criticise you because of the clause in our Bill to require free logs from Canada as the price of free lumber. I can say

this : A free lumber Bill was defeated in the last Congress through Michigan protests joined to those of California and the South.

Michigan interests in free logs from Canada reconciled her to free lumber, deny this and her opposition will be arroused at once.

Mr. McALISTER. Had they free logs at that time ?

Mr. CHARLTON. They had free logs at that time under the provisions of the McKinley Bill, which I discussed this afternoon. That Bill was being repealed, and some other provision had to be made in order to secure free logs. The lumber duty was reduced to $1 per thousand under the McKinley Bill, and the export duty was removed by Canada as the consideration given for the reduction in lumber duty. Then a new measure was before Congress, namely, the Wilson Bill, which abrogated the provisions of the McKinley Bill ; the whole influence of Michigan was aroused to protect its interest in free logs as formerly secured in the McKinley Bill. The policy of the Democratic party was for free lumber. Michigan declared, we will consent to free lumber if you will guard our interests, as they were guarded under the McKinley Bill, as regards free logs. That was the arrangement on which the suggested free lumber provision was incorporated in the tariff as it came from the Committee of Ways and Means. It was found that the export duty proviso was insufficient, and Michigan was aroused ; a crisis had arrived, when the whole scheme was under consideration before the Democratic caucus in the Senate, and when free coal, free sugar, and free iron ore had already gone by the board, through combinations among the Democrats against those additions to the free list, and free lumber appeared also certain to go unless the opposition of Michigan could be set aside, and the active friendship of Michigan to this measure could be secured. That is the key note of the situation, and the whole matter turned upon the proposition, in effect, to give to Canada free lumber, free forest exports, requiring 11 paragraphs to enumerate them, if Canada would agree to refrain from imposing an export duty on logs. That is the whole thing : Free logs on the one hand, free forest products on the other. This was the essence of the agreement, and the burthen of the negotiations and representations and interviews I had with members of the Finance Committee, with members of the Committee of Ways and Means, with Treasury officials, with members of Congress, and with members of the Senate ; all these efforts were directed in the line of securing free lumber for Canada, and in the line of securing concessions that I knew must be made, for it was futile to ask free lumber from the Americans without such concessions being made. Here is a great party, and gentlemen pretending to be men of honour, who have accepted and reaped what was procured under these considerations, and under these negotiations, men who have accepted the boon thankfully and have set aside their boom duties, and done everything that was necessary to retain the great advantages secured in this Bill, yet so paltry and malignant are they as to attack the chief actor in the negotiations which secured this boon. It is in the highest degree petty on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite and is in the highest degree unfair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it nice, is it Christian-like, is it generous, is it honourable ? It is the exact reverse of all these. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have very much more to say. I certainly have no reason to feel ashamed of the part I have taken in this matter. I feel more confident of this because hon. gentlemen opposite are reaping the fruits of whatever I may have endeavoured to obtain, and have accepted those fruits without a murmur or question as to whether it was proper to get them. They have accepted them without question as to whether they were advantageous to Canada or not, but they know they are in the highest degree advantageous. They know they would have been false to their trust as custodians of the interests of the people if they had not seized upon the concessions made under the Wilson Bill, for they know that we are getting ten where the Americans are getting one, as regards the advantage gained by this arrangement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. If hon. gentlemen do not think so, let them abrogate the arrangement and put the duties on again, and see what the country will think of their action. Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not do it. I defy the Government to act consistently with their professions in this matter, consistently with the course followed in condemnation of myself, and repudiate that arrangement, reimpose the export duty on logs, and again put all those articles on the dutiable list. I defy them to do it. If they dare not do it, then their condemnation of me is not fair, is not honourable, is not in accordance with the principles of truth, justice and right, as between man and man.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat must feel proud of himself after the statement he has made. He has stated deliberately in this House of Commons, the deliberative body of Canada, that he, of his own free will, went to the United States and represented himself as a Michigan lumberman in order that he might get advantages for Canada. This has been charged against the hon. gentle-

man, not only in this House, but throughout the country, and I am using, I hope, a parliamentary term, when I say that he is looked upon as a political humbug. Well, Sir, this charge from this time out cannot be without proof, because, in the statement the hon. gentleman himself made he proved it to the letter. It seems difficult to believe that a man who poses as a Christian politician, as a moralist, who even goes into the house of God and preaches on Sunday, should have said that he is maligned by misrepresentations. The hon. gentleman has said that he misrepresented as to who he was, in order to gain an end for his own advantage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order. I made no such assertion.

Mr. BENNETT. I certainly, and I believe other hon. gentlemen understood him to say that he led the Secretary of State to believe that he was an American, so that he could better secure the ends he was endeavouring to promote.

Mr. CHARLTON. No. I did not.

Mr. BENNETT. And that if he had gone there as a Canadian he would not have effected his purpose as he did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Let the hon. gentleman state what he did say.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for North Norfolk denies that he made that statement. The House must accept that denial.

Mr. BENNETT. All I can say is that "Hansard," to-morrow, will prove whether the hon. gentleman said it or not, and I will withdraw it. The hon. gentleman came here to-night, and what did he say? He said that the Wilson Bill as it stood, and the memorial of John Charlton, of Michigan, who, perhaps, may be the hon. member for North Norfolk, or may not be the hon. gentleman, but who was certainly a man who was conspiring against the interests of Canada; and that "Mr. John Charlton, of Michigan," who wrote that memorial——

Mr. CHARLTON. No such representation was made.

Mr. BENNETT. And the man "John Charlton, of Michigan," whether he was or was not the hon. member for North Norfolk; I do not say yea or nay, but I have my own opinion about it, and I think hon. gentlemen have theirs, too. He comes here to-night with a statement that when the Wilson Bill had passed the House of Representatives, and when it was going to the Upper House, that Bill was going to be changed, and that a clause in it that was favourable to Canada, was going to be eliminated. Where is the proof? Why, we have but the bare statement of the hon. gentleman himself, and not even on oath, as an hon. gentleman suggests. Perhaps that would not go much further in this House, because affidavits of the hon. gentleman have been heard here. The hon. gentleman states then that he caused that Bill to be amended and to be changed. Then if he did, he must have been the writer of the memorial which was sent to Secretary of State, Carlisle. Then, if he be the author of that article, I say that he dare not go before the people of Canada and attempt to condone, or attempt to palliate, or attempt to make good the charges that he has made there. Why, Sir, what is his position? Here was a Bill being passed by the House of Representatives of the United States conceding to the people of Canada privileges that they had not previously enjoyed; here was a Bill being passed that would have permitted the people of this country to have imposed prohibitory tariff export duty on white pine logs, and would have permitted other products of the forest to be admitted free to the United States. That would have meant that we could have exported ties, cedar posts, pulp wood, and all these articles that are combined in the wooden schedule free of duty, and at the same time we could have imposed a prohibitory duty on white pine logs, which could only have brought about a return to $1 a thousand duty against Canadian lumber. The people of Canada did not fear a $1 duty on lumber. The lumbermen of Canada had paid $2 duty, and had made money at that, and all that possibly could have resulted would have been a return to the $1 duty on lumber. These most enduring benefits to the people of Canada in respect to these other matters would have been granted; but the man who was to be vitally struck by that was the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If the hon. gentleman is loyal to Canadian interests why does he not establish a saw-mill on the north shore? Why does he not afford Canadians and Canadian lumber a chance? The hon. gentleman has not a saw-mill in Canada, but he is engaged in the work of towing Canadian logs into Michigan so that they can be manufactured there. The hon. gentleman is engaged in the business of selling logs to American lumbermen, and therefore he was the man who was to be hurt. It was not the Canadian lumberman that he was fearful for at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I never sold a log to a Michigan lumberman in my life. I am not in the business of selling logs.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has not been interested in any way in any logs that have been sold to American lumbermen?

Mr. CHARLTON. I did some years ago sell timber, and that was sent to New

York and sold in the Eastern States. I am not engaged in the selling of saw-logs.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is then perhaps doing a more unpatriotic work. He is towing logs over to the United States and having them cut in American mills. Does the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. BENNETT. There, the hon. gentleman is more unpatriotic than ever. The position of the whole matter is, that the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to bolster up his position, and yet during this whole debate, there has not been one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has stood up in his place and endeavoured to defend the conduct of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). And, Sir, a year ago when this matter was introduced into this House, there was not one gentleman on the other side who even made a colour of defence, to his claims to being considered, as having acted in the interests of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is brave in defying the Government to impose an export duty on logs, or to prevent him from shipping his logs to the States so that he can manufacture them in American mills. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having brought about what he has brought about, because I believe it is due to his efforts. I congratulate him on being in such close union with the American limit owners, Fisher and Alger; for those people whom he has quoted to-day are limit holders on the north shore of the Georgian Bay. These are the men who are attempting to bolster him up and justify him in this country. It is hard on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) that he has to go outside his own country to get a certificate of character; and that is the position he is reduced to. In my opinion his position is one to be deplored. I may tell hon. gentlemen that this season there are being shipped from the north shores of the Georgian Bay, upwards of four hundred million feet of logs to be manufactured in the United States of America. I claim that that cannot well be prevented to-day, because by reason of the Bill as it stands at present, and by reason of the terms that the hon. gentleman has had incorporated in his Bill; reprisals will follow on the part of the American Government that will tell sorely against the whole Canadian forest products. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is pleased with what he has done, and if the hon. gentlemen behind him are pleased with what he has done, then all I can say is this: that the hon. gentleman has very little to be satisfied with, and I do not think it will meet with the approval of the electorate of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Controller of Customs said he did it himself, and that the hon. member for North Norfolk had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BENNETT. Not at all. The Controller of Customs made no such contention.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker. It is very natural that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should try to explain the position he occupies before this country. I have done my best to understand his explanation, I have done my best to convince myself that in writing to Washington he was looking after the interests of Canada and not his own interests in the United States. I must say, however, that I am not yet convinced, and I do not think that taking his whole record there is anything in it to convince me of his loyalty to Canada. I do not intend giving much of my own impressions, but I think I should lay before the House, and give the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) an opportunity for explaining, a certain document which he no doubt remembers. Before doing so, I will tell the hon. gentleman, how we humble members in this House, understood the position he took when he said in his communication to the United States' authorities "it it respectfully submitted that this proviso should read as follows:"—Then he says how the proviso should read, and he continues:

> Should this proviso be inserted, it will inevitably prevent the imposition of the export duty by the Canadian Government.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is trying to teach the people at Washington, what they should do to take away from the Canadian Government its full liberty of action. That statement cannot be understood otherwise. He says to Washington, do this and you will tie the hands of Canada. In whose interest was that? The hon. gentleman will tell us himself. He says:

> It is that provision which the entire lumber trade in Michigan, Ohio and New York, dependent more or less upon the Canadian supply for logs, is anxious to be inserted in the Bill.

Here is an hon. member of this House going to Washington without disclosing the fact that he is a Canadian and that he has sworn allegiance to Queen Victoria and to his country, any saying to the United States Congress, In the interest of the lumber trade in three of the states you should insert such a proviso in your tariff, and in that way you will prevent Canada acting as the interests of Canada demands. This position I cannot yet understand. If the hon. gentleman was acting in his interest as a lumberman in the United States, he was acting against the interests of Canada or a great part of Canada; and if he was acting as a Canadian, he was deceiving the Government of the United States in not disclosing the fact that he was a Canadian and a sworn subject of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. I say that in acting thus he acted, I will not say dishonestly,

but not fairly or openly or manly, and he succeeded in tying the hands of the Canadian Government. He is trying to explain now that what he did was in the interest of Canada. I say whether or not his action was in the interest of Canada, it was not a straightforward one, and one dictated by his duty as a member of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, this was not the first time that the hon. gentleman forgot his duty to his country and even to his party. I hold in my hand a letter—I hope it will not be torn while I hold it—which I will read in order to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of explaining it. It was written in 1866, when the hon. gentleman was living in the States. He had come to Canada, and had met some volunteers coming back from the Fenian Raid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure it was not from the North-west?

Mr. AMYOT. No, it was not from the North-west the hon. gentleman was coming, and I will tell you why: because in 1885, in the North-west expedition the Government did their best to send only men who were loyal to the Queen. Having gone back to the States, the hon. gentleman wrote to a paper in Tonawanda as follows:—

Your correspondent happend to be in Paris, C.W., on the 19th inst. (June, 1866); heard music, saw flags, civilians, military, &c.; inquired what was going on; found that volunteer picnic was in progress, and concluded to stay and see the show.

Six companies of volunteers, numbering about 300 men, in the Canadian uniform of black coats, with ridiculously short tails, and dark gray pants, excessively large in the rear, just below the waist band, were the guests in whose honour the spread was made.

The grounds where the tables were spread, and the stands for the speakers and music erected, were in the beautiful valley of Grand River, just below the Buffalo and Lake Huron bridge. The day was all that could be desired, sunshine and a fresh, bracing breeze, contributing to the enjoyment of the crowd of hilarious and self-satisfied Canucks.

The proceedings were inaugurated by a battallion drill of the warriors. Your correspondent knows very little of military tactics, but is decidedly of the opinion that the six companies of volunteers aforesaid got slightly tangled several times, and had not a very clear conception of what they were trying to do. They formed hollow squares, for the purpose of repelling cavalry (one of Colonel Booker's strong points, I believe, when resisting an enemy without horses), but got their squares so solid that moving arms was next to an impossibility. After going through various evolutions, the arms were stacked and the volunteers invited to the stand to hear the order granting them permission to return to their homes read. The reading was performed by a tall, amateur military man, rejoicing in the title of major, whose legs were long enough to enable him to keep up with the fastest member of the Queen's Own, if it ever became necessary to try, and whose coat-tails were not long enough to impede his progress in the least.

After reading the order, and what I took to be an address from the officers, complimenting Canada on her loyalty, progress, and self-sacrificing devotion to British connection, and the volunteers on their soldierly qualities, patriotism, courage, virtue, fighting, height, weight, &c., the chairman introduced the Rev. Wm. Ryerson, ex-M.P.P., who made a speech by way of grace before dinner. The speech of the rev. gentleman was a very fine specimen of buncombe and bombast, and contained not a solitary acknowledgment to the United States for faithfully performing treaty obligations, and all the duties of international comity, in suppressing the contemplated Fenian invasion. The crowd, who stood open-mouthed, imbibing the sentiments of the venerable oracle, was informed that Canada had the finest volunteer force in the world, who had just gained a great victory, by repulsing and driving back the Fenian hordes, which a professedly friendly nation had permitted to attack them; that their institutions were immeasureably superior to the ultra-democracy of the United States, and that Canada was to become, through the agency of confederation, one of the greatest powers of the earth; had demonstrated to the world and all mankind her ability to take care of all Fenian hordes, and with the assistance of Britannia—that Goliath among the nations—to repulse and drive back, in ignominy and digrace, if need be, that greatest nation in all creation which they had for a neighbour.

After the speech of the Rev. gentleman, the volunteers partook of the repast provided for them by the ladies of Paris, which I presume was a bountiful one, though I did not inspect the tables.

Dinner over, speaking became the order of the day, and the clergymen of Paris, in rotation, ventilated their sentiments. The rev. gentlemen are good on buncombe; one, however, the Rev. Mr. Robertson, did get off a few sensible ideas, which refreshingly varied the monotony of claptrap and self-laudation. He had the hardihood to assert that it would not be improper to inquire whether Ireland did not labour under grievance, and to doubt whether the tenure by which land was held and the fact that a state-church was forced upon an unwilling people, was just the thing.

In all the speeches made, I did not notice a word of acknowledgment for the course taken by the United States. All the changes were rung on the repulsion of the Fenians; the fact that they gained one victory, and left without being repulsed, was not mentioned.

The self-glorification and elation over the glorious demonstration of power and patriotism made by Canada certainly appeared, to an onlooker, like wasting a good deal of powder on a small amount of game; and the studious avoidance of any allusion to the United States, except in tones of insult and disparagement, by the small fry who figured as orators on the occasion, is, I presume, an indication of the tone of public men and of the press in Canada, who will now attempt to counteract annexationist tendencies by misrepresenting the United States and sowing the seeds of bitterness and hostility in the minds of the people. Perhaps they may succeed, for the masses in Canada are not remarkable for intelligence.

The hon. member for North Norfolk has been charged with having written that letter. I am told that he once tore the letter when it was presented to him, but the fragments were collected, and it has been published again. He has not denied having written that letter, and it certainly looks very much like his own ideas of love for the United

States and sacrifice of Canada for the States. He represents the volunteers of Canada as a set of laughable young men, badly clothed, and praising themselves without any reason for glory that they did not win; and he gives of this country a description that is far from flattering. He says to the Americans that our people do not recognize their duties as good neighbours. He tries to foment bad sentiments between the two countries, and he winds up with this remarkable sentence "the masses in Canada are not remarkable for intelligence." It is not only the masses in Canada who are not remarkable for their intelligence. He wrote something else once. He said: "With a French Catholic leader, and under the manipulation of such unscrupulous politicians as J. D. Edgar, I have not the greatest confidence in the immediate future of the Reform party." With such allies as the hon. preacher—I beg pardon, I mean the hon. member—with allies who sacrifice the interests they have sworn to protect for the interests of American lumbermen, with allies who despise the whole Canadian people, with allies who despise their own chief, hon. gentlemen opposite may introduce hundreds of Bills of morality but they will never have a chance of reaching office.

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot allow this debate to close, after the shape it has taken, without offering a few remarks. I had hoped that the hon. member for North Norfolk who represents, in the Liberal interest, a part of the county from which I come and in which I was born, would have allowed the episode that has been discussed to-day to have remained in oblivion. It would have been wise for him and well for Canada had he done so. The conduct of the hon. gentleman has met the condemnation, not only of the Conservative party, but of the best elements of the Liberal party. It has met the condemnation of the better portion of the press of the Liberal party. I had hoped to be able to keep silent on this question, but after listening to the debate, my duty to my native county compels me, as its representative and a Canadian, to rise in my place and give expression to my opinion in this matter. Until to-day nothing would have convinced me that the hon. gentleman would not have allowed the mistake he made —to use a mild expression—to lie in oblivion and be forgotten. Representing one-half of that county, the other half of which is represented by the hon. gentleman, and that county, which, in its early days, was peopled by the fathers of this country—the U. E. Loyalists—I preferred to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman and allow oblivion to cover the mistake which he made. But now that he voluntarily, and not only voluntarily, but aggressively brings the matter up, and invites the expression of our opinion, the case is different. I am quite willing to agree, as I have frequently stated outside the House, that in the Reform party there are men as sincerely loyal, as willing to defend the institutions of their country, as can be found any where, and I feel all the more pained to have to rise here and break the silence I have hitherto maintained. But I feel that did I not rise now to express my view of the part the hon. gentleman has played, the charges could be brought against me that I had no reply to make. Now, in case the House may not have noticed it, I think it proper to call attention to this point. In my early parliamentary experience, whether from proper forbearance or from unwise diffidence in expressing my views, I did not speak aggressively in opposition to the hon. gentleman, feeling that, as our county of Norfolk was divided between one Liberal and one Conservative representative, it was right not to insist too strongly upon differences where such a course could be consistently avoided. I may have been wrong sometimes in not expressing my views, when my views did not agree with those of the hon. gentleman. But I want the hon. gentleman and the House to understand that when I talk in this House or out of it, I speak what I believe. I may be mistaken, and I may not be able to express my views properly, but I would have it understood that there is sincerity behind what I say. But when great questions arise, when not to speak would seem a dereliction of duty, I have spoken my mind with sincerity. As to the discussion that has now arisen, I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman has been well answered from this side of the House, and I am satisfied that his colleagues behind him feel that he has been well answered. Let me read from one of the sincere journals of this Dominion, the editor of which is one of my acquaintances. And I want to say here, as I have said in other places, that I believe that in the sincere and honest expression of its opinion the Montreal "Witness" will be recognized. Some hon. gentlemen about me may feel that I give too high praise to this journal: but, though its editor and I differ in our opinions on many things as widely as men can differ, I believe that he is sincere even when I think him mistaken. I do not wish to discuss this question with regard to the hon. member for North Norfolk, and it is only in the performance of an unpleasant duty that I read from the "Witness" of the 14th of June, 1894, after this whole question had been discussed, its opinion of the hon. gentleman's action. A large part of the article is devoted to this side of the House, by no means in a complimentary strain. Discussing the position of the hon. gentleman, the editor says:—

Mr. Charlton explains that his purpose in suggesting legislation by the United States Congress which would prevent the Dominion Government from imposing export duties upon logs was to

secure the continuance of the reciprocal relations which have proved so advantageous to both countries. We have no doubt whatever that Mr. Charlton was sincere in this purpose and not consciously moved by self-interest. At the same time, his course is not one that can be defended; it was a mistaken one. Canadians, and especially Canadian legislators, are bound to secure Canadian interests by the exercise of the self-governing powers within their own country, and not by placing in the hands of another country, a knowledge of the means by which Canada can be coerced even for her own good.

I have nothing to add to that. I wish to conclude my remarks by a short reference to the recollections stirred by the words that fell from my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). I was one of those badly clothed Canadians at Paris. I was clothed in the rifle green with which Britain has clothed her soldiers, as they carried civilization and Christianity throughout the whole world. I was captain of a company, and when I marched from Simcoe, I was a younger man than I am to-day. I left a wife, and almost every man in the ranks of my company was called upon to say farewell to wife and child. We did not march away upon that occasion to be ridiculed by such as the hon. gentleman. I speak as an old man now, but this brings up the same emotions that we felt that day. We felt that, in all probability, some of us who were leaving home that day, would never see home and friends again. The man who talks about Canadians who performed their duty in the way this hon. gentleman talks is not the man who ought to be in a Canadian legislature, and I repudiate such statements as the hon. gentleman made, not only on behalf of the South Riding, which is Conservative, but on behalf of the North Riding, which is Reform. For, faithful as the people there have been to him, if they are satisfied that he holds these views they will repudiate him also. Why? Because, in the very ranks that marched to his ridicule from the township of Townsend that gives him a majority of 500, were two companies made up of Reformers and Conservatives together, showing that in this rifle green clothing that he ridicules, members of the two political parties march together at the call of their country. We were not regular soldiers: you could not hire the men in those ranks to go as regular soldiers. But they required no hiring and no pay, when their sentiments as Canadians were aroused and when they realized that the institutions of their country were in danger. I remember how the sun shone that day, and how all looked fair about us as we left those who were dear to us with the tears running down their cheeks. Hon. gentlemen may laugh and ridicule the sentiments I feel, but God take me from this country and from the world when I am no longer affected by the feelings aroused by recollections such as this.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Further amount required to pay for expenses of revision of the voters' list... $40,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the Minister would afford us some information as to why this additional $40,000 is required.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was present when, at the last sitting of the House, I made an explanation with regard to that item. However, I shall be very glad to make it again. It is to cover the balance of the cost of revision during the past year. As the hon. gentleman, of course, understands, these items are for the current year. The list was revised last year, and the vote placed in the Estimates for the purpose was $200,000. At the time it was felt by the Queen's Printer, who made a report upon the subject, that, while he would try very hard to keep the cost within the vote, at the same time he feared it would not be possible to do so. As to the cost of the whole revision, in giving an answer some time ago, I was misled in two or three figures. The sum paid already to the revising barristers is $148,000; the sum still due the revising barristers is about $12,000, that is, upon the regular pay of those officers. In one or two cases, as I explained at the last sitting, there are small claims—I think, in not over three cases—made by the revising barristers as to some extras due them on account of the difficulty of travelling peculiar to their constituencies. These amounts, however, are very small, and I have advised the Auditor General to deal with them upon some fair basis, and to settle them. The preliminary lists have always been printed outside of the bureau, and, I may say, at a uniform rate; but outside the printing of these preliminary lists, there was paid for printing $35,000. The printing of the lists at Ottawa, together with the printing of some of the final electoral lists for the cities of Toronto and Montreal, which were printed in outside offices, cost about $40,000, making a total of about $235,000. It is estimated by the Queen's Printer that this $40,000, in addition to the vote of last year, will cover the whole expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister has answered only in part what I was seeking to find out, because, remembering the answer he had given as to the cost of this, I was led to inquire why he asked for $40,000 additional.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That arose from an error in the figures which were given to my department by the Queen's Printer, who misunderstood what was wanted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Because the Minister will remember that the question was as to the total cost, and as to the unascertained cost, and the figure he gave was $195,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is the way it occurred. The question was asked by my department of the Queen's Printer, what the amount paid out for printing had been. The Queen's Printer thought that the officer who asked him for the information only referred to the amount which had actually been paid out to newspaper offices outside the bureau, and the answer they gave him did not include the cost of printing here at Ottawa, which was a little over $40,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand the Minister's explanation, and it is a little unsatisfactory in one respect. When a question of this kind is asked, What is the entire cost of revising the Dominion voters' lists, if the total cost is not yet fully ascertained, how much of it is ascertained, and what is the estimate of the Government as to the unascertained cost? when an answer is given as explicitly as it was by the Minister, it is accepted by the press and by the House as a total amount, and it has gone out to the country a month ago that the revision of the voters' lists does not cost so much as was represented at the time, that it does not cost more than $200,000. Now we find that it is $240,000. But the idea is abroad and the country is under the impression that the cost is less than $240,000. It is unfortunate that answers should be given in this way. In reference to the cost of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, I think the House has been given two or three varying amounts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Over the amount.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Over or under, I cannot tell which. When you give varying answers, we are at a loss to know which is correct. I mention this because I think that when a question is asked like this, if anything like a definite answer can be given, it should be given; and, if not, it should be made sufficiently clear that more is to follow. Now, I understand that this $40,000 will complete the total amount required.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman has some reason to find fault, although the erroneous statement was made unintentionally. This vote covers everything. The revision of the list will cost $240,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What percentage of the printing was done in Ottawa, and what outside?

Mr. MONTAGUE. All of what we call the final electoral lists were printed in the bureau, with the exception of the lists of Toronto and Montreal. The hon. gentleman will see that all the preliminary lists, as already explained, are printed in the constituencies, but no final lists, except those of Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know the value of the work done in the bureau and the work done outside.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I gave the figures to the hon. member for South Brant. It cost $40,000 for the inside printing, and $35,000 for the outside printing. I have not the figures by me at the moment, but if the hon. gentleman will turn to the answer I gave when the item was up the other day, and which was absolutely correct, he will see that the item paid for printing the final lists outside was a very small one.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister says $35,000 was paid for outside printing which was done in Montreal and Toronto. Now, if it costs $35,000 to print the lists for Montreal and Toronto——

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He forgets that every constituency first has a preliminary list printed. The final lists for all the constituencies were printed outside the bureau, and the cost of those lists for the 215 constituencies is included in the $35,000, as well as the final lists for Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the amount allowed for the printing of the preliminary lists?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Three cents a name, and 50 cents for the heading of the polling sub-divisions. That rate was adopted some years ago, and has not been changed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not quite understand how the book-keeping is done in your department. You say about $40,000 was paid for printing in the bureau. Do you credit the bureau with printing the names at the same rate that you allow to outside offices? Does that go to the credit of the expense account for working the bureau, and to the debit of the wages? In other words, does the bureau pay its own expenses? Is there sufficient work done to pay all the employees and the expenditure connected with it? If so, is what you credit it for work done on the voters' list, done at the same rate as you pay outside offices?

Mr. MONTAGUE. As to the manner in which the bureau is run, I may say that it is run purely as a business concern, and on business principles, and the instructions of the department to the Queen's Printer are to run it absolutely as he would run his own private business.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And make it pay?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes. The matter to which attention has been called is a matter of book-keeping. Each department gets supplies from the Stationery Department and Queen's Printer, and these are charged against each department. As to the lists, I think the price mentioned is the absolute cost of printing them; I am not sure about that however.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister no doubt understands that in the Printing Bureau there is an immense quantity of type kept constantly standing for the purposes of the voters' list. Is there any account taken of the money invested in that enormous quantity of type ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no interest account kept. The lists are kept standing, and that is the system adopted by South Australia, Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and New Zealand. I have no estimate of the quantity of type kept standing but of course it is very large.

Mr. McMULLEN. My object was to ascertain if an interest account was kept. If not, the prices charged for labour do not represent anything like the actual cost.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No Government keeps such an account. For example, it would not do to charge the interest on these buildings, against legislation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When the Printing Bureau, was established, it was proposed to print the lists there, and a large amount of money was invested in type for the purpose of having the lists kept set up continuously from one revision to another. Now, the Government have adopted a different system. At first the lists were printed entirely at the bureau, and outside printers had nothing whatever to do with the work. Since then, when revisions have taken place, the Government have seen fit to have the preliminary lists printed at offices throughout the country in the different ridings where the revision has taken place. According to figures given by the Secretary of State, the preliminary lists cost $35,000, while the printing of the final lists at the bureau cost $40,000. It will thus be seen that the preliminary lists cost within $5,000 of the final lists. If the preliminary lists were printed in the bureau, the type would not have to be re-set for all the changes made. As occurs now the type is set in the country printing offices where the preliminary lists are printed and these lists are sent to the bureau and re-set there ; so the printing actually costs almost double that which it would cost if the system which the Government proposed when it invested in the Printing Bureau was followed, or at all events there would be a saving of one-quarter. Undoubtedly a large sum of money is wasted in having the lists printed outside and reprinted in the bureau. Could not something be done to change this system ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), who is a practical printer, I may say that the difficulty lies in the time allowed between the preliminary lists being prepared and the time when those lists had to be corrected. There are very many of such lists, and after all they do not affect the lists standing in block for the final list. The preliminary lists are not the whole lists ; they include a certain number of names which are to be put on, added or subtracted from other lists. I have discussed the whole matter with the Queen's Printer, and he tells me that he was given carte blanche to do what he believed to be cheapest in that regard, and he adopted the present system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the Secretary of State to say that only a small number of names were printed at the outside offices.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As compared with the total names.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not quite follow the hon. gentleman. I understand the cost was three cents per name. If the preliminary list cost $35,000 or thereabouts, that rate would be sufficient for about one million voters.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman must remember there is the heading for each polling sub-division for which 50 cents are allowed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would not amount to a very large sum, even allowing 20 or 30 sub-divisions for each constituency. The great bulk of payment must be for names, and if $30,000 are rquired, it is quite clear that the preliminary lists must comprise the bulk of the voters, as $30,000 is sufficient to meet the expense of one million voters at 3 cents per name. This fact materially strengthens the contention of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), that a good deal of money is wasted in dividing this work between outside offices and the bureau here.

Mr. HUGHES. In connection with the preliminary lists, I think, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), if he considers the matter, will see that it would be a very expensive method to have the preliminary lists printed at the bureau here. The preliminary lists are made up of three separate lists ; a list with the names to be added, a list with names to be removed and a list of names to be corrected. Suppose these preliminary lists were set up here and the type kept standing, that would be of very little advantage to the printer because he would have to come along and pick up the line and place it in its proper place in the final list. I am satisfied, from having had experience in printing both the preliminary and final lists, that this would lead to endless confusion and endless mistakes. It is quite possible that a much large number of names might appear on the preliminary lists than on the final list. There are, as I have said, three classes of lists. There is a list of names to be added, nearly all of which would be added, then there is a list of names to be removed, many of which would be re-

moved ; then there is a list of corrections, all of which would appear in the final list. It would lead to endless confusion if these preliminary lists were printed at the bureau. In my county, for example, if the revising officer experiences any difficulty, he can easily consult some one in the immediate locality and settle the matter finally. Ultimately the final list is printed at the bureau here and is easily done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) evidently did not understand what I meant to convey, which was that a very large saving might be effected if the whole of the lists were printed in the counties where the lists are made up. I have no doubt that a large sum of money would be saved in doing so, because when the preliminary lists are set up in the country offices the names are ready to be inserted in the final list. When it comes here to the bureau all these names have to be re-set. I contend that the Government would save money if they had the preliminary and final lists printed in the offices outside.

Mr. HUGHES. The only difficulty in that respect is, that it would require a larger amount of type than many of the outside offices have at their disposal. In every other respect the statement is correct.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That experiment was tried once. The first list was printed under the superintendence of the Auditor General and the whole printing was done outside and amounted to about $180,000. When the work was entrusted to the Queen's Printer, this plant was purchased and the final list was published in the bureau. The saving of cost on that in one year was equal to the cost of the whole plant employed in the printing the final lists in the bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister forgets that the payment for the first list was at the rate of 12 cents a name, and they only allow 3 cents now. The Government wanted to give the country printers a benefit when they paid them 12 cents.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no doubt that what my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) suggests would be very popular among the newspapers, but as to this whole question the Queen's Printer—whom hon. gentlemen opposite will admit is a good business man, and who runs the bureau as a business man—says that the method adopted now is the most economical. I discussed the subject with him and that is his opinion.

To pay Hugh Sutherland, late M.P. for Winnipeg, balance of sessional indemnity, 1886 $469

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know much about the merits of this matter, but whether it be well founded or illfounded, a very strong case ought to be made out in its favour, and a strong protest ought to be entered against allowing claims which have not been put forward for nine or ten years, being presented to us. I can conceive nothing more improper than allowing eight or ten years, and as we have seen in old times, thirteen or fourteen years, to elapse, before accounts are rendered to the Government. We should have some explanation why this claim is brought forward at such a late date. On what possible grounds are we asked to pay this money, and what is the justification for it ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know that I should attempt to give the hon. gentleman a justification for this claim further than this : In my opinion claims for sessional indemnity, inasmuch as that the sessional indemnity is statutory, are always exigible until they are paid. I have taken the ground with regard to other claims of this nature, made within a reasonable period of time—that is one or two years after the session in which the indemnity accrued—that I had the right to authorize the accountant to pay these claims, when the necessary statutory declaration was made. With regard to this particular claim, the facts are as follows :—Mr. Sutherland, in the session of 1886, came to Ottawa in the beginning of the session. He remained here for a certain number of days—fourteen, I think—and I understand he then went to England and did not return until the session was over. Prior to leaving here, he drew the full amount of mileage, and $91 sessional indemnity at the rate of $7 a day. He never made a declaration upon which the accountant could pay him the balance of the indemnity for that session of 1886 ; but during the year 1893, he did present to me a statutory declaration which under the law would entitle him to the amount now placed in the Estimates. As more than six years had elapsed, I would not undertake to authorize the accountant to pay that sum to Mr. Sutherland, without a vote of Parliament, although I confess that legally, I think, he was entitled to it. An application was, I understand, made by Mr. Sutherland to the Minister of Finance, and the opinion which I held with regard to the indemnity being exigible until it was paid, was, I am informed, confirmed by the Department of Justice. Upon that report the Government placed this amount in the Estimates to pay Mr. Sutherland the sum which he could have obtained at the end of the session of 1886, if he had made the necessary statutory declaration.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The days he was absent are deducted from the sessional allowance ?

Mr. SPEAKER. My recollection is that the declaration was made out in the proper statutory form, and the deductions of the days during which he was absent during

that session would leave the sum $469 due him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I understand Mr. Speaker aright, a member is entitled to full sessional indemnity, less the number of days absent upon which the House has sat ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought it had been ruled that a member should be here thirty days.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No ; the thirty days refers to the session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the statute is clear upon that point, and my own opinion with regard to it has been confirmed by the Department of Justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is understood that we agree to this on the score that it is, as Mr. Speaker represents, a fair debt, and that he, in his capacity as an officer of the House, will see that it is so.

To pay O. Durocher and J. O. Durocher for the privilege and authority to manufacture and to use in connection with the Dominion elections a certain invention described in the Patent of Canada, No. 30784 as " Ballot slip "..... $2,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has this ballot slip been made use of yet ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, in the late by-elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was it used in Antigonish ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and in Verchères.

Mr. LAURIER. It was also used in Quebec West, and it lost the election to the man who had the majority of votes.

Mr. FRASER. I would suggest that the Government should see, before the election takes place, that the same kind of ballot paper is used all over the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was nothing wrong in the Antigonish papers, was there ?

Mr. FRASER. There may have been nothing wrong in the papers, because the voters were right. But I see no reason why all the ballots could not be prepared here, where they ought to be prepared. I can see that the printing might have to be done elsewhere, but the paper should be uniform all over the Dominion, so that there would be no chance of anything wrong being done in that respect by any of the returning officers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a law on the statute-book, which was passed last session, at the instance of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), regulating the form of the ballot. It is impossible to have the ballots printed here, owing to the short space of time between the nomination and polling. As to the paper, I will discuss that with the Queen's Printer ; but I understand that that is regulated by statute.

Mr. FRASER. The paper should be uniform, otherwise the party in power might use paper that would give them an advantage.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, that would be a violation of the law.

Mr. FRASER. Then, the law is violated every day.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the nature of the paper ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The main portion is black, and there is a round space in white opposite the name of each candidate, in which the elector is instructed to mark the cross.

Mr. LAURIER. This ballot was introduced by the Act of last session, and the first result of its use does not conduce to the opinion that it is an improvement on the old system. There is this much to be said for the old system, that the people understood it. We had four or five general elections under it, it was tested in the courts, and the people came to understand it thoroughly. In one of the elections held under the new system, the ballot acted so as to lose the election to one of the candidates who had a majority of the votes, because some of the electors had marked their ballots according to the old way. I understand that according to the law, the cross has to be made in the blank space.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Some of the electors, instead of making the mark in the circle opposite the name of the candidate, made it in the space where the name was printed. Under the rulings of the Supreme Court, these are good ballots. In my riding some of them were unfortunately counted against me.

Mr. LANGELIER. A good many of the voters, instead of putting their cross in the blank space intended for it, put it in the space under or over the name of the candidate. It was understood when the law was passed in the House last year that the cross would be put only in the blank space provided for that purpose, and the deputy returning officer in Quebec West understood the matter just as it had been understood in this House. When the recount took place, the judge adopted the ruling of the different courts, and decided that the ballots in which the crosses were made outside of the blank space, that is, at any other place which would have been good formerly, would be good now. The law was clearly understood that in whatever place the cross was made, provided it was quite clear for which of the candidates the elector intended to vote, the

ballot would be counted. With the ruling given by the court of Quebec, this new ballot paper is perfectly useless, because the law is going to be exactly as it was before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the decision of the court in Quebec is that the marking of the cross within the disc is directory, and not mandatory, and it seems to me that there is a good deal to be said in favour of that view, because otherwise a man who marked his ballot with the intention of voting for a particular candidate and who marked it in such a way as to leave no doubt as to the party for whom he intended to vote, if he marked it outside the disc, according to one hon. member he would lose his vote, and, according to another hon. member he would be entitled to have his vote counted. Generally, we interpret the law in favour of the voter, and not against him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the Act is pretty explicit on that point. The argument that prevailed with the House was the satisfactory working of this form of ballot in the municipal elections in some of the Ontario districts. In Ottawa, they have that sort of ballot. It was not laid down in the Act as obligatory to make the cross inside that circle, though that was part of the directory section of the Act; but it was supposed there would be less difficulty on the part of the nervous and uninformed elector in finding the proper place to put his mark. If the mark were put in the division where the candidate's name was, it would still hold good, though it was not inside the white portion; and I think all the advantage gained was that while, as in the old ballot, if the mark were found in the division, it would still count, this white circle would attract greater attention.

Mr. LAURIER. The result of the Quebec election showed that really the best system would have been to adhere to our old system, although that was not perfect. The people had become accustomed to it, and some of them made their mark in the division. The judge ruled his ballots out, but I am not prepared to agree with the construction he put upon the law, because I think those ballots should have been allowed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So do I.

Mr. LAURIER. But the judge thought differently. If you allow the cross to be placed in any part of the division, what is the use of the new ballot. I quite understand that the idea was to bring the attention of the illiterate electors to this white disk, but it was found in Quebec that they marked the ballots according to the old method. In so doing, their ballots were legal, according to the construction of the Minister of Justice, but illegal according to the judge, and the result is confusion worse confounded.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It would be impossible to construct an Act that would be similarly construed everywhere by everybody.

Mr. LAURIER. It may be that I am too much of a Conservative, and adhere to the old form.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it a sufficient improvement on the old ballot to make it worth the amount of money we are asked to pay. I do not see that it is any great advantage. There is apparently no great genius displayed in its invention, and I object strongly to the grant of so much money for a form of ballot which has no greater advantage over the old one than this. It has been clearly shown that in practical use it is of very little advantage. Any official could have quite easily suggested the idea, if it was found in practice that the electors were liable to make mistakes under the old form. The patent would not hold against Parliament. There is no legal obligation, and the only thing which can justify this expenditure is the recognition of the great genius who did the work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think that no matter what view the House might take of the merits of this ballot, they would agree that we should ignore the claim of the patentee. It is quite clear that we were under no obligations to pay the patentee anything for the adoption of this invention, but Parliament decided, without any question, that it was worthy of adoption. I do not think that the leader of the Opposition would be inclined, from the experience in Quebec, to discard this plan or advocate the repeal of the Act. We cannot escape technical questions being raised with regard to any form of ballot that we may devise. It certainly will not be said that the experience of four elections is sufficient to show that the object we had in view has not been attained. No matter what opionion the House might express now, I do not think, after the decision we came to last session, that we should rely on our technical right of declining to award compensation to the inventor of this idea.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman was right when he said that the Act last year was passed unanimously. I do not recollect that any objection was taken to it, but neither do I recollect that any mention was then made that this new invention would cost $2,500.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not a large amount, if it is worth adopting.

Mr. LAURIER. I think that no mention was made at the time the proposal was first suggested——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the leader of the Government stated the exact amount, and I have sent for "Hansard" to verify my recollection upon that point.

Mr. LAURIER. It may be so, but I am under a different impression. According to my recollection, the Prime Minister stated that the ballot was the invention of Mr. Durocher. But I do not think he stated what it was going to cost the country. Though last year the Act was passed, it was passed unanimously at the end of the session, and perhaps, it did not meet, at that time, with sufficient consideration. The hon. gentleman must agree that we cannot devise a ballot which will be wholly free from the difficulties of working. But I attach great importance to this—that the form of ballot has been known, that it has passed through the courts, and that the courts have established upon it a series of decisions, a system of jurisprudence. Thus the elector knows generally what interpretation is to be put upon the different questions arising, and there is diffused throughout the country a knowledge of what the law is. I would not change the law unless there was in the new system a manifest improvement. This proposal is to substitute another form, which may have its own merits, which merits may not overbear the known and guarded defects of the previous form, and I question if there is any such advantage as is thought in the change. The result of the experience of this year has shown that there has been no improvement in this respect, as proven by the Quebec election. Had that election been held in the old form, what was practically an injustice to the people of Quebec would not have taken place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that anybody understood last year, when this matter was discussed, that we were to be asked to buy a simple invention of this kind. I remember the discussion now, and I think the impression made upon the members on this side, and of members generally, was that the invention was some new form of ballot box which was supposed to be capable of protecting the country against fraud, and not a mere slip of paper arranged in a particular fashion. I do not want to exercise our rights too rigorously, but I am bound to say that I think that the sum of $2,500 of public money is a great deal too much to pay for an invention such as this. I do not think it is worth $2,500, or even $1,000. I think the owner would be amply remunerated for the invention, for the exercise of brains and the time occupied, by one-fifth part of that sum. I must say, whatever may have been said at that time. I did not understand that what we were asked to pay for was simply a little bit of paper arranged in a slightly different way from the ballot hitherto in use.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The simpler the invention, very often, the more valuable it is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that, in the face of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition, as to the interpretation put upon the law in the province of Quebec, the Minister of Justice ought to propose to amend the law and to provide that the provision for marking the ballot within the disc ought to be directory and not mandatory. It seems to me that if the mark is so placed as to show very clearly for whom the voter intended to record his vote, that that ought to be sufficient. The object of adopting this ballot is not to put the voter in a worse position than he was in before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the House will allow me to give a reference to the statement made by the late leader of the Government on this point. Last session he mentioned the exact sum, so that I suppose that that will, on this item settle the point. On the 20th July last he said:

> The ballot paper is patented. But an arrangement has been made by which, if the Government should choose to use the ballot, we obtain the right to use it for the sum of $2,500. We say that it will be very beneficial to adopt this form of ballot paper throughout Canada for the purpose of preventing the spoiling of ballots.

That is quite in line with the hon. gentleman's contention, and mine, of that clause to which he referred. The Prime Minister went on to explain what we know of this form of ballot. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the Act, they will see that it was not to come into force—that section of it—until a proclamation was made, and that, no doubt, is why the leader of the Government stated that if we decided to adopt this form of ballot, we had agreed to pay. And the proclamation issued shortly before these elections.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You require a short declaratory Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No because the Act provided for a proclamation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the courts construed the clause adversely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We can't help that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, you can—by an amendment of the law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the leader of the Opposition will not say that we should amend the law because of that decision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Surely——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One court is not to control the legislation of this country. I do not think the hon. leader of

the Opposition will say that that decision is good law. We agree that it is bad law.

Mr. LAURIER. If the law is such that the judges make it bad, I think we had better amend the law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is done every year in the Imperial Parliament. Without waiting to carry the case to the ultimate court, Parliament removes any doubt as to the meaning of the statute by a declaratory Act. Take, for instance, the Kyne case, in which on a material point the court took a view contrary to that Parliament had entertained. Parliament immediately passed a declaratory Act without a single dissenting voice. Surely, it would be better that we should have an Act of half a dozen lines declaring how we understand that the ballot should be marked, rather than have the judges, in perhaps twenty different constituencies, through a misconstruction of the law, disfranchising voters and returning the candidates of the minority.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With great difference, I differ with the hon. gentleman. Where the law is so clear.——

Mr. LAURIER. Do you call it clear when the judges misinterpret it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Upon my word, I do not think that we could pass a declaratory Act that would be any clearer than the law as it now stands.

Mr. LAURIER. Better impeach the judge then.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have nothing to do with the judge, nor has the hon. gentleman. At any rate, here is a matter of good faith pending at this stage. I do submit, that if we wish to change that law, this is not the time to discuss the change. That, of course, is most humbly submitted. I submitted a similar opinion the other day, with some confidence, which was not accepted in the proper spirit. But I do say that if hon. gentlemen in this House do not approve of the law as it stands, we cannot in Committee of Supply, certainly with consideration for economy of time, discuss amendments. A few moment ago we discovered from "Hansard" that the House was seized of the fact that $2,500 was agreed upon with the patentee as the consideration for the adoption of that idea, the Government asked power from Parliament to adopt it and we unanimously adopted it. No matter what we may think, and I admit there is a good deal of room for discussion as to the advisability of continuing this, I again submit that so far as that item is concerned we are bound to vote that money and pay it like men. If the hon. gentleman from Bothwell thinks the law ought to be changed, there is a very easy way to do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman's position. Very frequently casual observations are flung out in the course of debate to which nobody pays attention and cannot be expected to pay attention, until the matter is brought before them in a substantive form. When we are being asked to pay over a disproportionate sum of money for what I regard as an extremely trifling improvement——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For the sum named at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not brought down here, and I cannot agree for a moment that a casual statement, whether made by the leader of the House or anybody else in that way, is to be regarded as binding the House to vote public money. It would be a dangerous doctrine to allow to prevail. I never supposed for an instant, from such a statement as the hon. gentleman has read, that we were going to be asked to pay for any such thing as this. I supposed it was for some complicated invention in a ballot box, not a mere modification of the ordinary ballot slip, as I now discover it to be. But whether that be the case or not, I do not think the House should agree that any such statements as the hon. gentleman has quoted can be regarded as binding on the House until the matter is properly submitted to them and discussed. It does appear to me that the late Minister of Justice was under a very grave misconception as to the value of this invention when he agreed to pay any such sum, or promised, which was all he could do, to recommend it to Parliament. All such declarations made by the Government are subject to revision here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course, that is why it is here now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman tells us we are bound to pay it, and that is where I take issue with him. I do not consider myself bound in honour by a casual statement made by any or all the hon. gentlemen as to what the cost of a particular invention may be. I will consider that when a sum of money is brought down in the shape of a distinct vote. I entirely repudiate the idea that because such a statement may have been made at three o'clock in the morning when everybody was asleep, or half asleep, and impatient to get away, and may not have been heard by more than the hon. gentleman, and two or three of his colleagues——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman himself was awake, because I see he spoke before and after this item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Possibly I may have been, but certainly I did not understand that we were to be asked to pay

$2,500 for any such a thing. I supposed it was for some rather intricate invention having reference to the ballot box, not to the mere slip that was placed in the box.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat must remember that the whole scheme of this ballot was brought down in a Bill which was submitted to every memebr of the House; so that the hon. gentleman must have had the Bill and must have seen that the change which it was sought to make was not in the machinery of the ballot box, but in the ballot papers. The amount of money which was submitted by the leader of the House at that time was also disclosed to the House. Under the circumstances it seems to me the hon. gentleman must recollect that the Bill was submitted to the House, and the form of the ballot was part ad parcel of that Bill, as well as the amount of money which the Government was supposed to pay for it. Although hon. gentlemen have mentioned that one judgment has been rendered indicating that the improvement might not be as considerable as was expected, I say that one judgment would not warrant a change in the legislation on which now controls this matter. The whole thing was disclosed to the House at that time, and the fact that the sum of money needed was disclosed by Sir John Thompson, shows that the Bill was fully discussed and examined by every honest gentleman. It seems to me that under these circumstances we might allow this item to pass.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe this mater was brought up on 20th July, and the House rose on the 23rd; in other words, it was brought up at a time when everything was being rushed through at a rate infinitely greater than railway speed, and when there was no opportunity to discuss any of these details properly. I do not see that I took part in the discussion, nor that I was present in that committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We sometimes try to get things through when the hon. gentleman is asleep.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We must take care that in Committee of Supply we do not recognize any of these implied promises. The money has not been paid, I presume.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not in Committee of Supply, that was in Committee on the Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but the point is this, that in Committee of Supply we are not bound, I think, to recognize any statement of this kind. What the Minister pledged himself to, I think, was to recommend the payment of that sum to Parliament. So far, I am with the Minister of Justice; but I do not think it was quite proper to say that the Opposition should be held as concurring in any statement of that kind until we have had an opportunity of discussing it properly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think there is not much difference between us. We do not say that until this vote is passed we are bound to pay one dollar, and Mr. Durocher could not recover a sixpence without the sanction of Parliament. All we do say is that we came to you with the Bill; we told you we were going to adopt a certain form of ballot, and we said that if this section was proclaimed according to the provision of that Bill, we had agreed to pay the sum of $2,500 for the use of it. Now, then, it is only to strengthen the claim for the $2,500 that we mention the fact that Parliament raised no objection to that Bill passing in that form. But having taken power to proclaim a clause in the Bill, and having said that we as a Government intended to pay the money if we proclaimed it, subject, of course, to an appropriation being made by Parliament, then I say that when we come the next session for the money, the House is morally bound to pay it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I cannot admit it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, in all common fairness, bound to pay that amount. We submit that at any rate the committee has the facts.

Mr. FRASER. I am bound to agree with the last statement of the Minister of Justice. I can understand that the Act, having been discussed and agreed upon, we are now not in a position to say that we will not pay the amount in question. There is, however, another point to which I wish to draw attention. The Act should be changed so that the mark must be made within the circular disk. If the Act is worth adopting, it should be made specific. This is necessary, I think, in view of the judgment given in the province of Quebec, which I hold is not correct. This Act should also be educative in its effects and be so framed that the people will rapidly learn its mode of operation. One of the troubles with the old Act was that it took some time for the people to learn its provisions. If the Act was amended so that the mark must be made only in one place, members of Parliament and the agents of the different parties would see that the people understood it; and once they understood it there would be no such difficulty as now prevails. I know a little about this matter in connection with the election in Antigonish, for I know how it worked there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It worked very well.

Mr. FRASER. Not only because the electors understood how they ought to vote, as far as principles were concerned, but also so far as the ballot was concerned. There would be much less trouble if the Act was made imperative, although I can see some difficulties that might arise.

Mr. FLINT. Is this a final payment ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, in full of all claims.

Mr. RIDER. Is this invention a patentable one ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. RIDER. If so, where does the method of voting differ from the old voting, for the voter places his cross opposite the name, as before ? It seems to be a matter of changing white to black, or black to white. I should like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to whether this is really a patentable invention. If not, the committee should not vote $2,500 for an article that is not patentable.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am afraid my opinion on such a question is not worth very much. The patent was issued on the novelty of the idea, that being much considered worthy of a patent, and I suppose there is the best warrant for granting a patent in the fact that no sooner had the patentee obtained his letters than the Parliament of this country unanimously incorporated the idea in an Act of Parliament. The idea was that this white disk would attract particular attention : and I considered if there is any way in which you can appeal to the smallest particle of intelligence possessed by any voter, it is by this form of ballot. It was intended to change the old law, but it was hoped that the disk with the instructions would point out to the voter the limits to which he would be safe in putting his cross. That was the idea, and the very simplicity of a suggestion is often reason for commending the idea to the Department of Agriculture in considering the inventive genius of an applicant for letters patent.

Mr. RIDER. The method of voting under this system is the same as under the old. There is no new idea embodied in the invention—it is merely a matter of printers' ink, the position of the cross requiring to be made within the disc. I fail to see where there is any patentable idea, and if not, surely the Minister of Justice will not say that the Committee are bound to purchase it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no question about that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As the member who took objection to this item, I desire to say that I was not aware at the time the Act was introduced that any amount was stated as one which would be expected to be voted. While I will not admit that the House was bound by that statement, at the same time I must agree to this extent that the House, having been made aware that if it adopted this invention a certain amount would be expected to be paid, that promise should, in all fairness, be kept. This shows that the House was very careless in placing this power in the hands of the Government. I believe, as do many members of the committee, that the suggestion is really not worth anything like the amount asked ; but, under the circumstances, that amount having been mentioned and the Government having been entrusted with the duty of exercising discretion in the matter, I for one will be willing to abide by the decision.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The immense value of having a ballot paper which would afford the least possible opportunity for making mistakes is obvious, and no doubt it weighed with the House in adopting this method now under consideration. The judgment given in the province of Quebec shows that in the opinion of the judge the ballot paper was valueless. I call the attention of the hon. member for Guysboro' to the fact that nearly a month ago I introduced a Bill, which is now waiting its second reading, having for its object the carrying out of the idea of adopting the ballot paper and providing explicitly that the ballot must be marked within the disc. Judging from the Order paper, I think I shall be obliged to ask the Minister of Justice to take charge of the Bill, as private Bills will have little chance of getting through this session. We cannot go to another election with such a judgment as now stands recorded in the province of Quebec, the effect of which is that, although we adopted the new ballot paper with a disc on it, the ballot can be marked within the square where the name is as well as within the disc where it is intended to be placed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a case recently decided where with respect to certain patterns made with paper it was decided that they might be matters for copyright, could not be matters for patent. I think the Minister will find that the rule in a case recorded in 1894, and that this rule is applicable to this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not under our Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that this is merely a change from a square to a circle, and I cannot see how the Commissioner of Patents ever gave it a patent. We should have some explanation from him as to why he patented this, before we vote

this large sum of $2,500 to use it. I cannot see that the House is committed to this vote on the argument presented by the Minister of Justice. The Government assumed the responsibility of contracting a debt, and the House has a perfect right to say now whether it shall vote this money or not. We are at liberty to criticise this ballot and the payment for it. In my opinion it is an absurd invention and there is no genius at all displayed in it.

To pay the Hon. Mr. Sullivan the amount absence through illness in the session of 1894 ..... $152

Mr. McMULLEN. I question the propriety of introducing this system. This I presume is to enable Senator Sullivan to receive pay while he was at home, and if you commence to do this in one case you will have to extend it to others, and after a while you will have one-half the Senators remaining at home.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But they will have to be sick.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, they may be sick, and they will claim their pay on the same grounds as Senator Sullivan claims it. The Senators should be made to comply with the Act, and if they are not able to, we should not pay them.

Mr. DENISON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is quite correct about this item. For instance, Sir David McPherson is now away in Europe for the benefit of his health, and if this is a proper vote Sir David might very well claim for the whole session, less the days he has missed. I think it is a bad precedent.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think that we should begin this system.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We began it long ago.

Mr. FRASER. There is the case of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) who is suffering from rheumatism and has had to go home. Should he not be paid as well as Senator Sullivan.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have done it several times for members of Parliament.

Mr. FRASER. We have done it but seldom. There is an absurd rule that if a man happens to be within a certain number of miles from Ottawa and should be sick, he gets his indemnity, but if he has to go home to be nursed he cannot be paid. That is absurd on the face of it. This, in my opinion, should be done only in very special cases, and only in such cases, as that a Senator or a member of Parliament might feel very much in need of the money. I do not think that this should be a general rule. If a member is returned to Parliament, or if a man is appointed to the Senate, he must expect to be sick, and he must accept the condition as a matter of course. However, there might be one thing said in favour of granting this money, and that is, that the Government is treating the country very well so far as the Senate is concerned; because it has not filled ten vacancies, and so it has saved $10,000 a year and travelling expenses. Yet there is another view perhaps. Perhaps this money should be voted to active Senators who do the work of the sick Senators and of those who are not appointed. I have the very highest respect for the Senator in question, and I am not speaking because it happens to be that hon. gentleman, but I think we should have a general rule about this matter. I venture to say that there were a number of members and Senators sick last year, and who if this principle is maintained, should be paid their indemnity. There should be no invidious distinctions made in this matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The case of Senator Sullivan is one that I think would come under the head of a special case. The hon. gentleman took so seriously ill in Ottawa, that I understand his life was despaired of, and he had to be sent back to his family. Had he remained in Ottawa without that care and attention which he received at home, this vote would probably not have caused any discussion in the House. On more than one occasion this rule has been applied to members of Parliament and also to Senators, and under the circumstances, I can see no reason why the item should not be voted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you should add to the item " the said Senator having got sick through staying at Ottawa."

Mr. McMULLEN. If you introduce this system you will find that a great many Senators and members of Parliament, after they come to Ottawa, will get sick, and be obliged to return to the tender care of their families. The result will be that claim after claim of this kind will be made. Now, I would like to ask the Government on what principle they will decline to acknowledge a claim on the part of Senator Macpherson, who is obliged to be in the south of France for the benefit of his health. And there may be many other cases of the same kind. By making the grant, the Government are only inserting the thin edge of the wedge, which is going to bring a general demand from senators who will return to the bosom of their families instead of remaining here the whole session. I maintain that the law regulating the attendance of members and senators should not be violated, or else it should be amended in the direction my hon. friend suggests, so that all may be treated alike.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope I may be pardoned if I say a word or two in reference to this matter. The law is not being violated, as the hon. gentleman suggests. Under the

law Mr. Sullivan could not be paid the sum of $152, and that is the reason, I presume, why the Government are now asking Parliament to grant it. Generally speaking, I think it is important that the law should be observed; but in my long experience in Parliament I have known some instances—not very many, it is true, and therefore the evil cannot be quite so great as hon. members have depicted it to be—in which members who have been absent from their duties through illness have had voted to them by Parliament the balance of their indemnity which had been deducted from them. I know nothing of the special circumstances connected with this case; but I assume them to be what the hon. Postmaster General has stated, that Mr. Sullivan, having been taken ill in Ottawa, would have been entitled to his pay if he had remained here; but finding it more convenient to go to his home, he remained away during nineteen sitting days of the session, and application was made by some person on his behalf that he should be recouped this sum of money. I say that very few cases have occurred during my time in Parliament, and therefore this case, which involves a small sum of money, is not likely to give rise to any abuse.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the Speaker has given the best reason why this vote should not pass. The hon. gentleman tells us that according to law this hon. gentleman is not entitled to this money. If you consider that the circumstances are such as entitle him to receive this money, then, I say, alter the law, and put us all on an even footing. But it is most invidious and highly improper, in my opinion, to ask the House to vote money in these individual cases contrary to the law. The law lays down that a man is entitled to indemnity under certain circumstances, and not otherwise, and it is exceedingly invidious to ask us to vote money when the facts are not and cannot be before us.

Mr. SPEAKER. One instance that occurred in recent years was that of the late hon. member for East Hastings, Mr. Burdett, who was voted the full amount of his indemnity because of his illness.

Mr. FRASER. After he died?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, not after he died. He was absent during the greater part of the session of 1891, and my impression is that the cheque was sent to him before the session was over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We may have done wrong before and set a bad precedent, but there is no reason why we should follow it. The amount may be small, but I decline to discuss either the amount or the gentleman in question. It is the principle involved that I am dealing with, and if you adopt a new principle now, you cannot, in justice, ignore any other similar case that occurs. If I am detained at my home in Charlottetown for a similar reason, I can demand my indemnity. In this way you make the indemnity a perfect burlesque. What is the principle of the indemnity? It is this: We grant it because while a member is in Ottawa he has to incur expenses that he would not incur at home; but here you are setting a precedent the result of which must necessarily result in similar demands on behalf of other members of the House and the Senate, who may be detained at home because they do not feel very well. How are we to decide how well or how ill a man may be? We cannot ascertain the fact: we have simply to accept the statement of somebody who says he has been informed, just as the Postmaster General states in this case that he has been informed. I think we are adopting a thoroughly evil principle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingston) had his leg broken while on his way to Ottawa, which necessitated his being confined to his house for several weeks, and the Government refused to recognize his claim to indemnity for that time. In that case, the fact did not depend on the opinion of the Postmaster General or any one else; it was well known; and I would like to know from the Government how they can reconcile their granting the one claim and refusing the other.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before expressing an opinion as to how I could reconcile the two cases, I would like to know the facts. I am not aware that the indemnity was ever refused to the hon. member whose name my hon. friend has just mentioned. I am not sure whether he applied for the indemnity, but if the hon. gentleman was laid up from a serious accident and applied for the indemnity, I see no reason why it should not be granted to him as well as to Dr. Sullivan. I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman that to save time, we should allow the item to stand until the Minister of Finance, who happens to be away to-night, but who is very seldom absent from his place, is present to give the details.

To meet the expenses for promoting the dairy interests of Canada by placing fresh made creamery butter on the British market without deterioration, for securing recognition of its quality, in that market $3,000

Mr. McMILLAN. There was a resolution passed by the Select Committee on Agriculture and Colonization last session. I seconded that resolution, and have been blamed for being one of the causes of the Government purchasing butter and exporting it to the old country. It is true that I did second the resolution, which was as follows:—

Moved by Mr. McLennan, seconded by Mr. McMillan, "That this Committee are of opinion

from evidence placed before them, that the creamery butter manufactured in Canada and sent to the English markets, suffer from an unfounded prejudice which has hitherto affected, materially the prices obtained, and consequently with the increase that this country should be making from year to year, in this important article of our dairy product, and therefore recommend that the Government will take such steps as will place our butter on the markets, in fair competition with all other butter imported into that country."—Carried.

I had no intention that the Government should take butter and ship it on their own account for the simple reason that I knew that in 1872-73, when they took butter, we were suffering in the English market from the butter that went from Canada. I knew from interviews I had in the old country that our butter only brought 16½ cents there at the time when creamery butter was bringing 20 cents. I knew from my visit to the old country that no individual trader can injure the credit of his country so much as when he ships his stuff under the wing, or in the name of the Government. Had I expected that the Government was going to purchase butter, I would never have seconded that resolution. My view was that the Government would take steps to have refrigerators fitted up in steamships, or to have ships fitted up in the same manner as they are fitted for bringing butter from Australia to Great Britain. I have always been opposed to a Government purchasing any goods and putting them on the market. We have men in the trade who are well posted and who know when to put their goods on the market, and if a bad article is put on the market by them, it does not injure the country to the same extent as when shipped by the Government. The Government should not take any steps for the purchasing and placing on the market of any article of farm produce. Denmark has never done anything of the kind, but has set us a noble example. The Danish Government give prizes for the best articles exhibited, and are very careful not to give the opportunity to manufacture specially for exhibits. With this view, they only give notice of the exhibition a week or two before it is held, so that there is no opportunity to prepare specially for it any small quantities of butter. I am decidedly opposed to this action of the Government, and I have always opposed it. I believe that we have men steadily engaged in the trade who are better capable of placing goods on the market than is the Government. I speak with a knowledge of what we suffered in 1872-73, because I interviewed some of the commission men in the old country myself, and both from these men and from the report submitted in June, 1873, it was evident that our butter was put on the market in very bad condition indeed. A question was put the other day with respect to the quantity of butter sold. We were told that a certain number of packages had been taken over—I think 915 packages—but we were not told what was the weight of a package. I would ask now what was the weight of the package that the Government took over?

Mr. SPROULE. I have some recollection of the discussion which took place in committee, and I do not think that any course was indicated for the Government to take in placing Canadian butter upon the English market. The hon. gentleman says that our traders are quite capable of putting butter on the market just as well as the Government. How then has it happened that although they have been putting our butter on the English market for years, it has not gained the reputation there it should have. What were the instructions from the committee? They were that the Government be authorized to take such steps as they thought best to put Canadian butter on the market from time to time in proper condition. The manner of doing this was not indicated. I understood most distinctly that the Minister of Agriculture and the dairy commissioner were to exercise their own judgment as to the manner in which the butter should be placed on the market, provided it got there in good condition. I can see a great deal of wisdom in the Government overseeing the work. Why? They can select experts for the examination of the butter, so that nothing except the finest quality would be taken across. If a private individual were making the shipments on his own account, his object would be to sell his goods no matter what the quality might be; but the Government, whose only object is to obtain a good reputation for Canadian butter, will see that only the best quality is put on the English market. Every package sent over is examined carefully by an expert and put on the market when fresh. That plan must ultimately bring about a great deal of good to the Canadian products. Why do we suffer to-day on account of the small sales of our butter? Because the butter is held sometimes by the manufacturers but more frequently by the farmers for such long periods that, by the time it reaches the English markets, it is not the class of butter that they want, and it will not command the figures paid for Danish butter or for butter that is sent in fresh from other countries. There are certain times when people say it does not pay to send our butter, that is during the warm weather. But that is because we have no cold storage or refrigerator cars. But even if the Government were to provide both, very often the merchant would not send his butter to the English market, at this season, because of the low price ruling at that time. But I contend that our butter should be on the English market, in those months as well as in any other. I think it would be better if a little money was used to buy the best quality of butter and send it fresh from

week to week during the summer as well as the winter. If this were done with reasonable care, we should soon enjoy a reputation for butter equal to that of any other country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government have no apology to make for the course they have adopted in connection with this matter. The House, I am sure, is well seized of the importance of cultivating and improving the butter interest of Canada. I need not now call the attention of the House to the fact that one of the most important items of export at this time is cheese. The export of cheese from this country has risen from six and a quarter millions of a few years ago to no less than $15.000,000 last year.

Mr. SCRIVER. Without any help from the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is quite wrong in that, because this has been achieved with the help not only of this Government alone but of the provincial governments as well, who, in conjunction with this Government, have employed experts for the purpose of assisting the cheese industry all over the country. Now, with regard to the cheese industry, we have reached the point when the cheese export of Canada actually represents half the total imports into the British market; and we are increasing our exports so rapidly that we have become our own competitors in that market. Consequently we had better look to a new dairy product which, at the present time we export to a very limited extent indeed. The importation of butter into Britain represents, I believe, something like $60,000,000 a year. At the present time that market is monopolized almost entirely by France, Denmark, Australia and Sweden, while Canada is sending only about 1 per cent of the total importation into the British market. What is the reason? The reason is that while the butter made in the private dairies in Canada is, to a large extent, excellent butter, it does not possess the uniformity necessary to gain a foothold in so conservative a market as that of Great Britain, nor have we had the means of putting it upon the British market in good condition. We have secured our cheese market and have given our cheese an excellent reputation by sending it out in small samples at the Colonial Exhibition, by distributing it among many dealers in Great Britain and by putting it prominently before the world at the World's Fair; and we have held our place and maintained the price of our goods notwithstanding the keen competition that has existed during the past year. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that the Government are justified in its action with regard to the butter industry by the history of other countries. My hon. friend has referred to Denmark as a country that has held its own in the market while it has done nothing for the purpose of encouraging the industry. My information as to Denmark is very different from that of my hon. friend. I understand that Denmark took great pains, by appointing a commission of experts, to assist in the development of the industry, and employed a commissioner to remain in Great Britain for the purpose of placing Danish butter upon the English market. But we do not need to go to Denmark for a precedent in this regard. The Australian colonies are, at the present time, supplying 8 or 10 per cent of the total importation of butter into the British market. What has enabled them to do that? A few years ago Great Britain was importing from Australia only a very few thousand dollars worth of butter. But the Australian colonies adopted a policy of encouraging in every possible way the export of butter to Great Britain. They gave a bonus and this House will probably be surprised to know that that bonus was 2 cents per pound if the butter brought 16 cents in the English market, and up to 6 cents per pound if it brought 24 cents per pound. In one year—I think the dairy commissioner will bear me out—no less than $254,000 was paid by Australia as bonus upon butter shipped to Great Britain. And, notwithstanding the attack upon the system that has been made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), we find that we have to compete in Great Britain with the finest butter from the Australian colonies and from other countries that have spent large sums of money in promoting shipments and the sale of butter in Great Britain. Now as to the results. It was stated that very little money would be lost in this experiment. The butter was purchased from Canadian creameries at 20 cents per pound. All of it that passed inspection at Montreal was sent to the markets of Europe, and what was not deemed not quite up to the standard for shipment to Europe was sold at Montreal at 21 cents per pound. When the two sides of the account are balanced, it will be found that we have lost only a small sum in doing this.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is it not 4 cents per pound?

Mr. MONTAGUE. There were 915 packages of 56 pounds each, and after meeting all the expenses of freight, inspection and everything else, the whole item asked for is only $3,000, which will more than cover the expense. But the question for this House to consider is this—Have we met the requirements and requests of the dairy interests of Canada, and, in the second place have we done any good to the industry on the British market. I have no hesitation in answering these questions in the affirmative. Were my hon. friend from Huron and the other gentleman opposed to the carrying out of this experiment aware that the Government were only following out. not only the

suggestion of the committee on Agriculture, but also the suggestions made by the various dairy and creamery associations throughout the province of Ontario with regard to this very same subject. My hon. friend, I am sure, does not doubt me, otherwise I could read the resolutions carried at the Central Farmer's Institute, and the Creameries Association, and at the last meeting of the Farmer's Institute, held on 5th March, at Finch, Ontario, all of which asked the Government to pursue this course or complimented them upon the course which had been pursued with regard to this industry. Now, as regards what has been the effect, the shippers in Montreal, have to-day more inquiries for Canadian butter than they have had before in the history of the industry for a great number of years. Messrs. Clements & Son, of Manchester, have written, with regard to this very subject:

> We have received delivery of 215 packages of butter ex "Ottoman." Most of this shipment is fresher than last, and altogether superior, which proves to us that if care is taken with details at your end, and the goods shipped absolutely as soon as made, you need not fear what quantity you send. They will certainly suit this market better than Australian; but, of course, it will take some time to get them known * * We have had several of the best buyers in Lancashire examining them, and the general opinion is you could run the Danes very hard in a year or so.

I think, Sir, that that statement of facts from a leading butter dealer in the city of Manchester, is a compliment to the Government as to the course it has pursued in this matter.

Mr. CASEY. What did it sell for this last fall?

Mr. MONTAGUE. From 90 shillings to 70 shillings for 112 pounds, that is speaking generally, was the price secured in Great Britain for these shipments. I have not the exact data by me, because the last returns have not been received. I can only say that I am somewhat surprised that the attacks upon this vote should come from a farmer. It appears to me that my hon. friend has not exhibited that great kindness for the farmers' interests that he has expressed sometimes in this House. Now, as to the future. The Government do not intend to drop the dairying industry; they intend to encourage it in every possible way. They intend to continue the services of the Dairy Commissioner and his staff, who are pushing forward education in regard to this matter of better methods of making and shipping dairy products. They have made a start in the British market with this butter, and what they intend to do in the future is to supply cold storage for the purpose of placing Canadian butter in the best possible condition upon the British market. I may say more to the hon. gentleman, although the subject will come up again on the main Estimates, that the Department of Agriculture have already made arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and are now making arrangements with the Intercolonial Railway, for the purpose of providing cold storage from the creameries to the port of Montreal. But first let me add that, in purchasing this creamery butter during the past year, the Government are not only establishing a market for creamery butter in Great Britain, but they were relieving the congested markets in Canadian cities, and were consequently improving the price as well of the dairy butter which is produced by the farmers throughout the country. Not only have the Government made arrangements with the railways mentioned, but they are also making arrangements for inspection at Montreal; and they have made arrangements with the steamship companies for providing cold storage across the Atlantic. They have also made arrangements for cold storage in three ports of Great Britain, London, Liverpool and Glasgow. The purpose of the Government is to provide opportunities of cold storage and to get the railways to put on refrigerator cars. The creameries which export this butter—because in future the Government do not intend to buy butter——

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE.—Will my hon. friend allow me to continue. Having started a market in Great Britain by purchasing this butter and placing it there, and, as I have shown by the extract, given it a character in Great Britain, the creameries which export the butter, will be required to pay the ordinary rates of freight, as well as the ordinary rates of storage at different points. But the Government, out of the vote which is asked for, will pay the extra expense of the cold storage upon the cars, as well as at storage points. I think that covers pretty well the question of what the Government intend to do. As to the transportation across the Atlantic, they will have, I think, a semi-monthly service, beginning with the third week in June, and continuing all through the season. They are making arrangements with the Allan Line by which they, the Government, are to fit up boats themselves at Montreal, affording excellent accommodation. This will be done out of the vote asked for in the main Estimates. Nine boats are being enlarged for that purpose, and the only expense to the Government will be the extra expense for cold storage, the freight being paid for by those who have shipped the butter. As I have said, we do not continue to purchase the butter, but do provide cold storage for the purpose of putting that butter in the very best possible shape upon the British market. The vote asked for in the main Estimates will supply facilities for putting upon the British market 2,000,000 pounds of Canadian butter during the season. If hon. gentlemen will think over the matter carefully they will see that the Government is pursuing a very wise and helpful course towards the

Canadian butter industry, which has helped us in times when other products were low, and the growth of which can only redound to the advantage and prosperity of the Canadian farmer.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Secretary of State started out by telling us what was done in other countries. He has evidently got a little idea of what has been done, for instance, in the Australian colonies, but he is quite incorrect in his statements. He said that 2 cents per pound was paid by the Australian colonies as a bounty on butter that brought 16 cents per pound in the British market, and that there was 6 cents per pound paid on butter that brought 24 cents. Now, my hon. friend is not correct. It is 2 pence a pound paid on butter that brings over 9 pence per pound sterling in the English market; and it is 3 pence per pound that is paid on butter that brings over a shilling in the Australian market.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The dairy commissioner tells me that my figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. I take my statement from the reports of the Australian colonies themselves, and I care not either for the Secretary of State or his commissioner. He may have valued it at 6 cents, but it is 3 pence a pound on butter that brings over a shilling in the English market. Now, with regard to the quantity that is being sent out, he asks for a vote of $3,000 to cover the expenses of shipping 915 packages. Now, count that up, and it comes within a small fraction of 6 cents per pound. I commend the Government for providing cold storage, I am glad to know they are encouraging the butter industry. Anything at all that will help the poor farmers, will certainly receive encouragement from this side of the House. I presume that it is in the face of an approaching election that the Government are beginning to show their sympathy for the farmer, and to offer to provide cold storage, and to spend money in finding a market for their butter. The Government have done very little before this for the farmers. With regard to the cheese industry, the farmers are under no obligation whatever to the National Policy for the position that industry occupies in the English market. There is not an intelligent farmer in this Dominion who will admit that the National Policy has done anything for the cheese industry.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was not saying that the National Policy was concerned in the matter; I said that encouragement had been given, not only by this Government, but by other governments, in the way of teaching better methods of dairying and in lending their assistance in that direction.

Mr. McMULLEN. The methods of manufacturing cheese was fairly well understood long before there was any experimental farm, or anything done by the Government here. The Ontario Government took a very active part many years ago in this direction, long before the Dominion Government did any thing at all. They sent out lecturers from place to place, who gave instructions to the people in the best methods of making cheese. The Dominion Government were late in entering the field to do anything for the cheese industry, and they are late in entering the field in regard to the butter industry. I agree that it is desirable we should encourage the export of butter in every possible way. We know that in the English market there is a larger field for butter than for cheese. I think we only exported something like $2,500,000 worth of butter last year, and I think Denmark sent $20,000,000 worth to the English market. It is desirable we should encourage this industry, and I hope the introduction of cold storage will tend in that direction; but I claim it would be much better to follow the Australian system, by which the Government would either grant a bonus to those who export butter and obtain a certain price for it, or supply the cold storage. I hope, at all events, the farmers will obtain some benefit, and that the business will increase.

Mr. CASEY. I should like to know if the provision for cold storage is limited to butter, or applies to fruits and other farm products. I congratulate the Government on one resolution to which they have come—they have gone out of the grocery business, out of the business of advancing money on butter, taking the risk as to what they could obtain for it. According to the statement made by the hon. Secretary of State to a question put by the hon. member for Stanstead, the prices realized on the butter purchased by the Government, on which they advanced 20 cents per pound, varied from 16 4-100 cents to 16 3-10 cents per pound, as shown by the returns up to the 14th of last month. The Government realized less by from 3 2-3 cents to 4 cents per pound than the amount advanced to the farmers. When this plan was proposed, it was held out to the farmers that they would probably realize on this butter something like 24 or 25 cents per pound, that the imprint of the Government would do much to increase the price in England, that the careful selection by experts, and its shipment in the best possible condition, which the Secretary of State said had been attended to, would cause it to bring much larger prices than those ordinarily obtained. The absurd failure of the whole scheme is proven by the fact that the selected butter has not realized to the seller in Montreal as much as creamery butter has averaged in the Canadian market. The butter selected by experts, and sent in the best possible condition to England, has not realized, by several cents, as much as creamery butter under ordinary circum-

stances in the Canadian market. The hon. Minister himself has stated that butter which they rejected as not fit to send to England realizied 21 cents in Montreal. I am afraid he is mistaken ; but 5 cents per pound more was obtained according to his statement for inferior butter sold in Montreal than was obtained for selected butter shipped to England.

Either the Government were not sufficiently careful or the experts were not sufficiently careful. The whole scheme was an attempt on the part of those not in the business to interfere with the natural course of business and to take out of the hands of those who understood the business a particular branch of trade, and place it in the hands of amateurs who know nothing about its practical side. I am very glad for all these reasons that the Government have seen fit to give up their butter shop business. The reason of the adoption of the policy was so very evident that it is hardly necessary to explain it. When the policy was initiated it was intended to have the elections brought on before this date. It was thought that it would be good policy for the Government to go to the farmers and tell them that the cheese business which had been encouraged, was somewhat overdone, and that butter was languishing, and so the Government were going to strengthen the price of butter and do a good deal for the farmers. That would have been a very nice manoeuvre if the elections had come on at the time originally intended. But in this, as in other cases, the Government's prophecies were not fulfilled. The elections were not brought on, and so we are now, unfortunately for the Government, able to discuss the results of this catch-penny enterprises before they take place.

The Secretary of State laid great stress on the cheese industry. He pointed out that it had been one of the largest lines of export for many years back. I could go further than he did, because our cheese industry, perhaps more than any other, enabled Canada to pull through a period of depression and hard times and make up to the farmers a portion of the loss inflicted by heavy taxation which this Government has imposed upon them. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the farmers have been heavily taxed. If he were not, he would not endeavour to make it appear that the Government would relieve him on his butter. Not one hon. gentleman opposite paid the farmers the compliment that they are men of ordinary common sense.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have positive evidence of it during the last four elections.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman thinks the National Policy was the cause of victories at the last four general elections, he is much mistaken. The causes that led to the return of the Government have been pointed out time and time again, and certainly they have not been due to the satisfaction felt by the farmers with the National Policy.

The cheese industry has been one of the greatest supports of Canada in years gone by, and it has largely flourished on account of the assistance given by the Governments of Ontario and Quebec before the Dominion Government had anything whatever to do with it. The assistance given by the provincial governments took the form of furnishing information. They taught the people how to make cheese, prepare it, and pack it for the English market. The rest of the cheese interest is distinct from the industry of making cheese, and depends on the business capacity of those engaged in the trade. They have shown themselves worthy of the duties resting on them, and they have built up a large and highly profitable trade. But now, the Minister says, that is a warrant for us to begin the butter dealing business, and if that fails, as it is admitted to have utterly failed, it justifies us in giving a bonus on the export of butter if not in the shape of cash payment, in the shape of payment for cold storage. Did they ever pay for cold storage for cheese in Canada or in the United Kingdom ? Did any Government ever send agents around to find markets for cheese ? I believe that the abstention of all Governments from interfering in the cheese business has been one cause of its great success. If it is thought that the producer of creamery butter, as distinct from the private maker of butter, is entitled to this public benefit, then the Government are in the right.

It must be understood, however, that the plan of the Government is to provide cold storage for creamery butter only, and that the butter made by the farmers' wives, some of which is just as good, cannot obtain the cold storage in a Government warehouse. That is a question for the Government to settle as between the patrons of creameries and the private makers of butter. If the Government are to have a corps of experts, why should not they select the home-made butter as well as the creamery butter. The proposal of the Government is not to favour Canadian butter generally, but only that which is made by the creameries. It is, in fact, a continuation of the whole policy of the Government, to favour the large manufacturer rather than the private producer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you opposed to the principle ?

Mr. CASEY. I am pointing out to the House what the Government propose, and I am not saying whether I am opposed to it or not. The hon. gentleman has not yet explained to the House why it is that the Government will not extend the same privi-

leges to home-made butter as they propose to extend to the creamery butter. The practice of bonussing exports is one which I do not think can be defended in the interests of any class of the community.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Ontario Government purchased butter and cheese.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman says that the Ontario Government purchased butter and cheese for export he is stating what is directly contrary to the fact. If he says they purchased it for use in their own institutions, of course he is right, because they do not starve the people there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. The Ontario Government did purchase more butter and cheese to place on the market at the time of the Colonial Exhibition, than we have purchased, and they spent more money in it.

Mr. CASEY. They did purchase butter and cheese for exhibition at the Colonial Exhibition, but that is entirely a different thing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was for the same purpose of establishing a market.

Mr. CASEY. I leave it to the House if anything more absurd has ever been stated, even by the Secretary of State. He says it is the same thing to buy butter and cheese and send it to the exhibition for the purpose of showing the products of the country, as it is to set up a butter market in Montreal, and buy butter from favoured parties and sell it at a loss of 4 cents a pound in England. Every Government buys certain products for an exhibition, and they may be sold to meet the expenses of the exhibition; but that is not keeping a butter shop, or a grease shop for an election either, which the hon. gentleman is perhaps better acquainted with.

The proposal to bonus butter (which he is not plucky enough to make, although he applauds it in the case of Australia) is simply a proposal that the whole of the population of Canada should pay for cheap butter for the people of England. It will not increase the price of butter in England, but the people of Canada will be obliged to pay a part of the price which the English consumer ought to pay for his butter. That is what a bonus to an export means. That is what it means when we give a bonus to the Masseys for exporting their goods out of Canada. If they sell their goods in Canada, they have to pay duty on their materials, but if they sell them out of Canada the duty is returned to them, and we pay for the cheap goods which are sold in Australia and the Cape of Good Hope, and all over the world. The hon. gentleman forgets to tell us that we are bonussing a line of steamboats to carry the bonussed Australian butter, to which he refers, across the Pacific and Atlantic, and to send it to England in competition with our Canadian butter. Perhaps he will tell us that that is in the interest of the farmers. The farmers are not the class of thickheads and mossbacks and wayhacks which the Government imagine them to be. They are not open to such arguments as were advanced by the Secretary of State to-night, and they can easily see into any attempt which the Government make to hoodwink them.

Mr. SMITH (South Ontario). I have listened to-night to the discussion on this item about granting the sum of $3,000 for the purpose of promoting the dairy interests of Canada, and I must confess that not one single gentleman on the opposite side of the House has had the moral courage to say that he is opposed to that grant. They have talked around it in every shape and form, but not one of them dare say he is opposed to this grant of $3,000. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the keenness of the competition in the English market, and the difficulties of placing our butter of a uniform quality on the market, have weighed with the Government in placing this vote in the Supplementary Estimates. There is a feeling growing, not only in Canada, but in different portions of Europe, that the European countries have nearly reached the maximum of their production; and it remains to be seen whether the Canadian people will be able to take advantage of the English market as they should, and whether they will be able to overtake again what they have lost. I can scarcely understand the statements made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who say that the Dominion Government has done nothing to promote the cheese industry. It is true, in Ontario the farmer had to help himself to a great extent; but will the hon. gentleman say that in the province of Quebec, and in the maritime provinces, particularly in Prince Edward Island, the Government have done nothing to help this industry? Why, to-day there are about 28 cheese factories and two creameries at work in Prince Edward Island, and it is stated that the new system, as compared with the old, will make a difference of $50,000 to the farmers of that province, which would make up many times over the $3,000 that is asked for in the Estimates. Before I sit down I want to congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on becoming protectionists. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated that he was not altogether in favour of cold storage, and would rather grant a bonus to the Canadian butter producer. I am a protectionist, and I do not care whether protection is given in the shape of cold storage or duty or bounty, so long as it is given. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have had a conclave lately, and seem to have decided that they must do something in the interests of the Canadian farmers, for they sent out a circular asking them what

their opinion was of protection for Canadian farmers. That question has been tested time and again, and the farmers have decided that they want protection ; and if there is one thing more than another for which this Government should be supported, it is because they have given to the farmers of Canada, from time to time, the protection they demanded.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am the individual who has been blamed for sending out circulars to the farmers ; but I want to say that no circular was ever sent out by me or with my consent to any of the farmers of Ontario. If any one else did it, I have nothing to do with that ; I want that to be understood. Now, with respect to the creamery associations asking for Government aid for the butter industry, the Western Creamery Association met at Chelsey, and Mr. Wart brought in a resolution asking the Government to grant cold storage ; but Mr. Wart told me that that resolution was not adopted. It is true that at the Central Farmers' Institute at Toronto, a resolution was brought in, in the dying moments of the meeting, when there was not time to discuss it. I was present and would have said something if I had had the privilege, but I was not a member of the institute. What I said before I say still, that I think the Government should assist in providing refrigerators and cold storage ; I am not opposed to that. We are told that the best butter only should be sent to Europe ; but the best butter is not sent at the present time, because part of the butter sent only brings 76s. per cwt., while part has brought 90s. per cwt. This shows that inferior butter is sent, and I fear that as much injury will be done to the reputation of Canadian butter in the English market in 1895 as was done in 1893. I am opposed to the Government becoming a purchaser of any commodity and putting it on the market. Now, it is stated that the European countries have reached their limit in the production of butter. Here is a statement from the "Fortnightly Review," showing that whereas in 1889 the value of butter exported from Denmark to England was £3,742,869, in 1894, it had increased to £5,843,954. The same authority says :

> It is erroneous to imagine that Danish butter-making is a State business. The State has nothing whatever to do with it, beyond arranging competitions and awarding prizes for excellence. These competitions are usually arranged at twelve hours' notice, so that the competitors are obliged to send in any butter they happen to have ready, instead of an extra good pound or two made specially for the exhibition with great care.

I hold that the Canadian Government ought to encourage butter making in Canada in the manner in which it has been encouraged in Denmark. It has been stated that the Ontario Government purchased butter and cheese. They did not purchase it to put it on the market, but to exhibit it in competition with the products of other British colonies at the Colonial Exhibition. I was present at that exhibition myself, and I felt proud of the exhibit of butter and cheese from Ontario which I saw there. That is a very different thing from purchasing butter and cheese and putting it on the market for sale. It is very strange that some of the dealers in Montreal sold their butter to the Government when 21 cents a pound could be realized for it. I would like to know if Mr. Hobson sold his butter to the Government for 20 cents a pound, or did he get an extra price for it ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not one cent in any case was advanced above 20 cents.

Mr. McMILLAN. Then Mr. Hobson was certainly a very stupid individual if he sold his butter for 20 cents a pound when inferior butter for shipment to England was bringing 21 cents. I say it advisedly that the farmers of Ontario are not in favour of the Government purchasing butter. They are certainly in favour of the Government doing what they can fairly do to place the butter industry upon a good footing, by assisting in placing butter on the British market in as good condition as the Australian butter, which is all brought in vessels having refrigerators. Danish butter is not shipped in refrigerators, because it does not come so great a distance and does not require them. If the Government do purchase butter, they should purchase from private individuals as well as from creameries, so long as it reaches the required standard of excellence. It is not fair to crush out private enterprise when we know that there are well-trained individuals who produce an article that will sell anywhere as well as creamery butter. Just as good butter can be produced by private individuals who have the modern appliances and who make it on scientific principles. Now, with regard to cheese, the province of Ontario engaged an expert, and sent him through the province to assist in perfecting our cheese making. Down to that time we had been at a disadvantage. But Prof. Arnold, who went through western Ontario, came to the factory of which I was at the time president, and remained there the day. The benefit we derived from his visit was very great indeed. That was the only assistance that the cheese industry received from the government of Ontario. But it was a great benefit. It placed all the factories that worked under his instructions in such a position that no further complaint was heard. The cheese industry in Ontario was established on a sound foundation before the Dominion Experimental Farm was started at all. I do not say that the Government are not benefiting the outlying provinces by means of this experimental farm system and I do not say that it is not of benefit to the farmers who

follow the instruction given. We go to the expense of sending travelling dairies, and the farmers benefit by the example set them in manipulating the cream and make good butter. I believe the Government are doing right in not taking any more butter, for we have men in the business who are better capable of putting it in good condition on the English market, and all they want is refrigerators provided to take it across the ocean.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). We are all very much in the dark. I should be very pleased to have a specific statement from the Secretary of Sate, who represents the Minister of Agriculture, of the actual transaction. The only official statement we have was in reply to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Rider) three weeks ago, according to which reply the limited shipment of butter was sold at a fraction over 16 cents a pound. If that transaction stands alone, it would create the impression abroad that the butter was either of inferior grade or handled under adverse circumstances.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I explained to the hon. gentleman that the returns had not been received for all the shipments which had been made, but I thought I gave to the House a very full statement as to what had been done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was a stump speech.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend must judge for himself, but I thought I was giving information to the House. I can only say that the cost of examination, inspection, freight charges and everything else will certainly come within the item now asked; and the question for the House to consider is whether the Government, in pursuing that course, have done $3,000 worth of a value to the butter interest of Canada because that is the real question. Again I am very much surprised that hon. gentlemen should pursue, with regard to this matter, the course they have pursued. Surely we ought to be all united in our desire to promote in every shape the dairy industry of the country, and there is not a gentleman on the other side who dare say that that was not the desire of the Government in taking the steps now under review. As to what the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMullen) said, I must say that the Government acted not only in accordance with the resolutions sent from the farmers' institutes but with the wish of the butter and creamery associations, who asked that financial aid be given for one year for the purpose of establishing a market as much as possible in Great Britain. As to the statement made earlier in the debate that this industry had not been helped by the Government, hon. gentlemen answered that themselves by admitting that money had been spent for the purpose of booming Canadian cheese in Great Britain, and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) also admitted that an inspector did spend one day in his factory for the purpose of giving them lessons in their industry.

Mr. McMILLAN. It was not the dairy commissioner but long before he had existence. It was the commissioner brought from the other side and paid for by the Ontario Government to go among the cheese factories of western Ontario. He came to the county of Huron, called the cheese makers together, and showed them how to manipulate the milk, from the time it came to the factory until it was converted into cheese.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend does not differ with me. I knew what he said exactly. I can only say that the Government are proud of their record with regard to the dairy industry of Canada. We are proud that we spent about $3,000 a year in Prince Edward Island since a few years ago, and that we raised the export of butter and cheese from that island from $5,000 a year to no less than $90,000 a year. According to the estimate of the farmers in that island, the sum of $50,000 more has been received for the dairy products of Prince Edward Island than would have been under the old system for the same amount of product, which the hon. member for South Huron is defending. We are adopting the same course in the North-west Territories. We have inspectors there who are instructing the people the way to prosper in the dairy industry, and I am glad that, while hon. gentlemen opposite are finding fault with the policy of the Government, the creamery associations of Manitoba have been asking the Government to assist them, and the Government besides spending small sums, passed through the House, last session a vote in that direction. And notwithstanding the harping of hon. gentlemen opposite on small technicalities, this Government will pursue a similar course to-day whenever required.

Mr. McMILLAN. How much butter was sold in Montreal?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Two hundred and forty-six packages, which were not regarded by the inspector as quite up to the standard for the British market. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that dairy butter, while it may be very excellent and command an excellent price in the Canadian market, is not sufficiently uniform in taste or colour to secure the British market and the hon. gentleman, if he knows anything about the subject, knows that the hope of Canada is to secure a large export of creamery butter and establish a uniform grade in the British market.

Mr. McMILLAN. What price did you get for the butter sold in Montreal?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Twenty-one and twenty-two and a half cents.

Mr. SCRIVER. The Secretary of State's expression of surprise that any one on this side should presume to question the propriety of the course which the Government has taken, is, under the circumstances, somewhat amusing. His own statement, made with the plausibility and eloquence which he has always at command, amply justifies those who found fault with the course taken by the Government with regard to the butter industry. That such a course was a mistaken one has been amply justified by the statement he has made himself. I do not hesitate to say that the experiment which the Government made of purchasing butter and sending it to the English market and selling it there was a huge blunder. There were very few such requests made, and his own admission, though he was wrong in his figures by 3½ cents per pound in the first place—shows that the result has been a great loss. This is one proof that it was a mistake, and a greater proof still, is his attempt to show that the result upon the butter trade has been beneficial. And what was the proof he gave us of that? A letter from one firm in Manchester—which is not our chief butter market by any means—that they had received about 200 tubs of butter which would run the Danish butter very hard. For my part, I am free to say that I was opposed to this policy on the part of the Government, in the first place, and I wondered at the time that our dairy commissioner, whose talent and judgment in regard to such matters I have often admired, should adopt such a course. For once in his life, I feel free to say, he has made a great mistake. And I would call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that the great exporters of butter in the city of Montreal are not buying for export in the face of the great experiment which the Government have made. The finest creamery butter in Montreal to-day is not being bought to any extent for export. And the prices are lamentably short of what they were for the same article last year. The finest creamery butter is now being sold in Montreal at 15 cents per pound.

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, no.

Mr. SCRIVER. I have a friend who is largely interested in the trade, one upon whose word I can depend; and he tells me that he has bought the finest creamery butter within the past week at 15 cents or 15½ cents at the outside. I congratulate the Government on the fact that they have gone out of the butter business. At all events, while I am opposed to this system of bonussing any interest in the country, if the Government could be justified in doing anything that would help the butter business of the country, it would be the system they propose to undertake of cold storage. I am in hopes that some benefits will be derived from that, but I hope this lesson which they have received in the butter business will satisfy them for all time to come.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman opposite should feel so bad that some protection is afforded to the farmers. It is really too bad, these hon. gentlemen think, that the farmers should be protected. The hon. gentleman stated that fine creamery butter is selling in Montreal at 15 cents. I will not class that statement as it should be classed, but I can speak for our own factory, and I know that we are selling at from 19 to 25 cents.

An hon. MEMBER. Look at the quotations.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The figures of actual practice are better than a table of newspaper quotations. We do not take our information on this subject from the "Witness," or the "Herald," or anything of that kind.

An hon. MEMBER. Take the "Gazette."

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, nor the "Gazette." I am speaking of what we ourselves are doing. Hon. gentlemen speak as if they were sorry that the farmers should be encouraged in any way. I am not going to approve or justify the Government in bonussing butter, but I think they should be praised for their efforts to encourage and help the farmer by the establishment of cold storage, or in any way of that kind. The particular plan adopted may be wrong, but it is right that we should help the farmer and try to do for him what is being done for all other classes. I think the farmers are more with us than they are with our friends on the other side.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Secretary of State has addressed to the House a speech not intended to afford information to the House, but a campaign speech for the purpose of telling the farmers of the country how much the Government have done for them, and what everlasting obligations they will be under to the Government for what it has accomplished on their behalf. Well, Sir, I was not a little amused with one feature of the speech of the hon. gentleman. He said: We have done very much for the farmers; we have gone into the business of buying butter, and, so the agricultural population can see how much more we are doing for them than the members of the Opposition are willing to do. But even while he was making this boastful statement to the House, he was obliged to inform the House that the business of acting as butter merchants on behalf of the whole country was so bad a business that the Government had abandoned it. That this work for which the agricultural population ought to be under ever-

lasting gratitude to the Government for was an experiment which the Government abandoned at the end of twelve months. The hon. gentleman has told us what the cheese industry owed to the Government, and said that the butter industry was likely to owe just as much to the Government in the future. So far as that is concerned, I felt inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman. What I wish to point out is that by entering the field of mercantile operations for the purchase of these articles, the Government have never conferred any advantage or benefit upon the agricultural population of this country. Why, Sir, how came these cheese manufacturing industries into Canada? Cheese-making in this sense was introduced in the west by certain parties who came from the state of New York, who had adopted the uniform and scientific method of making cheese, a knowledge of which method has extended over the whole country. The Government might assist in the educating process, but to enter upon the market and to undertake to act as guardian to the agricultural population of this country is another and very different thing. One would suppose, to hear the speech of the hon. Secretary of State, that the Government had issued a commission in lunacy to take charge of all the farms of this country, because those who have conducted them are no longer competent to manage their own business or conduct their own affairs. I deny that proposition. I say that what the agricultural population, in this respect, want to-day is to be released from the burdens the Government has imposed upon them. Give them a free field and a fair opportunity in the struggle of life with the rest of the people. That has not been done; and when the Government go into the market and bid against the grocery man who was buying butter at the village corner, and profess to promote the interests of the farmer by selling at a loss what they have bought in the English market, they were doing what it was none of their business to do, and what they never could do to advantage. They might as well issue a commission to take charge of the markets of this town, and do all the purchasing for all the people as to undertake what they did undertake in relation to this butter industry. Well, Sir, I congratulate them. They have learned by one year's experience that what they did was not the business of a government, that they neither helped themselves nor helped the agricultural population of this country by the undertaking. That being so, all we have to say with regard to this item is, that the adventure was a foolish one, that it turned out as every man of experience ought to have believed from the outset that it would turn out, and that the people, if they are thankful to the Government at all, are thankful that their folly did not carry them further; that the losses have not been larger than they have been in the operation. We are glad to know that the experiment is not to be repeated, and that the Government are satisfied with twelve months' experience in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat gave a history of the beginning of the cheese trade in Canada, but, from my information, he is entirely wrong in his facts. I heard it distinctly stated, not ten days ago, by Senator Reed, of Belleville, that he exported the first cheese ever exported from Canada; that he gave $100 to establish a cheese factory in the Belleville district, which was the first factory in the country. The same gentleman was one of five, I think he said, who gave $100 apiece for the purpose of employing a man to come amongst them and educate the people how to make cheese. At first the industry depended altogether upon private individuals, and it was not until some time later that the Ontario Government took up the matter and granted subsidies to supplement the efforts of private individuals. Now, it is all right for the Ontario Government to do this, but according to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when the Dominion Government does the same thing, it is all wrong.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the natural assumption from the hon. gentleman's arguments. Now, how is it that cheese has attained the position it occupies in the English market to-day. Is it not owing to the fact that an educational process has been going on, and that the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government have been granting assistance, pecuniary and otherwise, to develop that industry. Now, if the Dominion Government try to do the same thing for butter, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, they must be wrong.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not the same thing for butter. To undertake to become butter merchants is a different thing to assisting the manufacture of butter.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has condemned the action of the Government, although he asks, What evidence have we that there is any good done? Does not that letter which was read from the wholesale merchant in England, show that something is being done? He says in that letter that the last consignment is better than the previous one, and, if we continue to send them butter like that, we will run the Danish butter-makers very hard. Is not that what we want to do? Although the experiment has only been tried for less than one year, we still have proof that it has been successful. Then, it was said that we have lost money on the transaction. Well, who got that money? Why, it was the Canadian farmer, according to what the hon. gentleman said a few moments ago. If the Can-

adian farmer could only sell his creamery butter in Montreal for 15 cents, and the Dominion Government paid 21 cents, who got the difference? The Canadian farmer got it. The only thing to criticise is that the Government paid a little too much to the Canadian farmer for the butter they sent over to England; but no one lost money on it. The Canadian farmer has got whatever was lost, and it is paid by the Dominion Government. However, it is only a small sum, about $3,000; but no matter whether the sum is small or large, hon. gentlemen condemn it because it is an effort by the Government to bring about a reputation for our Canadian butter in foreign markets. Now, I believe that many farmers in this country will bear me out in saying that if the Government pay annually $10,000 or $20,000, or $100,000 in buying that butter from month to month, and putting it regularly on the English market until such time as the reputation of that butter was fully established, and the wholesale and retail men could afterwards buy it and send it there, it would be money well spent in the interest of the Canadian farmer. I am sure the Canadian farmer would appreciate it, and would defend the Government for doing it. We know that, notwithstanding all the efforts of the wholesale merchant, notwithstanding all the efforts made by farmers themselves, for the last ten years especially, we have not been holding our own in the English markets with butter. If we have failed to do so through private enterprise, should we blame the Government for coming forward to assist private enterprise? From all the evidence we can get on the subject, we shall succeed in this effort, if we only persevere. If we continue in this direction for a little while longer, we shall be able to sell millions of pounds of butter in England in the future, in place of the small quantity we sell there now. As the dairy commissioner has said, we only supply a small portion of the butter used in England, whereas in cheese we are selling 60 per cent of all that is used in that country. Why can we not do the same thing in butter? I think it is unfair for the hon. gentlemen opposite to oppose the Government for their policy in this direction, and I am confident that the farmers throughout the country generally will heartily approve of their policy.

Mr. SEMPLE. The experiment of the Government in buying butter from the farmers and shipping to Great Britain so far has been a small one, but no doubt the farmers are thankful for small favours. A great many farmers think they should have protection on butter, but not in the way that my hon. friend is doing. I wish to read an extract from the "Farmer's Sun" in regard to which I would like some information:

The farmers of Canada will not fail to notice that official returns show that Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Australian policy of importing Australian agricultural products into Canada, is getting under full swing by reason of the line of steamers subsidized by our government. Official returns from Vancouver show that from July 1st, 1894, to February 1st, 1895, the following quantities arrived from Australia: 7,552 lbs. butter, value, $1,355.

There is also another statement that by this policy the Australians have been enabled to ship butter as far as Sudbury. It says:

For example, the following advertisement of a Sudbury firm appeared in the issue of the Sudbury "Times," of May 2nd, 1894:

"From Australia ex ss. Warrimoo, to Vancouver, B.C., thence by the C.P.R. transcontinental line to Sudbury direct. We herald the arrival of invoices of consignments of creamery butter from the celebrated Rosebud Creamery of Newcastle, N.S.W., also tinned meats, the product of the country."

So it is plain that while the Government are endeavouring to find a market in one quarter, their policy of procuring cheap freights from Australia is filling up this country with butter. I wish to know from the Secretary of State, if he can tell how much butter is coming from that country, and if the Government propose to do anything to retain the market in that section of the country for Canadian farmers, that has hitherto been supplied from Australia? I read this extract from the "Farmer's Sun," the organ of the farmers of Canada. They are sensible of the fact, and feel it keenly, since they have to pay for steamers to bring butter here to compete with the products of their own country.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to say one or two words, and I will be very brief, because I shall have an opportunity at a subsequent period of saying what I want to say on the question generally as regards butter and as regards butter in the North-west Territories. Let me say this, however, that I congratulate the Government on the determination expressed through the Secretary of State to continue a policy of developing to the utmost the butter industry of this country, and securing for it the greatest possible advantages in being placed on the English market. Having said this much, let me add a word in regard to the controversy which has prevailed to-night. The hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Elgin argued as though the Government had gone into the butter business. The meaning of that is, if it has any meaning at all, and at all events it is what the hon. gentlemen intended to convey and the whole cogency of their argument depended on it, that the Government went into the trade in butter with a view to make a profit. Palpably, however, that is not what the Government did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. What the Government did was to adopt a scheme by which they would

accommodate the farmers, by which they would advance money on butter to farmers; and if in doing that any loss has been incurred, it shows merely that there has been a miscalculation, and I say the remark made by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is entirely fair and just, that the Government leaned in this matter to the farmers. With respect to what the Secretary of State said as to what would be done in Manitoba, at a future period I will press upon him this argument: This Parliament stands in the position in regard to the North-west Territories, if I may use the language, of being in a large measure a local government. We are not merely a Dominion Government, but we exercise powers over the North-west that are within the circle of the powers of local governments elsewhere. Under these circumstances I think that it will occur to the Government, to the Secretary of State, and I hope to the Minister of Agriculture, that while Manitoba gives a large amount to help creameries, it behooves this Parliament of Canada, not merely to do in the Territories what we do elsewhere, but to supplement what we do at present in the Territories by doing there what a local government fully equipped would do. I will not take up the time of the committee at this hour further than to say that, with my friend the member for Ontario, I am exceedingly pleased to see that the members on the Reform side of the House are on this subject mainly protectionists. They vary a little, as they vary a little on nearly every subject. Individuality is so largely developed in the Reform ranks that they never see exactly eye to eye, and although the hon. member for Huron, the hon. member for Elgin, the hon. member for Bothwell, and the hon. member for Wellington differ as regards details, they all agree in this, that they want to have something done for the farmers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let them alone.

Mr. DAVIN. That proves what I say. The hon. member for Bothwell says let them alone, but the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) thanks Heaven that something is being done for the farmers, and the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), who is one of the most respected members of the Reform party, declares that cold storage should be provided, and, of course, that would cost money. Hon. gentlemen of the Reform side cannot escape from this conclusion: they may differ with the Government as to the particular form that protection to the butter industry should take, but so far as I could judge to-night, not a single member declared he would have free trade as it is in England for butter.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I desire to offer a few remarks in regard to the action taken in Prince Edward Island with respect to the cheese and butter industry. Private enterprise tried to start the cheese industry, and failed. The factories were closed, with one exception, and it produced little. Our protectionist Federal Government, under the very able Dairy Superintendent, Prof. Robertson, came down to our province and established the co-operative system, so that to-day, after an experience of three years only, we have twenty-eight cheese factories and two creameries in existence, and the business is being successfully carried on. The Dominion Government have acted in a progressive and liberal manner towards the people of the province, not only in getting the co-operative system thoroughly established, but in seeing that the products of the dairies and creameries are properly marketed; and I am satisfied that the action of the Government in this respect on the Island will rally the farmers round them when the proper time comes.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITION FROM THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) presented a petition from the Auditor General and asked that it should be read at the Table of the House.

The petition was read as follows:—

To the Honourable the House of Commons, in Parliament assembled:

The petition of the undersigned, the Auditor General of the Public Accounts of the Dominion of Canada, humbly sheweth:

That he has been pleased to observe that members of Parliament have been good enough to speak of the Audit Office as giving in its annual report evidence of its not having been idle. This indicates to some extent approval of his own work; but it is manifest that one man's labour must count for little in so great an undertaking, and that, therefore, the main credit is due to the staff. He may, consequently, without to any great extent claiming favourable consideration for himself, draw attention to the amount of work which is done in the office. Every person is fully employed during office hours for the whole year, while for half the year the hour of leaving is five o'clock instead of four. Besides, much night work is cheerfully done. Without belittling the work of any other department, he

can safely say that more or better work is not done by an equal number of employees in any other branch of the public service.

That it is quite useless to make the Auditor General a parliamentary officer with the object of securing an independent examination of the expenditure of $40,000,000 and of the collection of the same amount of revenue, as well as of giving an intelligible statement in detail of all, while there is left entirely in the hands of those whose financial transactions he is to criticise, the power to give or withhold assistance and the power to promote the clerks or keep them for ever in the same position. It is true the Auditor General has the power to promote when there is money to pay the increases of salary, but if the recommended increases are refused, as they have been, the power to promote never becomes effective.

That, excluding Ministers, Deputy Ministers and messengers from the estimates of the several departments, and himself with the messengers from that of the Audit Office, the percentage of chief and first-class clerks in the Audit Office compared to the whole number there is 16⅔, while that for the whole service is 26, there being but one department—the Post Office—which has a smaller percentage.

That if your petitioner made a comparison between the Audit Office and a department in which no provision is being made for promotion, it might be said that all which can be done by the Government in the case of a department which is now too expensive, is to depend upon deaths and superannuations to restore the annual salary charges of the department to what they should be. It might also be said that, if no superannuations are indicated by the Estimates, it is because none of the staff have reached superannuation age. No one can, however, object to his comparing the Audit Office with the Finance Department, claimed, he supposes, by the Minister of Finance to be well governed, and admitted by the Opposition to be well and economically conducted. Your petitioner assents to the favourable view taken of that department. There are already 5 first-class clerks in the Finance Department, besides 4 chief clerks, and the Minister of Finance says that it is in so great need of another first-class clerk that he is justified in advising its having one, and in advising also the doing away with every restriction to the appointment that exists in the Civil Service Act. The Minister of Finance thus proposes that there shall be 10 higher grade men out of 28, or more than 35 per cent. On the other hand, the Audit Office, having now but 3 chief clerks and 1 first-class clerk, must be considered by the Government as making an extravagant demand when it asks to have two of its second-class clerks promoted to the first class, making 6 higher grade men out of 24, or 25 per cent. Your petitioner thinks that there ought to be 4 first-class clerks in the Audit Office instead of 3. He asked for only 3, two besides the one now in the office, because he understood that there were to be no increases except statutory. As the estimates show that clerks in the Customs and other departments are to be promoted, while they are much below the maximum of their classes, he thinks it is his duty to press for parliamentary authorization of the promotion of a third second-class clerk who is now at $1,350.

If this request were granted, the percentage of the Audit Office would be less than 30 as against 35 in the Finance Department.

That the average cost per clerk in the Audit Office is $1,074, while that of the Finance Department is $1,551, and of the whole inside service $1,228. That, while the Audit Office contributes, like all other departments, to the superannuation fund, not a dollar is now being paid out of that fund for any one whose right to an allowance arose from service in the Audit Office. If you take into account as chargeable to the other departments, the amount paid for superannuation allowances to those who were in the inside service, the average per clerk of the whole service is increased to $1,313.92, as compared to $1,078.96 for the Audit Office.

That there is no friendship between any of the staff and your petitioner, except such as naturally arises in the performance of the daily work of the office for a number of years, and that all the clerks have been appointed by the party who are now in power. That, therefore, there is nothing to interest him in the advancement of any of them, except the success of the work and the desire that any honest man feels to see those who are assisting him get the reward of industry and intelligence.

That, while your petitioner does not desire it to be supposed that all the clerks of the Audit Office are of equal usefulness, it is his duty to state that no improved method of selecting the staff could be the means of providing a more zealous and loyal staff than that which the Audit Office now possesses.

That he should be glad to afford any member of the House who may desire to test the accuracy of his view that the Audit Office gives as good value for its salaries as is given in a well-conducted merchant's office, every opportunity of doing so.

That your petitioner need scarcely say what is likely to be the effect on the work, of giving advancement to men in one department and leaving men of at least equal industry and intelligence in another without recognition. It must be dissatisfaction and ultimate abatement of zeal in the latter. No fair-minded man can conclude that the Audit Office clerks should remain at $1,074, while the general service is at $1,228, and is advancing.

It should not be left to the executive of the day to determine the number of employees of the Audit Office, and particularly the number of the respective grades. That should be done by Parliament. If the Auditor General does his duty, he and his staff will be unpopular with the Government, no matter what may be the political complexion of the dominant party.

That you may restrict all departments, the Audit Office among the rest, in the matter of promotions, to cases where persons have reached the maximum of the class from which promotion is to take place. It is well, however, to remind you that the theoretical organization of the Audit Office, as already established by the Government, permits the promotions which he has sought.

Your petitioner has heard an objection made with reference to the Audit Office expenditure, which, as it appears to him, will not bear a moment's consideration. It is, that men have come in at more than the minimum of their classes. Let him here repeat what was said in his letter in the Report of 1893 : "Isn't it better to show the clear-headed, industrious men that you appreciate their intelligence and zeal by giving with pleasure to 3 the salaries you would be forced to give to 4, and get from them more work than from 6 of the other kind, and of an immeasurably better quality ? Then, the man who is brightened by his work being appreciated, respects himself and takes an interest in everything connected with his department." There are two questions to ask with reference to the cost of work : 1. What does it cost ? 2. What should it cost ? Apply the test to the Audit

Office expenditure now, or to what it was at any time during the last seventeen years.

It is possible that one of the objections to promotions here is that, when the money provision is made for a promotion, your petitioner makes the promotion, excluding from consideration everything but the claims which the candidates have made good by effective service in the Audit Office. The politicians have done enough for a man when they have secured his appointment. He should have a right to feel that once in the service he may look to his work for advancement. Nothing else should count.

Supposing there were a change of Government to-morrow, what efficiency would there be in the Audit Office, if the incomers could put their friends, with short experience and, therefore, insufficient knowledge of the more important work of the office, over the heads of those who have always done their duty and have acquired a full knowledge of it ?

As long as your petitioner is in his present office, no matter what party holds the reins of power, every effort will be made to keep the financial affairs right, and in cases where it is impossible to do that, to make it as clear as possible to the tax-payers of the country wherein in his opinion, the wrong consists ; while every man in the office, no matter what his opinions may be about other things, will get what his work entitles him to get, so far as your petitioner has the power to help him to get it.

Your petitioner does not want it to be understood that he complains about the treatment of this office until the last year or two. The success of the office, such as it is, has been brought about in a great measure by Ministers who supported it when it was placed on its present basis, particularly by Sir John Macdonald.

EXTRA CLERKS.

Your petitioner must also draw your attention to the reduction in the estimates for extra clerks from $1,800 to $1,300. The larger sum was appropriated for this current year, and all of it is required.

He is often ashamed in asking men who are doing more than they should be called upon to do, to make a further effort so that the Report may be got out in time, and yet, although the estimates for permanent clerks are reduced by $382.50, the Government has reduced this estimate, as above stated, by $500, without calling upon him for an explanation. Your petitioner just learns that two of the permanent clerks require three months' leave of absence on account of ill-health. Besides, there are now two vacancies in the permanent staff. It will then be impossible to make the Report for the current year anything like it should be in fulness and carefulness, and it will not be got out in time.

One of the extra clerks gets at the rate of $500 a year, and all the rest only $400. They work until five o'clock when permanent clerks do so. One has been here for three years, another for two years. The services of the others are dispensed with as soon as the Report is printed.

Your petitioner therefore prays that your honourable body do appoint a special committee to consider the facts set forth in this petition, and to report the means which should be taken to secure the continued efficiency of the Audit Office, whether by establishing regulations to govern its extra clerk service and by fixing a theoretical organization for the permanent staff of 3 chief clerks, 4 first-class clerks and 5 second-class clerks ; or by such other provisions as may seem to be advisable for the purpose, and your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I move :

That the petition of the Auditor General presented this day, be printed in the Votes and Proceedings of to-morrow, and that Rule 94 be suspended so as to permit of the same.

Mr. FOSTER. The rule cannot be suspended without consent. However, it is a matter of some interest, I suppose, to the House as a whole, and I have no objection at all to its being printed to-morrow in the Votes and Proceedings ; but of course we cannot establish a precedent of that kind with regard to other petitions. It might be printed separately.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not object to its being printed separately ; I only wish to get it before the House ; and the Auditor General, being a public officer of high rank, what may be done with regard to his petition would not become a precedent for everybody's petition.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is proposed, as I understand, with the consent of the House, to strike out the words, "in the Votes and Proceedings to-morrow.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. FLINT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 107) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said : The principal provision which it is proposed to amend is that regarding the powers of search under certain circumstances. The object of this amendment is to define more clearly the powers and limits of the search under a search warrant. Another clause refers to a conviction for a second offence in case the party charged is not present at the time of the conviction. I will explain more fully on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ASSIGNMENT OF SALARIES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BECHARD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) respecting the assignment and attachment of the salaries of public employees.

Mr. AMYOT. Explain.

Mr. BECHARD. The Bill provides that any public employee may make an assignment to any person of his future salary, and that his head officer, on being notified of it, may pay the creditor of that employee a certain part of his monthly salary. Another clause provides that the salary may be attached by judgment of the court. It provides for the proportion which may be so attached or assigned. If the salary

does not exceed $600, no more than one-fifth of each monthly pay can be attached or assigned. If it is over $600, and does not exceed $1,400, not more than one-fourth can be attached or assigned. If it exceeds $1.400, then one-third may be attached or assigned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the time.

MAJOR GENERAL HERBERT.

Mr. GIBSON asked, 1. Did Major General Herbert tender his resignation last year as Commander of the Canadian Militia? If so, what was the date of his resignation, and the reasons given? 2. Was the late premier, Sir John Thompson, notified while in England, by any member of the Government, of General Herbert's resignation, and what action, if any, was taken thereon? 3. Is General Herbert absent on leave, from what date and how long? 4. Is he expected to resume the position he occupies? 5. Who is now discharging the duties of General Commanding the force? 6. Does the Government contemplate any change in the law so as to permit of the appointment of a Canadian officer as General Commanding?

Mr. DICKEY. In answer to the first question, there is no record in the Department of Militia of a resignation by Major-General Herbert of his position as general officer commanding the Canadian militia. In answer to question No. 2, no. In answer to questions 3, 4, and 5, General Herbert left Canada on leave, granted 25th February last. He has been doing, in England, some work for the department, the duties of his office in Canada being discharged by the Adjutant General. It is not expected that General Herbert will resume the duties in Canada of the general officer commanding. In answer to No. 6, no.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IMPORTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Mulock) asked, What agricultural products, and in what quantities and values, have been imported into Canada since the 30th June, 1894?

Mr. WALLACE. It will take some days to prepare the report. I will be able to answer the question about the end of the week.

THE ROYAL STANDARD.

Mr. MARTIN asked, What persons in Canada have the right to hoist the Royal Standard, and on what occasions?

Mr. DICKEY. The Royal Standard is only authorized to be hoisted at a military station in Canada when a member of the royal family is present (vide 29th March, 1889). This regulation does not, however, apply to Halifax, N.S., at which station the flag is maintained by Her Majesty's Imperial forces under Imperial regulations.

SURVEY OF TOWNSHIP 16, RANGE 16 W.

Mr. MARTIN asked, What action do the Government intend to take with regard to the new survey of township 16, in range 16, west? What is to be done with regard to those settlers who have relied upon the old mounds, and who are in possession?

Mr. DALY. From representations made to the department, it appears that there are gross irregularities or errors in the existing survey of township 16, range 16, west of the 1st meridian. Under section 7, of the Act 52 Vict., chap. 27, the Governor in Council is empowered, in such a case, to direct that the survey be cancelled, and a new one made. Before taking authority to cancel the present survey of the township mentioned, it was considered expedient to send a surveyor to the ground and find out where the lines ought to run. It may be mentioned that all the settlers in the township, with one exception, signed the petition for the re-survey. It now appears, however, that the effect of the re-survey, in at least one instance, will be to place the improvements of the settler upon the road allowance or upon adjoining property. Considerable correspondence has passed between the department and the parties interested, but no final conclusion has yet been arrived at as to the dispositions to be made of the case. Whatever is right will be done.

TELESPHORE GENDREAU—HARBOUR MASTER OF MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant the inquiry asked for in relation to Telesphore Gendreau, recently appointed harbour master of Montmagny?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before considering the question of granting the inquiry, it was deemed advisable to communicate with the harbour master, and to furnish him with a copy of the charges laid against him, for immediate reply.

SEIZURE OF STILL AT L'ISLET STATION.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether the Government are aware that a still was seized in one of the sheds of the Intercolonial Railway, at L'Islet station, in March or April last? Did the Dominion officer, Phileas Dubé, report the said seizure? What steps were taken in pursuance thereof? Have the Government in-

stituted, or is it their intention to institute, an inquiry in order to ascertain whether the still was placed in the Government shed by the employees of the Intercolonial, or by other persons ?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The Government is aware that a still was seized at the freight shed of the Intercolonial Railway at L'Islet, 27th April, 1895. 2. The seizure was made and reported by Phileas Dubé. 3. The seizure report was forwarded through the Collector of Inland Revenue at Quebec, who was instructed to confer with the agents of the Department of Justice, and if evidence was sufficient to secure a conviction, to institute proceedings. 4. Yes. The Government have taken steps to ascertain who were the parties responsible for the still being found in the freight shed at L'Islet.

W. FINLAY, OF COURTRIGHT.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has one W. Finlay, of Courtright, recently been appointed to any position in the Customs service ? If so, what is the position ? What are the duties, and what is the compensation or allowance? How is such compensation or allowance paid i. e., monthly, or otherwise ? What particular reason was there for such appointment ? Have similar appointments been made at other parts of the province of Ontario recently ? If so, where, and what are the names of the appointees ?

Mr. WALLACE. In reply to the hon. gentlemen, I beg to say : 1. Yes, Mr. Finlay has been appointed to a position in the Customs service. 2. The position is that of acting preventive officer. 3. His duties are to control and guard the frontier south from Sarnia, to Corunna, Moore, Sombra, Davies Point, Baldoon, Oungh, Stag Island, and Walpole Island, for the prevention and detection of smuggling, also to see that duty is paid on all merchandise which may be imported to Stag Island and Walpole Island—which places, being popular summer resorts, import considerable quantities of goods and articles during the season of navigation. For this work he is remunerated at the rate of $50 a month. 4. The amount is paid monthly. 5. The reason for such appointment is that the officer employed at this work last year, resigned. 6. No vacancy has arisen in other parts of the province of Ontario recently, and, consequently, no other similar appointments have been made. 7. Answered by the above.

MILITARY GROUNDS AT ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. By whose authority has a grocery shop been built on the military grounds at Annapolis ? 2. Who are the lessees or tenants of the whole or any part of said military grounds ? 3. What rents are paid for the use of said lands or any part thereof ? 4. Are any rents due for the use of said lands, and by whom, and why are the amounts not collected ?

Mr. DICKEY. 1. I am not aware that any authority has been given to build a grocery shop on the military grounds at Annapolis. I have caused inquiry to be made immediately. 2. The department has at present only one tenant at Annapolis, a Mr. Andrew Gilmour. 3. The rental paid by Mr. Gilmour is $12 per week. 4. There are no arrears due for the Annapolis property, save the claim the department holds against Mr. T. B. Mills for $823.69. This claim is disputed by Mr. Mills. Legal proceedings have not yet been taken against Mr. Mills to decide the dispute.

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McISAAC asked, 1. Was the contract for carrying Her Majesty's mails between Malignant Cove and Ingonish, in the province of Nova Scotia, under the terms of an advertisement calling for tenders for said service, dated 1st March, 1895, awarded, and to whom ? 2. What are the names of the persons who tendered, and the amounts of their respective tenders ? 3. Were the tenders opened ? If not, why not ? 4. If the contract was not awarded under the terms of the advertisement to any of the persons who tendered, to whom was it awarded, for what amount, and for what reason ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The contract for the Malignant Cove and Merigomish mail service was awarded to W. J. McDonald, but not under the terms of the advertisements calling for tenders. As the new contract was a renewal of the one now in operation, the tenders were not opened, and the department is therefore unaware of the particulars of the tenders received. The existing contract was renewed under authority of paragraph 2, section 61 of the Post Office Act.

DISMISSAL OF CONDUCTOR GEORGE McCULLY.

Mr. PATTERSON (Colchester) asked, 1. Has any application been received by the Minister of Railways and Canals for an investigation as to the reasons for the dismissal of conductor George McCully from the service of the Intercolonial Railway ? 2. For what reasons were conductor McCully's services dispensed with ? 3. Is it the intention to reinstate him in the railway service ?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to state that an application asking for an investigation was received, but it was not considered necessary to hold one. His services were dispensed with because he was not considered a suit-

able person for the position of conductor. There is no intention of reinstating him.

NEW CHANNEL AT GRAND ETANG.

Mr. FRASER asked, Does the Government propose to open a new channel at Grand Etang, Cape Breton? If not, what is the reason? Has any promise been given by the Government, at any time, that such new channel would be opened?

Mr. OUIMET. The Department of Public Works proposes to open a new channel at Grand Etang, Cape Breton, so soon as the road which crosses the entrance to the Grand Etang has been diverted by the municipal authorities. I am not aware that any promise was given at any time by the Government, but the opening of the channel in question is part of the work required to make Grand Etang a harbour of refuge for the fishermen of the district.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davin:

That in the opinion of this House, the privilege of voting for candidates for membership therefore should be extended to women possessing the qualifications which now entitle men to the electoral franchise; and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I have listened, the other day, to the speech delivered by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), in reference to the enfranchisement of women. I could not help admiring the ingenuity of the hon. member in trying to show that the female portion of humanity had a natural right to vote; that is to say, to mix up with politics, on an equal footing with the male portion. The rights of the two sexes are quite different and they have been long since defined by the wisdom of the most civilized nations on earth. At all times, it has been admitted that a woman is a queen in her home, a queen in the family and that she has an absolute right to direct the family's domestic and intimate education; that according as that education is good or bad, the individual receiving it bears the traces of it during his life-time. On that early education, indeed, depends the part that will later on be played in the community by the citizen receiving it. On that early education depends the qualities, good or bad, that will develop in the individual who was its object. And lastely on that education and on those qualities often depends the future of the family and even the future and prosperity of nations. It is allowed on all hands, Mr. Speaker, that a woman reigns supreme in the family realm and I cannot conceive what service my hon. friend will render her by claiming for her the right to take a hand in the terrible conflicts of politics. I cannot see there any advantage to her, but I rather see an onerous burden for her in a contest in which man himself often leaves his good repute. If my hon. friend's motion would give to womankind a new device by which humanity could be made happier, which he has not shown, I would think it the duty of this House to take it into its earnest consideration. But, on the contrary, I only see in it the fulfilling of a painful duty which the men wish to get rid of by drawing the fair sex into the political arena. For this reason, I do not think it generous on the part of a citizen, or a member of this House, to attempt to throw upon woman's shoulders one of the heaviest burdens that bears on those of men, the burden of politics, the burden of electoral contests, the burden of representation. For, if it be admitted that one day or another women are to be called upon to take part in the elections and to give their votes, we will have to admit them likewise to the responsibilities of representation. It would be an amusing, I was going to say a queer sight, that of the mother of a family having under her charge a dozen children, some of whom would yet be in their infancy, receiving canvassers in her house, during the absence of her husband, who would inculcate to her political principles, give her a political direction and induce her to the polls, there to give a vote sometimes hostile to that of her husband, the two representatives of the family. This proposal of the hon. gentleman should be rejected for many other reasons. For, besides paying a poor compliment to women, it throws upon their shoulders too heavy a burden for them—a burden which is exclusively ours. This has been acknowledged since the origin of the representative government and I think our sex should have the courage to fill in the community the portion of obligations that were assigned to it, without allowing any enchroachment upon this department. We will have the courage of our ancestors who showed themselves to be true friends of their country, by reserving to themselves alone the political duties and we will leave the woman, that guardian angel of society, that good directress of the family, within her sphere and her sanctuary, to the duties which were assigned to her by the wisdom of the people, the legislators and the clergymen of the various religions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for all these reason and for many others, I understand the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should not press the passing of his resolution. To invite the fair sex to take part in our political contests seems to me to be as humiliating and as shocking a proposition as to invite her to form part of our militia battalions organized for the defence of the country, for, Mr. Speaker, the militiary profession does not belong to that sex. Not that I would say that no honour attaches to that profession likely to tempt

both sexes. So, from time to time—it is shown by history—devoted women were found with martial souls, who launched out into the military career and sometimes rendered signal services to their country. But is it possible to leave aside the lesson given us by the wisdom of nations and only to be guided by such precedents in order to come to the conclusion that women should go to war, be enrolled in our militia battalions and sent forward against an invading foe? Such a proposition, Mr. Speaker, would be considered as preposterous; it would be considered as a device on the part of men for escaping duties, obligations and charges which were imposed upon the stronger sex and having them shared by the weaker sex. The female sex is released from such charges and duties by the laws of our legislators, by the common sense of nations and by the common sense of the religious authorities. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member for Assiniboia(Mr. Davin) will not press the passing of his resolution; and should my hon. friend press it, I hope the House, relying on the numerous precedents that are to be found in any civilized country, and acting on the precedents supplied by the wisdom of nations, will not add new burdens to the already numerous and heavy ones which bear on the shoulders of the fair sex. By adopting the principle involved in the resolution moved by him, my hon. friend would throw upon them the burden of politics, which belongs to us, and which we should have courage enough to bear alone.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Laurier) p, 719:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Campbell,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Dawson,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Gibson,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lowell,
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Scriver,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Vaillancourt, and
Welsh.—47.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blanchard,
Boston,
Bowers,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grant (Sir James),
Grieve,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Joncas,
Lachapelle,
McLennan,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Leclair,
Legris,
Lippé,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGreevy,
McInerney,
McKeen,
Madill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pridham,
Putnam,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville), and
Yeo.—101.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on main motion (Mr. Davin) p. 701:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Baker,
Bergeron,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Carpenter,
Charlton,
Christie,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Davin,
Dawson,
Dickey,
Dyer,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Foster,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Landerkin,
Lister,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
McAlister,
McGregor,
McMullen,
Madill,
Mills (Annapolis),
Sanborn,
Semple,
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Tarte,
Temple,
Turcotte,

Grant (Sir James),
Grieve,
Guay,
Haslam,
Tyrwhitt,
Weldon, and
Yeo.—47.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Allan,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyd,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Chesley,
Choquette,
Coatsworth,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Devlin,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Fairbairn,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Godbout,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hodgins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Joncas,
Lachapelle,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Legris,
Lippé,
Lowell,
Macdonell (Algoma),
Maclean (York),
McCarthy,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGreevy,
McInerney,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McLennan,
McMillan,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mignault,
Miller,
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pridham,
Proulx,
Putnam,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ryckman,
Scriver,
Smith (Ontario),
Somerville,
Stairs,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Vaillancourt,
Wallace,
Welsh,
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot, and
Wood (Brockville).—105.

Motion negatived.

SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that Bill (No. 3) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction, be read the second time. He said: In presenting this Bill to the House, I desire to make a very few remarks to set forth the reasons why I deem that the Criminal Code, in this respect, should be amended slightly in some of its provisions. The measure for making seduction, under certain circumstances, a criminal offence, was first introduced into this House, I think, fifteen years ago. That Bill, in the various stages of its progress through the House, received the efficient aid of my hon. friend who now leads the House, and from whom I solicit a kindly consideration of the amendments that are proposed to be made to that Act. The Bill was at first received with great manifestations of disfavour. Very few members saw fit to support the principle of the Bill, but it gradually won its way, after discussion from year to year, and through the gradual creation of a public sentiment in the country in favour of the measure. The pressure of public sentiment in the country led to the adoption of the measure by the House. The Bill, after its passage by the House, was reaffirmed by the action of the House, I think, in three successive sessions before it secured the assent of the Senate, and it received in that body some modifications which somewhat impaired the efficiency of the Bill. At last it became the law of the land, and that law has been upon the statute-books for several years. Many prognostications were made with regard to the operation of the law. Those who were opposed to it apprehended very grave difficulties arising from the facilities it would afford for blackmail, and apprehended that it would prove to be a law not in the interests of the country. These fears, I am happy to say, have all proved to be groundless. The law has given satisfaction, has proved to be a law which has been received with favour by the country, and has grown in favour as it has continued upon the statute-book, and as its operations have developed the influence that it is calculated to exert. The results, I affirm, are in the highest degree satisfactory; and I may point with great gratification to the fact that the record of illegitimacy for the province of Ontario is lower than that of any other country in the world, so far as I know. It is lower than the record of the state of Massachusetts, it is lower than the record of the British Empire, or of any of the European countries that I am aware of. It amounts to only a fraction over 12 in the 1,000; and I attribute this favourable condition of public morals, to some extent, at least, to the operation of this law. Now, Sir, I do not need to descant upon the character of the old law or its provisions, for these are all familiar to the members of the House. The old law fixed the age of consent at sixteen years. Seduction between the ages of fourteen and sixteen was a criminal offence. Seduction below fourteen was punished with still greater severity, and between the ages of fourteen and sixteen seduction was a penal offence. I propose, in this measure, to ask the House to increase the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years. This is practically the law

in England at the present time, I believe, it is the law in New York, and many other of the American states, and I see no reason why, in a country like Canada, the age of consent should be limited to sixteen years. The age of innocence, and of lack of knowledge of the wiles and ways of the world, does not pass away at the age of sixteen, in the majority of cases; and our young women are perhaps, in some degree, as unsophisticated and as liable to the wiles of the seducer between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, as prior to that age. The first proposal of this Bill is as follows:

Section 181 of the Criminal Code, 1892, is hereby amended by substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "sixteen" in the fifth line thereof.

Which would be fixing the age of consent at eighteen years instead of sixteen years. The next proposal of the Bill is to amend section 182 of the Criminal Code by substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "twenty-one." The age fixed when the male is liable to prosecution for seduction under promise of marriage in the Bill as it originally left this House, was eighteen; but in the Senate that provision of the Bill was changed, and the age was placed at twenty-one, so that no man under the law was liable for seduction under promise of marriage until he had reached the age of twenty-one. Some of the senators, in private conversation, thought that some of their boys might get into trouble if the law was not put into that shape. The proposal of the Bill is to make a man liable for seduction under promise of marriage, at the age that a girl ceases to be protected by the law limiting the age of consent, namely, at the age of eighteen. The third section of the Bill proposes to amend section 283 of the Code by substituting the words "twenty-one" for the word "sixteen," in the fourth line. Perhaps I had better read that section in order to make clearer the change that is proposed:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to five years' imprisonment, who unlawfully takes, or causes to be taken, any unmarried girl, being under the age of sixteen years, out of the possession, and against the will of her father or mother, or of any other person having the lawful care or charge of her.

The amendment proposes to raise the age from sixteen to twenty-one. These are the changes in the Bill I now present to the House: First, to raise the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen; second, to make the man punishable for the act of seduction under promise of marriage if of the age of eighteen, instead of, as at present, twenty-one; and, third, to make the act of abduction punishable in the case of a female of twenty-one, or less, instead of sixteen, or less.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill has stated that he has endeavoured to obtain legislation on this line for some years.

Mr. CHARLTON. I stated that efforts to get legislation such as proposed in the Bill had been made; but the Bill has been in operation for some years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes; but efforts in the direction of amendments now proposed to the code were commenced some years ago. When I asked the hon. gentleman when these efforts were first entered upon, he said twelve years ago. I have not any recollection as to when the hon. gentleman undertook to bring this subject before Parliament. My object in referring to that matter is to call attention of the House to the fact that the subject has been before Parliament on many occasions, and a great deal of discussion has taken place. In England the subject has been considered. This is a question surrounded with a great many difficulties. No doubt the hon. gentleman is impelled to persist and continue his efforts by the agitation which, if I may say it without offence, for I mean none, is confined wholly to people who have had little or no experience in the administration of criminal law, but people who occupy very high and important positions in society, and in different parts of our country, and who, actuated by the very highest principles and best of motives, think they will secure society against evil, and prevent these serious offences taking place by making the law severe, and placing the age as the hon. gentleman now proposes. This whole subject was very carefully considered by this Parliament in 1892, and it is my duty to call the attention of the House to the fact that I find further that from no Attorney General connected with the administration of criminal matters in the provinces, or any of the judges, who watch these matters and take interest in them, has there been any statement or representation which would warrant me in coming to the conclusion that there was a desire on the part of those concerned with the administration of criminal law to secure the changes proposed. In England it was not till 1885 that the age was placed as it is in our code of 1892. The Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons in that year gave much attention to this subject. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the state this Bill left the House: but it received very careful consideration on the part of the committee, and Parliament, and whether the Senate took the action by which the law, as it now stands, was framed, or not, the result is, that outside of the people to whom I have referred making further and strenuous efforts to secure society against those evils, there is not a particle of information which Parliament should have in a case of this kind to lead it to venture further into legislation surrounded with in-

numerable difficulties. I do not think, therefore, that it is necessary for me to refer at greater length to this subject. I feel that what I am saying is within the knowledge of many hon. members who have had far more experience in the courts, and in connection with the administration of criminal justice, than I possess; and holding this view, and with every respect for the intentions of those who are behind the hon. gentleman in this matter. I do not think there is sufficient warrant for the legislation proposed. I therefore move that this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For my part, I concur in the reasons which the Minister of Justice has given that this House should not assent to the Bill. When the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill some years ago, to make seduction a criminal offence, punishable by this Parliament, he had my sympathy and support. The question of the arbitrary age at which Parliament should make the offence a criminal one is one which aroused much discussion, and the matter was thoroughly threshed out at that time. The principle adopted at that time was that a child below a certain age ought not to be held, in the eyes of the law, responsible in the sense of giving consent, and Parliament fixed the age at sixteen years. We must fix some arbitrary age, although no one can say that it is absolutely correct; but the general consensus of opinion was that sixteen was about the age at which the line should be drawn. Nothing has occurred in the part of the Dominion from which I come to induce me to vote to alter the age. Government should not be tinkering with these laws every year. When we have a law which works fairly well, and the general consensus is that this law is working fairly well, and requires no amendment, we would be taking a leap in the dark and moving in a wrong direction if we altered the age.

Mr. CURRAN. Not only must the arguments presented by the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Queen's be considered, but it must be remembered that the mover of the Bill has not himself stated that it has come within his knowledge, or within the knowledge of those for whom he is acting, that there is any necessity for changing this law. The Bill is not, therefore, to remove any evil, the existence of which he knows, or is known by any of those with whom he is connected, and without a single complaint or suggestion before the Department of Justice of any sort from any source whatever, either from police magistrates, judges, or Attorney Generals of the provinces, it would be altogether improper to amend a law which has worked well so far.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think it is a very good reason for not adopting the Bill, that it has not been recommended by the judges throughout the land. If we have to wait for legislation until representations have been made by the judges, we shall frequently have to wait a long time. This Bill is in the right direction, and should receive the support of the House, and, for my part, I intend to support it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the fate of the Bill is a foregone conclusion, as the Minister of Justice and practically the Government have declared against it. I would call the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that he was once a supporter of this proposal in this House, and I can see no reason for his dropping down from the position he then occupied with regard to this measure. The Bill as it left this House was a more stringent measure than it appears on the statute-book to-day. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that it is very difficult to tell what limit should be fixed, that the limit of age is an arbitrary limit, and that we may be pretty near the proper limit now and we may not. The object of the Bill is to preserve the morals of the community and to confer a benefit upon Canada by guarding the purity and chastity of the young females of the country, and the age of sixteen was evidently fixed by the Senate because it was thought, if a girl was sixteen years she had sufficient knowledge of the world, and of the wiles of the seducer, to enable her to guard against the consequences that this Bill is calculated to protect her from. I do not believe that such is the case, and I believe that the general consensus of opinion in this country is that the proper limit should not fall short of eighteen years. If it is proper to fix a limit at all, then it is proper to extend that limit of age from sixteen to eighteen years, which this House once believed was correct. So far from there being any evidence that this is unnecessary, we have the evidence of numerous states that have adopted the limit of eighteen years. That limit has been adopted by the great state of New York, upon our borders.

An hon. MEMBER. Any other state?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it has been adopted by many other states, and if I am correctly informed, it is the limit of age in England.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, sixteen years is the limit in England, adopted in 1885.

Mr. CHARLTON. This limit has been adopted in many of the United States, and I might urge for consideration that the age of maturity among females is reached somewhat later in Canada than in the states to the south. I do not believe that our female population, with our society

usages, and the dangers that lurk in their path, are any better qualified to resist these wiles at eighteen than at sixteen years. My hon. friend says that we should not tinker with the law every year. I agree with him, and I wish to point out that I have not been tinkering with the law. This law has been on the statute-book for five or six years without an attempt to have it changed. We have experience as to the character of the law and its working. When that law went on the statute-book, it was predicted that it would lead to blackmailing. It was affirmed that it would be a weapon in the hands of unscrupulous females for the purpose of inflicting injury upon innocent males who themselves were the ones that ought to be protected by the law against the wiles of the seducer. Practically all these fears with regard to the operation of the law have proved groundless.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says "no." I do not know of a case where this law has not proved beneficial. I do not know of a case where this law has not been calculated to punish the vilest of all criminals, the one who robs a female of her virtue. It has met with the approbation of all classes of society, and if the law is necessary or salutary at all, I assert that it would be proper to advance the age from sixteen to eighteen years of age, for the purpose of affording more efficient security than it now does. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says: Leave well enough alone. Well, of course, that is an admission that that law is a good one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said we had gone far enough, and possibly too far.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not mean what he said. My opinion is that if you have a thing in a pretty good position you should better it if you can. The Minister of Justice said, there is no evidence that there is any popular opinion asking for an amendment of this law. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman. As far as I have been able to follow public sentiment, there is a general expression of feeling that the age of consent ought to be eighteen years, and the action of the House in granting the first section of this Bill, was met with the general approval of the public and press of this country. Having watched the indications of public sentiment myself in this matter, I can assure the hon. gentleman that he makes a mistake when he says there is no public sentiment asking for this change. The Government may not have been memorialized by judges or police magistrates, but the amendment is proposed on the broad basis of the protection of female virtue, and the object of the law is to make it a penal offence to destroy the virtue of the female. I can imagine no reason why a girl under eighteen years of age should not be protected as well as a girl under sixteen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why not make it nineteen?

Mr. FERGUSON. Or forty-five.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have got to stop somewhere.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why?

Mr. CHARLTON. Because we assume that at the age of eighteen a girl has acquired enough knowledge of the world to lead us to say that she should take care of herself. But, while she is between sixteen years old and eighteen, we may presume that is not the case, and that she is as much in need of protection between sixteen and eighteen as she is between fifteen and sixteen years. The Solicitor General informs us that there is no desire, so far as he knows, for a change in the law. Well, the hon. gentleman must have read the newspaper press of the country very carelessly. I have followed a great many newspapers, and I do not remember a single case where a Canadian newspaper favourable to restrictions of any kind whatever has pronounced against this amendment. However, if the Government denies this application; if my hon. friend the leader of the House goes back upon the record he made once when I felt so grateful to him for assistance in this matter; we will have to wait. I had to wait for a good many years before I got this Bill through, and I had to wait three years before it went through the Senate. I may have to wait further until I have that Bill perfected, but I have no doubt that I will attain my object in the end. I shall, of course, vote against the amendment of the Minister of Justice, and I hope we may have the yeas and nays.

Amendment, six months hoist, agreed to.

SUPERANNUATION ACT.

Mr. McMULLEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Superannuation Act.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that I have a Bill on the Government Orders dealing with the question of superannuation. I might suggest that the hon. gentleman retain his Bill on the paper until my Bill comes up for discussion in the House, and we then could take up the whole question together. Of course that is as the hon. gentleman feels in the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the fifth time during my parliamentary life that I have had the privilege of bringing before this House the question

of superannuation. For several years, I have given considerable study to the operation of the Act, and I have endeavoured to expose the objectionable operation of that Act upon the public expenditure of this country. Last year, at the urgent request of the First Minister, I consented to allow this Bill to stand over, on the ground that the Finance Minister was not in the House at the time, and I did not get another opportunity of bringing it forward. On this occasion, I would gladly consent to the proposition made by the Finance Minister had I positive assurance that I would have another opportunity of moving the second reading; but, owing to the manner in which I was disappointed last year, I think I should embrace the present opportunity to go on with the Bill. I have endeavoured to point out, from year to year, the manner in which the Superannuation Act has operated. I have proved that the country has lost a large amount of money by the continuation of this system. The Act was brought into force in 1871, when Sir Francis Hincks was Finance Minister in the Government headed by Sir John Macdonald. Had the Act been allowed to remain on the statute-book as it was first introduced, by which 4 per cent was deducted from salaries of $600 and over, and 2½ per cent from salaries under $600, the fund would have been self-sustaining. In fact, had it been honestly administered, as I will prove later on it has not been, it would have been more than self-sustaining. But, after the Act had been in force some three years, Sir Leonard Tilley, when Finance Minister, introduced an amendment to it, providing that the sum deducted from the salary of civil servants should be reduced—on salaries of $600, and over, from 4 per cent to 2 per cent; and on salaries under $600, from 2½ per cent to 1¼ per cent. That cut down the receipts under the operation of the Act, 50 per cent. The result was that, owing to the large number of civil servants who were superannuated from year to year, the superannuation fund became a drain upon the country's resources, which grew worse and worse from year to year. Now, I will give the receipts and expenditures on account of the fund for each year during its operation:

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditure
	$ cts.	$ cts.
1871	49,470 50	12,880 49
1872	53,213 80	38,842 81
1873	54,757 30	53,026 12
1874	34,620 18	64,442 84
1875	36,678 71	71,371 85
1876	38,476 00	101,627 16
1877	40,890 26	104,826 99
1878	41,856 62	106,588 91
1879	41,959 20	113,531 63
1880	43,531 80	116,391 75
1881	44,995 80	147,362 10
1882	46,426 39	160,319 95
1883	46,372 03	186,236 67
1884	51,882 21	192,692 70
1885	52,701 33	203,636 21
1886	57,075 43	200,655 25
1887	62,600 96	202,285 85
1888	62,945 72	212,743 72
1889	63,031 46	218,933 65
1890	61,513 05	241,764 66
1891	62,824 60	241,110 49
1892	63,862 79	253,679 88
1893	64,433 27	263,710 15
1894	63,974 67	262,302 00

This shows that during the time the Act has been in force, some twenty-two years, the total receipts were $1,239,094.08, and the total expenditure, $3,770,963.83; or a net loss to the country of $2,531,869.75. The number on the list of superannuated officers at the end of 1893-94 was 551. The gross amount paid to them is $262,302. The average amount to each is $476. The total amount contributed by those now in the Civil Service during the last year is $63,994.67. The total number on the Civil Service list last year who contributed to the fund was 4,685, and the average amount contributed by those who are now in the Civil Service is $14.10 annually. I contend that the Act has been very much abused. Had it been administered as originally intended, the amount which the country has been called on to pay would not have been sacrificed. The Act, however, was only in force a few years when it was used as a means to remove civil servants from the positions they occupied and place them upon a retiring allowance, in order that room might be made for others who were pressing their services on the Government. Now, to show the position in which the Civil Service now stands, and to prove that there is no necessity, from a financial standpoint, why superannuation should be continued, let me give the figures from a return that has been placed before Parliament, of the number of civil servants in the employ of this country on the 30th June, 1894, and the average salary paid. It will be found that we have in the inside service in the city of Ottawa, 898 employees altogether. They draw a gross salary of $1,095,723.50, or an average salary of $1,220 each. Then we have the outside service, consisting of 3,787 employees, who draw a gross amount of $2,830,063.30, or an average salary of $747. Taking the inside and the outside service together, the average salary of all the employees of this Dominion, on the 30th June, 1894, was $838. Now, I contend that the Civil Service are fairly well paid. There is no other class in this Dominion who get an average salary of $838 per year. School teachers do not get that much,

neither do ministers of the gospel. Take the bank clerks throughout the Dominion, and I venture to say that they do not get an average salary of $838. You will get no other class in this Dominion that, on the whole, is as well paid as the Civil Service. They have short hours, good salaries, and they get three weeks holidays during the summer, during which their salaries are allowed to run. Under these circumstances, there is no ground whatever why we should be asked, in the straitened condition of our finances, to contribute not only the gross sum of over $200,000 a year, but to keep adding to the list of superannuated civil servants and thus add to the drain on our resources from year to year. To prove that the system has been grossly abused, to prove that hon. gentlemen opposite have, year after year, utilized this Act for the purpose of making room for those who were pressing their services on the Government, let me mention the fact that on the list of superannuated officials there are eighty-four who were superannuated under the age of fifty, and a considerable number superannuated under the age of forty. It is evident that a number of those were removed to make places for others who were urging upon some members of Parliament or upon the Cabinet the engaging of their services by the country at a good round salary. I claim that, with the facilities enjoyed in Canada for life insurance, it would be much better to leave the civil servants to provide for themselves, in case of sickness or old age, by taking advantage of the very cheap systems of insurance now in force rather than to compel them to contribute to this fund, in the hope that they will reap the benefits of superannuation. I am glad to be able to say that I have good reason to believe that the Civil Service is in favour of the measure I am now advocating. The salary of each one is subject to a reduction of 2 per cent annually, and those who die in the service never get any benefit, nor do their relatives, from this drawback on their salary. It is in a great measure only the incompetent class, who have put in a few years' service and are in the way of the more efficient class, who reap the benefit of superannuation. Then, the only other class which gets any benefit consists of those who were removed because their places were wanted for others. These are the two classes that fill the superannuation list. We have throughout the country many evidences of the application of the system in this way. Take, for instance, the postmastership of Montreal. Mr. Lamothe, who used to be postmaster, had served a term of twelve years, and Mr. Dansereau was very anxious to get his place. Through the influence, I presume, of Mr. Chapleau, now Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, he secured the superannuation of Mr. Lamothe, at an allowance of some $2,000 a year, by adding eight years to his term of service. Mr. Lamothe was superannuated at that figure, and is now enjoying life in Montreal on that ample allowance, and Mr. Dansereau was appointed in his place at $4,000 a year. You can go through the whole country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and find evidences of the scandalous abuse of that Act in every city and town. On 30th December, I see the Government were still continuing to use this Act in a manner contrary to the interests of the people. The return provided for under this Act and laid on the Table of the House this year shows that on the 30th December, 1894, the Government had, during that year, added 57 to the list. The gross amount payable to that 57 as long as they live, is $22,710.33 per year. There have been gratuities given to some five in addition to the number superannuated, amounting to some $2,631. Now, I notice that some have been superannuated who have not served the number of years provided for in the Act, which makes ten years the minimum term of service in order to qualify for superannuation. In order to get over that the Government have utilized another clause of the Act which authorizes them to add years to the term of service for reasons such as efficient service, technical knowledge of some particular subject, and so on. Mr. W. G. Gouin, a culler in receipt of $500 a year—the cullers are employed only in the summer time as there is no culling to be done in winter—served five years. He is now 37 years of age. The Government added ten years to his term of service and granted him an allowance of $150 a year for the rest of his life. Thomas Malone, also a culler, on a similar salary, served eight years, had ten years added to his term of service and now, at 37 years of age he is retired on a pension of $108. Out of the 551 names in the superannuation list, hon. gentlemen opposite have superannuated 429. Since the year 1880, they have superannuated 412 civil servants, so that there is a very small percentage on the superannuated list to-day who were not superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite. While I am on this point, I will give a few more names to show how this Act has been abused:

—	Years in the Service.	Years added to length of Service.	Amount of Annual Allowance
			$ cts.
E. N. Piché.....	6	10	400 00
Rev. J. Cameron..	3	10	252 24
P. E. Côté.....	9	10	424 08
C. J. Coursolle...	8	10	851 20
E. Daigneault.....	7	3	187 92
Robert Donkin....	5	10	437 04
John Flinn.....	5	7	456 00
Charles Ketchum.	6	7	499 20
J. W. King.....	6	10	608 04
C. M. Nutting.....	5	10	145 56
W. A. Ryan.....	3	10	75 72
F. Z. Tassé.....	8	7	997 44
V. Têtu.....	8	10	345 60
John Costley.....	10	10	592 20

If the Act had been honestly administered, as the Superannuation Act in England is administered, the balance would be on the right side of the ledger to-day. Every possible excuse that can be used has been used in order to superannuate men who were filling lucrative positions that were wanted for others. The result is that over two and a half million dollars of the people's money have virtually been wasted. Let me give you a statement that I have prepared, showing the amount that has been paid in and the amount drawn out by a number of those on the superannuated list. Shortly after Parliament opened, I procured an order of the House for a return that would give us the full amount that had been paid in by each civil servant now on the superannuated list and the gross amount drawn by him from the fund up to the present time. For some reason that return has not been brought down. It is not one that would take a great deal of work to prepare. I made up my mind that I would not delay the second reading of my Bill for that return, for fear it should not be presented during the present session. Now, in the statement I have prepared the amount paid in is based upon the last three years of service, so I am virtually giving them credit for more than they have paid in, for it is well known that civil servants get an increase of $50 or $100, or, in some cases, $200 per year. And basing the calculations of their payment to the fund on the last three years of their service, gives them credit for a larger amount than they are entitled to. But I want to give credit for the full amount, and even more, as I am charging them with the full amount they have drawn. This is the list I refer to:

Date of S.	Name.	Paid in.	Received.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
1878	Agnew, William, Custom-house Officer	168 00	9,996 00
1884	Amos, J. S., Custom-house	260 00	6,819 12
1885	Armstrong, Clerk, Post Office, Hamilton	336 00	6,669 60
1883	Ashe, D. D., Director of Observatory	336 00	11,759 04
1883	Austin, F. P., Clerk, Interior	408 00	11,880 00
1891	Baillairgé, G. F., Deputy Minister of Public Works	1,280 00	8,959 68
1884	Bracello, Clerk, Post Office, Montreal	208 00	2,463 12
1887	Bayley, J., Railway Mail Clerk, Montreal	307 20	2,150 40
1883	Befort, F. X., Inspector of Steamboats, Sorel	240 00	4,559 60
1885	Belanger, J. A., Clerk, Secretary of State	448 00	9,919 20
1879	Bell, R., Inspector of Canals	224 00	4,158 00
1879	Benoit, Ulric, Clerk in Post Office, Montreal	176 00	9,408 00
1893	Bellemere, R., Inspector of Inland Revenue	1,100 00	3,499 92
1882	Bissonnette, J. S., Assistant Appraiser at Halifax	154 00	2,335 19
1888	Bowes, W. F., Mail Clerk	340 00	4,899 72
1891	Bucke, P. E., Clerk, Post Office Department	720 00	5,040 00
1887	Caldwell, S. R., Customs Surveyor, Halifax	480 00	5,760 00
1881	Carmichael, J. E., Landing Surveyor, &c.	160 00	7,738 88
1885	Cherriman, J. B., Superintendent of Insurance	1,120 00	17,600 00
1891	Corner, S., Weigher Customs Department	480 00	3,600 00
1884	Degaspé, A. A., Clerk, Post Office, Montreal	260 00	6,600 00
1881	Dixon, J. D., Collector of Customs	160 00	5,822 88
1887	Dore, F. J., High Commissioner's Office, London	800 00	10,800 00
1881	Douglas, R., Sub-Collector of Customs	75 00	3,864 00
1886	Duff, Alexander, Locker, &c., Toronto	360 00	7,560 00
1887	Dupont, C. J., Inspector Inland Revenue	704 00	11,733 36
1891	Emery, M., Assistant Postmaster, Montreal	800 00	5,600 00
1882	Foot, T., Accountant, Intercolonial Railway, Moncton	528 00	15,969 72
1880	Forbes, H. J. G., Custom-house Officer	153 00	8,668 80
1880	Fox, J. J., Collector Customs, Magdalen Islands	216 00	12,600 00
1881	Gordon, J., Clerk, Post Office, London, Ont.	240 00	8,316 00
1881	Graham, R., Collector of Customs, Fort Erie	200 00	8,400 00
1890	Graham, Assistant Receiver General, Victoria, B.C.	440 00	9,300 00
1883	Grant, G. W., Clerk, Customs Department	384 00	5,850 00
1883	Green, J. A., Surveyor of Customs	432 00	15,120 00
1888	Griffin, W. H., Deputy Postmaster General	1,088 00	15,680 00
1890	Hamley, Hon. W., Collector of Customs, Victoria	1,444 00	11,779 80
1872	Hewitt, Thomas, Paymaster, Lachine Canal	32 00	18,282 24
1884	Higgins, M. A., Clerk, Finance Department	468 00	13,860 00
1880	Himsworth, F. A., Clerk, Privy Council	315 00	16,830 00
1883	Hood, H. A., Collector of Customs, Yarmouth	336 00	7,381 52
1887	Howe, S., Dominion Auditor, Halifax	608 00	9,727 68
1882	Jenkins, C. W., Post Office Department	396 00	11,700 00
1892	Johnson, J., Commissioner of Customs	1,680 00	8,399 88
1884	Johnson, S., Clerk, Post Office, Montreal	299 00	7,615 08
1883	Jordan, F. G., Clerk, Receiver General's Office, St. John.	366 00	11,759 04

Date of S.	Name.	Paid in.	Received.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
1887.....	Kavenagh, L., Sub-Collector of Customs	102 00	3,223 68
1882.....	Kidd, Governor General's Secretary's Office	517 00	20,332 00
1873.....	Knight, Thos. F., Inspector of Ports, Nova Scotia.....	40 00	7,656 64
1880.....	Labossiere, E., Lock Labourer, Chambly Canal.....	46 50	4,231 80
1885.....	Laperriere, Auguste, Library of Parliament	504 00	12,000 00
1886.....	Leahy, Mary, Matron, Kingston Penitentiary	255 00	3,787 56
1871.....	Lee, J. S., Clerk, Customs, Ottawa.....	20 00	7,920 00
1879.....	Leslie, J., Postmaster, Toronto.....	560 00	39,798 72
1879.....	Marter, W. J., Locker, St. John, N.B.....	128 00	8,958 72
1887.....	Mingaye, W. R., Collector and Inspector Customs.....	1,216 00	28,064 00
1882.....	Moncey, J. F., Appraiser, Port of Halifax	308 00	6,186 96
1884.....	McCaffrey, Messenger, Finance Department	48 75	2,970 00
1879.....	McColl, Evan, Landing Waiter.....	150 00	6,646 80
1873.....	McCrea, W. H., Chief Clerk, Customs, British Columbia...	77 00	11,112 64
1891.....	McKeon, John, Clerk, Post Office, Montreal	600 00	4,200 00
1881.....	McKay, H. B., Deputy Warden.....	480 00	12,768 00
1887.....	Nelson, John, Landing Waiter.....	448 00	7,839 36
1877.....	O'Hara, J., Marine Mail Clerk.....	320 00	4,160 00
1879.....	Passow, F. M., Post Office Inspector, Halifax	352 00	24,640 00
1885.....	Peachy, J. W., Customs Department.....	672 00	14,400 00
1882.....	Perkins, T., Landing Waiter, Windsor.....	82 50	4,680 00
1883.....	Pope, Hon. J., Dominion Auditor, Prince Edward Isl'd	540 00	15,120 00
1872.....	Prendergast, J., Cullers' Office, Quebec.....	60 00	7,302 96
1874.....	Quinn, Francis, Cullers' Office, Quebec.....	19 25	8,685 72
1873.....	Ranney, G. W., Superintendent, New Castle Dis. Works..	36 00	7,851 36
1873.....	Reid, Alex., Lighthouse keeper.....	14 50	8,931 12
1866.....	Roberge, O., Messenger, House of Commons	220 00	4,158 00
1879.....	Romaine, E. C., Inspector Inland Revenue	352 00	10,878 72
1887.....	Ross, Thomas, Accountant of Contingencies	832 00	14,559 36
1871.....	Rubidge, F. P., Assistant Engineer, Public Works.....	48 00	39,916 80
1884.....	Russell, Lindsay, Surveyor General.....	832 00	17,049 12
1881.....	Scott, F. G., Clerk, Finance Department	28 00	10,662 24
1871.....	Scott, Thos., Chief Architect.....	600 00	9,040 00
1877.....	Small, W. M., Clerk, Post Office, Meaford	176 00	4,269 16
1881.....	Smyth, J. S., Keeper of Lighthouse, Nova Scotia.....	53 75	4,214 00
1881.....	Stephens, Chas. L., Clerk in Post Office Inspector's Office..	200 00	6,158 88
1879.....	Thomas, G. W., Landing Waiter.....	55 00	2,090 88
1886.....	Tomilson, J., Department of Railways and Canals.....	750 00	12,674 61
1886.....	Torrance, J. A., Finance Department.....	667 50	10,011 60
1887.....	Travis, J., Stipendiary Magistrate.....	960 00	5,760 00
1885.....	Vradenburgh, Henry, Customs.....	336 00	4,520 00
1872.....	Vincent, O., Library Messenger.....	7 50	10,460 00
1889.....	Walsh, T. J., Cullers' Office, Quebec.....	540 00	6,300 00
1871.....	Watson, John, Lock Tender, Welland.....	9 75	1,701 12
1883.....	Weber, A., Post Office Clerk, Toronto.....	255 20	3,763 20
1887.....	Wicksteed, G. W., Law Clerk, House of Commons.....	1,088 00	19,039 68

My reason for detaining the House by reading over this list is to point out the objectionable manner in which the Act is administered. I have given those who have been drawing on the resources of the Dominion credit for more than they have paid, and the amount drawn for superannuation is that which will be drawn up to the 30th of this month. I may add that every name on the list is that of an officer who has been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite. I contend that under these circumstances, in face of all these facts, it is quite time in the interests of the country that we should abolish the system. There is no necessity to keep it in existence, and I now move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I should like to call the attention of the House to the provisions of the Bill before the motion is put, because in my opinion this is a Bill which must be introduced on the responsibility of the Crown, if introduced at all. This Bill contains certain provisions, and it seems to me on reading it carefully—though at first glance I thought the first section might have gone—that the whole Bill hinges upon section 3, which is as follows :—

Any person now in the Civil Service of Canada, or any person so appointed after the passing of this Act, shall upon his retiring from the public service, or if he dies when in the service, his legal representatives shall upon his death be entitled to the repayment of the whole amount of the deductions from his salary under the provisions of the said Act, together with interest thereon calculated and compounded at the rate of five per cent per annum on conditions hereinafter provided by this Act.

It seems to me that this creates a charge on the public revenue, which it is not competent for any private member of the House to impose by any Bill introduced into this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I submitted the Bill to the Law Clerk of the House, and asked him with respect to my right to introduce it as a private member, and he agreed that I was quite within my right in introducing it, and I have done so.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Law Clerk is simply concerned with drafting Bills, and he will draft a Bill for any member. The hon. gentleman should have known that he has not the power to bring in such a measure as this, without the assent of the Crown.

Mr. McMULLEN. I submitted the Bill to the Law Clerk, and he held that it was quite within the right of a private member to introduce such a Bill. If the Government are prepared to assume the responsibility of ruling the Bill out on this ground, well and good.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must not place on the Government the responsibility of ruling out his Bill. That responsibility devolves on the Chair. If my opinion was that the Bill was in order, the opinion of the Government would not prevail in inducing me to decide that it was out of order. Not being in order, the second reading of the Bill cannot be put.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think my hon. friend has proceeded on the assumption that it can scarcely be held to involve a charge on the public treasury, as under it provides for the full amount to be repaid.

Mr. FOSTER. With 5 per cent compounded interest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, but if the Government choose to retain the money at that rate of interest, that is a different matter.

Mr. FOSTER. That gives a claim to the person superannuated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But, the hon. gentleman will see that my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) is proceeding all along upon the assumption that there is to be no charge upon the public revenue, and that it is simply a trust on the part of the Government, created on behalf of those in the public service. On that ground, I think it would be worth some little consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I have not had a very great deal of time to give consideration to this matter, but my own opinion is very decided, that the provision in the Bill that the Government is to pay 5 per cent compound interest, constitutes a charge upon the public revenue. The provision of the Bill, if I understand it aright, is that any person now in the permanent Civil Service of Canada, and having contributed to the superannuation fund, shall be entitled to select whether he shall retain his right to superannuation under the provisions of the Act, or abandon the same, and accept in lieu thereof the provisions of this Bill. Now, if he abandons his right to superannuation under the present Act, and accepts the provisions of this Bill—if the Bill passes and becomes law—clearly the Government would be bound to pay 5 per cent compound interest upon the amount paid in, not only to the individual himself, but to his legal representatives in case of his death in the service. It seems to me, so far as I am able to judge, that it certainly imposes a charge upon the public revenue.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, you will recollect that this is not the first time this question has been before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in that form.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Never mind the form. It does not matter whether it was by resolution or Bill, because if a private member has a right to introduce a resolution, he would have the same right to introduce a Bill. One of the most distinguished members the House has ever had, and who was leader of the Opposition at the time, introduced a resolution in 1882 on the identical lines the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) adopted; and with the clause which Mr. Speaker has said is beyond the power of a private member to introduce. Of course, that is not conclusive.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the resolution?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was introduced by Mr. Blake, providing that the Civil Service Act should be amended in the identical direction that my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) provides for. The principle in itself was so eminently just that it commanded the assent of a very large number of the members of this House. The motion was lost on a party vote, but I have heard expressions of opinion from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that the principle involved was just, and that if party ties were not pressed, it would command the assent of a large majority of the members. That resolution was brought up a second time by another hon. gentleman on this side of the House. The point of order which is now taken by yourself, Mr. Speaker, never was raised, nor was it thought of by any hon. member. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) followed the precedent set by Mr. Blake, and adopted afterwards by another prominent member of the Opposition. Mr. Blake's motion was debated in this House for several days, and I submit that my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) had a good, honest right to assume that he was fairly within his right when he made the same proposition in the form of a Bill. There may be something in what Your Honour says, and as I have not had an opportunity of looking closely into the rules of Parliament in the matter, I will not express an opinion one way or another. Unless you are very thoroughly satisfied, Sir, as to your ruling, I venture to hope that the matter should not be fin-

ally decided by you at the present time, without your looking into the question more closely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The procedure, no doubt, followed by Mr. Blake was under the practice referred to by Dr. Bourinot in his work, at page 336:

A practice has grown up in the House of allowing the introduction of resolutions by private members, when they do not directly involve the expenditure of public money, but simply express an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant. As this is a question not always understood, it may be explained that such resolutions, being framed in general terms, do not bind the House to future legislation on the subject, and are merely intended to point out to the Government the importance and necessity of such expenditure.

There is the distinction, I submit. The Bill the hon. gentleman has now in hand does not ask the House to bind itself to a mere expression of opinion, but it asks the House to commit itself to specific legislation which involves directly a charge upon the Crown.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would submit also, that as the measure of my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) is directed to the object of materially reducing the burdens of the people, that it is well within the purview of any member of this House. I grant you he cannot add to the burdens of the people by his Bill, but if he can materially reduce those burdens, he makes out a strong case why he is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) desires that I should look further into this question, I have no objection to doing so. I may tell him, however, that my opinion is very decided with regard to it at present, and it will require strong evidence to convince me I am not right with regard to the position I have taken.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ST. THOMAS, ONT., POST OFFICE.

Mr. CASEY asked, What additions have been made to the salaries of the postmaster and of each of the employees in the post office at St. Thomas, Ont., within a year, and when?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No changes have been made in the salaries of the postmaster and employees in the post office at St. Thomas during last year.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT—SPECIAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CASEY asked, 1. What are the names of all the persons, not members of the permanent Civil Service, who have been or are now employed by the Customs Department during the past five years in the manner of and for the purposes described in the answer given by the Controller of Customs to a question on 30th May ult., as follows:—

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know that any individual is so employed at the present time who is not a member of the Civil Service. It is only when an important question arises at a time when our regular staff is fully occupied, or when a question is so technical in its nature as to render advisable the employment of one technically qualified to make the investigation, that individuals might be employed temporarily in this connection.

2. During what periods has each been employed? 3. What class, or classes, of merchandise has each made investigations or reports in regard to? 4. In what country or countries has each been employed? 5. What pay or allowance has been given to each? 6. What was the occupation of each at the time of his employment? 7. Which, if any, continued, during the time of his employment, to do business as a manufacturer of merchandise of the same classes as those in regard to which he was or is employed to investigate or report, or of similar kinds, or to act as the agent or employee of such manufacturers; or is now so doing business, or acting in such capacity? 8. What are the names of all other persons, not members of the permanent Civil Service, who have been employed during the said period to report to or advise the Department of Customs in regard to the value or classification of merchandise, and what are the particulars in regard to them as above asked for in paragraphs 1 to 8, inclusive of this question?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. F. S. Belton, William P. Atkinson, and T. J. Hawthorne. 2. Mr. Belton has been employed for the last eight years as secretary or assistant to Mr. Chief Inspector McMichael, and a portion of his duties has always been to investigate prices of various classes of merchandise. Mr. Atkinson was employed from the 3rd to the 30th April, 1895, and Mr. Hawthorne, on several occasions during the period between the 17th July and the 13th November, 1894. 3. Mr. Belton has made investigations and reports in regard to a great variety of goods. Mr. Atkinson was employed to investigate the prices of bicycles, information on that subject being necessary, and the officers usually employed at such work being otherwise engaged. Similarly, Mr. Hawthorne

was employed to investigate the prices of scythes and axes. 4. In the United States. 5. Mr. Belton's pay for a portion of the time was $2 per day, and later $2.50 per day and travelling expenses. Mr. Atkinson's pay was $2 per day and travelling expenses. Mr. Hawthorne received an allowance of $110.70, including travelling expenses. 6. As to Mr. Belton and Mr. Atkinson, I am not aware what business they were engaged in at the time they were employed in the Customs service. As to Mr. Hawthorne, I understood that he was connected with the manufacture of scythes and axes, and harvest implements, and it was because of his technical knowledge of the values, qualities and markings of the various brands of scythes and axes that the department secured his services. 7. Though having no particular knowledge of the matter, I presume that Mr. Hawthorne resumed his former employment, as he was engaged in the work of the department for only a few weeks. Mr. Atkinson is making no further investigation.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved that, on Friday next, the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts by repealing section 14 and substituting the following therefor :—

"14. If any judge of a Superior Court who has continued in the office of judge of a Superior Court in Canada, or in any of the provinces, for fifteen years or upwards, or who becomes afflicted with some permanent infirmity disabling him from the due execution of his office, resigns his office, Her Majesty may, by letters patent under the great seal of Canada, reciting such period of office, or permanent infirmity, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary annexed to the office he held at the time of his resignation, to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

"2. Courts of Vice Admiralty and the Maritime Court of Ontario shall be deemed to have been Superior Courts, local judges in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court to be judges of a Superior Court, and stipendiary magistrates within the North-west Territories to have been judges of a Superior Court, within the meaning of this section."

Motion agreed to.

PENITENTIARY ACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 66) further to amend the Penitentiary Act. He said : The Bill is mainly for the purpose of enabling the Federal Government to enter into arrangements with the various provincial governments or local authorities regarding the care of criminal lunatics. It was proposed some time ago, as the House will remember, to ask for a grant to enable the federal authorities to obtain a suitable building in connection with the Kingston penitentiary for this purpose. That expense will be saved and every desirable purpose attained in this connection by the adoption of this Bill. For instance, instead of the authorities being compelled, as heretofore, to pardon the criminal lunatic, the lunatic now will be transferred, if we can make arrangements with local authorities—and I do not think there will be any difficulty in doing so—to one of the provincial asylums, and should it turn out that the insanity was feigned or should the lunatic recover his senses before the expiry of his term of imprisonment, this Bill gives the federal authority power to send him back to the penitentiary for the balance of his term. The first clause is perhaps not absolutely necessary for this object, but it was deemed best to insert it here in consequence of some experience of the administration of the department. It provides that the Governor in Council may, when the incumbency of the present accountant expires by death or otherwise, abolish his office, in which case the duties will devolve upon the inspector, who, it is believed, will be able to discharge satisfactorily the duties of both offices.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the hon. Minister of Justice has considered the question whether the simple certificate of the surgeon of the penitentiary is as much evidence of insanity as is required by the various local governments, in ordinary cases, to admit patients into their asylums for the insane, because it would be rather a pity to have any dispute on that point later. Very likely more stringent provisions are required in the provinces before they admit ordinary patients. When in committee we can get further information on that point. Then there is the other question about arrangements with the Lieutenant-Governor as to payment, and so on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly, we could not put any one there without their authority.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LAURIER. I would imagine from this first section that the Minister of Justice is of opinion that the office is useless. If such be the case, why not abolish the office at once ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We may reach that conclusion, but I would not be warranted in stating, as a matter of fact, that we have the material on which we could reach that conclusion positively. The impression is that the present inspector will be able to do the work, but he has only been in office a short time. He is a particularly good accountant and a man in the vigour of life, and we expect to be able to do this ;

but I do not think it would be safe to make the doing of it obligatory. We take the power to abolish the office and express our intention of doing so, unless we find it impossible in the public interest. It will be unsafe at this juncture to abolish that office. It is sufficient for the present that we declare our desire to proceed in the direction of that economy. There was no agitation or inquiry suggested in any committee with reference to the getting rid of this office.

Mr. LAURIER. The legislation which the hon. gentleman proposes is altogether dependent on the fitness of the inspector to discharge both offices. If he turns out to be a good man, then the other office will be abolished ; but if he should not reach the expectation of the Minister of Justice, the other office will be continued. But I will put it another way to the hon. gentleman. Suppose that the accountant dies to-morrow—then the office is abolished and the duties would devolve upon the inspector, as to whose competence the hon. gentleman is not satisfied. The hon. gentleman must see that it is not reasonable to base legislation upon the contingent capacity of the incumbent of an office. He must decide whether there is work for two officers, or only one. If there is work for two, let it be provided that two officers shall be appointed, and if only for one, let it be so stated, and let a competent officer be selected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman gives altogether the credit to the department that it deserves in the effort that it is making.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish I could.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Suppose the hon. gentleman's views should prevail, what would the position be ? We should have two officers, as the law now provides.

Mr. LAURIER. Not necessarily.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly. I am not stating to the House, as I am not sure that, in the public interest, we could afford to abolish that office.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to hear you say that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will give the reason. We are not in possession of the slightest evidence that this clause would work. But between this and the meeting of the next Parliament, we might come to the conclusion that we are able efficiently to administer the department without this officer. In such a case we could not take a single step until another session. I do not stand strongly upon this. I thought it would be better to come to Parliament and state that, a new officer having been appointed to the position of inspector, possessing all the qualities for the discharge of these duties, that it might be that as soon as he had an opportunity to get his work in hand—and he has not had that opportunity, as the hon. gentleman will see, as he was appointed only two or three months ago—this economy could be carried out. If so, the Government would be prepared to carry it out. But, certainly, with only two or three months' experience for the inspector—he has not had the time even to visit all penitentiaries under his supervision—it would be impossible for us at the present moment to say to Parliament that we are prepared to take this step. But we can say that if we are able to do so, we will.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me there is another point in this question. I do not know whether I am right in my conclusions or not. This clause says :

> At any time after the present accountant of the penitentiaries ceases to hold that office, the Governor in Council may abolish the said office.

And so on. It seems to me that that installs the present incumbent during his natural life. Suppopse the hon. gentlemen now on the treasury benches should be replaced by some other Cabinet, who should find that this economy could be carried out. It seems to me that this would place this officer in such a position that the Government could not deal with him, but would have to come and ask authority from Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No ; that is not the object, nor would that be the construction.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know the hon. gentleman's object, but it seems to me that would be the effect of the clause.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the hon. gentleman will accept my assurance that this Bill does not affect the officer's status in regard to any matter of discipline under the Civil Service Act. That is not the intention, nor is it the effect of the language. But, of course, so far as that is concerned, we do not propose ruthlessly to abolish this office.

Mr. LAURIER. This is the effect of what the hon. gentleman says : We have made an appointee to the position of inspector within the last few months, and we think we have appointed a good man. If he turns out to be as good a man as we suppose, he will be able to discharge the work of two officers, and there will be a saving ; but if he is not equal to the discharge of these duties, two officers will be appointed, and you will have two men to do the work which might be done by one if he were a competent man and able to do the work. The whole of this section, according to the hon. gentleman, depends upon the compe-

tency of the incumbent of one of these offices. This cannot be a reasonable basis of legislation. The only basis upon which the hon. gentleman can proceed is to decide whether there is work for one or two officers. I assume that all the officers of the Government are competent for the discharge of their duty. If so, the whole question resolves itself into this: Are one or two officers required for this work?

Mr. DALY. I do not think the hon. gentleman sees the effect of this clause. It is not a question of competency altogether, but a question that only experience will enable the Minister of Justice to decide the question whether or not the inspector can find time both to inspect the different penitentiaries and to perform the duties of accountant. There are five penitentiaries in Canada, and it seems that the officer, no matter however competent he may be, is going to find his work cut out for him. All that this Act contemplates is that if the present inspector, who is acknowledged to be a competent officer, finds that he can accomplish duties of both inspector and accountant——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At the same salary.

Mr. DALY—at the same salary, then, after the present incumbent of the accountant's office ceases to hold that office, his office shall be abolished. The section is twofold—first, to abolish the office of accountant if the inspector finds that he can fulfil the duties of that office as well as those of the inspector, and, second, on the abolition of the office of accountant, the duties and powers appertaining to that office shall devolve upon the inspector.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why not alter the clause to read: "Any time after the passage of this Act, the Governor in Council may abolish the office of accountant of penitentiaries." Then it leaves it for the Government to say whether the office of accountant shall be abolished or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like some information on this point. The executive Government of the country can create such offices as it deems proper, where they are not created by statute, and the statute limits the prerogative in that respect. Is not the accountant appointed during pleasure? He surely is not appointed during good behaviour?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is appointed the same as any other officer. The appointment is provided for in the Penitentiaries Act, which reads as follows:—

The Governor in Council may appoint a fit and proper person to be the accountant of penitentiaries, who shall be an officer of the Department of Justice, and he shall be charged generally with the direction, inspection and audit of the books, accounts, money transactions and financial affairs of the penitentiaries.

And so on. Thus he is appointed by the Governor in Council, and holds office during pleasure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But, according to this section, you seem to imply otherwise.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think there is any importance attached to that. The drafting simply had regard to the——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not skilful drafting.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think there is anything objectionable in these words; but I do not attach much importance to the form of words, and we have no objection to them being taken out.

Mr. LAURIER. Make it read that at any time the Governor in Council may abolish this office.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there no way under the law by which you can relieve the public service of unnecessary officers after they have been appointed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I stated to the House at the start that the reason for asking this was in order to remove a number of doubts as to our power, because, while Parliament gave authority to the Governor General to appoint an officer, it had charged that special officer with special duties; so it might have been argued that if we had abolished the office there was no other officer to perform the duties. The object of this clause is to remove that doubt, and to say that the officer who is appointed after the office is abolished, shall have the same duties.

Mr. MULOCK. I think if there is no power to relieve the public service of an unnecessary officer, that power cannot be taken a moment too soon. It does seem to me that a person employed in the public service should occupy a higher position than a person appointed in the private service. Does it follow that because a man is appointed to the public service, that whether he is required or not in the public interest, there is no way of dispensing with him during the period of his natural life?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly, we can retire these officers for the greater efficiency and economy of the service, under the Superannuation Act. The trouble was with us that after retiring him, the office still existed, and the man who was appointed to another office could not be said to come under the Penitentiaries Act, because it had there directed that the accountants of the penitentiaries should do all these duties.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has not met the point I make. It appears to me that there ought to be an implied condition in connection with every appointment to the public service, that if the service does not require such an officer, if there is nothing for him to do, then there ought to be a way of relieving the service without putting this man on the charge of the public for the rest of his natural life.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is another question.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a question now thrown upon us by this legislation. It is conceded now that the office is not wanted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was present when we went into committee, but I then explained to the leader of the Opposition that we are not in a position to make that statement, although we thought that it might be found impossible after further experience, to dispense with the officer.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the accountant ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Foster.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have not the Government had ample time, during the absence of this man from the office, to learn whether they cannot permanently dispense with his services as accountant ? How many months has he been absent, for instance, as warden of the Manitoba penitentiary ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Parliament has twice voted additional sums to officers who have undertaken to do the duties of this officer during his absence. He has been absent, I should say, over a year ; and the department has, up to recently, felt a great deal of inconvenience on that account. There has been more than the ordinary work put upon the other officers, and for that reason Parliament has given them an additional amount. But I do not think it can be argued that because an officer may be spared temporarily from his office, the office should be abolished, or that it is not required. We know that, both in our service and in the British service, very long leave is given, under certain circumstances, and on the understanding that no further charge will be put upon the treasury in consequence, and that others do these duties during the absence of that officer. But you could not argue directly from that fact that the office was unnecessary ; and certainly, I have not sufficient information to enable me to state to the House that we do not require that office, though I believe it will be found eventually that we can do without it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister admits that this gentleman has been absent from his duties for a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From these duties.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, has the department been forced to employ others ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. Mr. Lane, who was assisting him, has been working over-hours. He has been with the inspector as his assistant in discharging these duties, and twice Parliament has voted an additional amount of money to Mr. Lane.

Mr. McMULLEN. Here is a case where an important official has been unable to perform duties outside of the office for which he was originally appointed, who has been absent from that office for twelve months, performing other duties, and during all that time the work of that office has gone on just the same as if he had been there. Now, I think there is ample evidence in that fact to justify this committee in coming to the conclusion that that man's services are really not wanted in that office, and that it should be abolished.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there are two points involved in this section, one of which relates to dispensing with the accountant. As I understand the Minister just now, he says that the assistant is retained along with the inspector to discharge the work, while the services of the accountant are dispensed with. Now, it is rather an unusual way to begin by retaining the services of the subordinate officer and dispensing with his superior. One would suppose that the natural order would be to begin the other way. But I wish to remind the Minister that this section restricts the power of the Crown. Of course, apart from statutory regulation, all the administrative functions——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ? I consented to drop the words that the hon. gentleman thought restricted the discretionary power, because that did not interfere with my object.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The section, even as amended, does so restrict.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It reads this way, "The Governor in Council may abolish the office of accountant of penitentiaries and appoint," and so forth.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this, that in the constitution of a department, in most cases, you have the Crown free to reorganize the department, to say what the duties of the department shall be, and what officers shall be from time to time employed in the discharge of those duties. Now, under this arrangement, suppose you carry this Bill, the prerogative would be altered in this respect, that it would be the inspector, and any person else to whom you might appoint, who would discharge these duties. I think that the hands of the Crown ought not to be tied in that particular. I do not

see any object to be gained. It might be found by experience, in a short time, that another arrangement much more convenient could be made; therefore I do not think you ought to put unnecessary restrictions upon a Minister in that particular.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a feature of the old Bill, and has not worked injuriously to the service. The Penitentiaries Act put these powers in the hands of the accountant; and the hon. gentleman's criticism would apply to both cases. I think the hon. gentleman's argument is largely theoretical; practically, no inconvenience has arisen from vesting these powers in the accountant. The change is certainly very small, when it is provided that the officer who shall perform the duties of accountant after this shall have the same powers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that that is a reason for removing the barrier altogether. The hon. gentleman undertakes to remove it so far as the accountant is concerned and to transfer his duties to another officer. I do not see the propriety of undertaking to tie the hands of the Crown in this particular.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is Mr. Foster doing at present?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is acting warden of the British Columbia penitentiary.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention to make him permanent warden there?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. As I understand this question, this officer, it is thought, is not required in the public service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; that is not so.

Mr. MULOCK. It may or may not be the case: but at the same time I call the attention of the committee to the state of the law. If this be the state of the law to-day, the moment a man is appointed by the Governor in Council to the public service he cannot be removed from office except he is pensioned. We must assume that this is the law, or Parliament would not be asked to relieve the public service of an unnecessary officer. If there were such power existing at the present time to remove such an officer, the Government would not be asking for such power; therefore, I assume that the Government will come to the conclusion as a matter of law that no officer can be removed from the public service unless he is pensioned. A condition should be inserted in the appointment of any officer to the public service that he shall retain office only so long as his services are required. There has been to much pampering on public officials in this way, and now it is necessary to get an Act of Parliament in order to dismiss an unnecessary officer and relieve the public treasury of his services. I submit that it is the duty of the Government, in view of this construction of the law, to introduce at the earliest possible moment a measure asking Parliament to give the Government power to relieve the service of any official not required in the public interest. The fact of the Government asking to-day for this legislation shows the view they take of the law, and that view of the law is the final interpretation of the law so long as it is within their administration. For that reason I hope that before the session is much older, the Minister of Justice or the appropriate Minister, will introduce some measure dealing with this question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I must protest against the hon. gentleman's statement, that the object of this Bill is for the purpose of obtaining power to abolish an officer. The main object of this section, as I have more than once stated, is to vest in the officer who succeeds to these duties the power which Parliament has placed in the hands of the accountant. I do not admit that we come to Parliament confessing that we cannot abolish an office—there might be a question about that. But Parliament has vested in the hands of the Government certain powers, and said that you may appoint an accountant, and that when you have done so that officer is to have certain authority, and very important authority. The duties are not the ordinary duties of an accountant, but are of a special character. He is authorized to audit the accounts and examine them, and perform such other duties as may be required by the Minister of Justice; he shall audit the accounts of the penitentiaries, transmit the same, inquire into the money transactions and financial affairs of penitentiaries, prisons, or hospitals such as receive support wholly or in part from the Government of Canada. He has the power of an inquisitor. This new officer shall have these powers and functions, and, therefore, I do not take the position of the hon. member for North York that the Government cannot do anything without an Act.

Mr. MULOCK. As the Bill was introduced, the Government was only asking to abolish an office. But such officer would have to be superannuated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. He might be promoted.

Mr. MULOCK. The Government would not ask to abolish an empty office. The abolition is asked with a view to dealing with the existing state of affairs, and the effect is an admission that there is one officer too many.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suggest the addition of the words "and such officer as may from time to time be appointed by the Governor in Council."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As hon. gentlemen opposite generally seek to restrict the powers of the Governor in Council, I did not venture to suggest the insertion of the words "such other officer as might be from time to time appointed by the Governor in Council." I was too modest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I hold the Government responsible for the efficient discharge of their duties, and I do not undertake to tie up the prerogative of the Crown by regulations of this sort.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the suggestion with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. LAURIER. You can have the same service time and time again.

On section 3,

Mr. EDGAR. I hardly think that this provision as to proving the insanity of a convict, would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the provinces, because it only requires a report in writing from one surgeon. Under the Ontatio statute, the proof required before admitting an insane person into an asylum is very different. They say : No person shall be admitted into an insane asylum except upon the order of the Lieutenant-Governor (and that refers to special cases which are provided for afterwards) without the certificate of two medical practitioners, each testifying to the signatures of two subscribing witnesses and bearing date within three months of the time of entry to the asylum. That, of course, is to ensure the protection of the liberty of the subject, and I suppose it might be said that the liberty of the convict is not of such importance. In section 6 of the Ontario Act there is a provision for admitting into an asylum those who are imprisoned for an offence, under the authority of any of the statutes of the province, and that may be done upon such evidence as the Lieutenant-Governor deemed sufficient. But, if you look at section 29 you will see that the judges and the medical practitioners have to make a personal examination of a person committed to jail as insane, and under section 33, they have to make a certificate as to the insanity of the prisoner. It would be well for the Minister of Justice to see that he does not introduce a mode of proof of insanity which might be considered insufficient.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have considered the point, and I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) to remember, that we are not dealing with the province of Ontario alone. The most dangerous thing we could do, would be to put any hard and fast rule that would be a condition precedent to our acting under the statute in regard to admission into local asylums. Each province will no doubt have a system of its own with regard to the requirements necessary for the admission of insane patients. We avoid all these difficulties by simply taking power from Parliament to arrange with these various asylums. We must comply with every rule they have and with their terms, and it is to be an arrangement with them on their consent or no arrangement whatever. In following the Act out, we have gone upon our own surgeon's certificates, as we always have heretofore, and while different asylums have different rules and requirements for certificates, it is enough for us to get authority to deal with our patients. We keep on the old lines in that respect. We either make an arrangement with the local authorities, or if we fail, we have to take care of our criminal insane ourselves.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All your arrangements are contingent on an agreement being made with the provinces.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How do you dispose of your insane convicts, if you fail ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We take care of them as we do now. We have some in Kingston at present.

Mr. EDGAR. There is a good deal in what my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says, that he will be forced to comply with whatever the provincial arrangements are, and if he takes that view of the case and is prepared in every case to meet the objections, that might remove the difficulty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In Ontario they have been most obliging even under present circumstances. Some patients that it would have been impossible for us to have properly treated at Kingston, have been taken off our hands by the local authorities by arrangement ; but we have had to pardon the prisoners in order to send them to the asylum. One or two cases have been mentioned to me by my officers where the insanity was of a very short duration, and the prisoner escaped punishment in that way.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister think that the certificate of one surgeon will meet all cases ? The surveillance in the penitentiary is much stricter than in an asylum, and a prisoner who, on the certificate of a single surgeon may be removed to an asylum, may be less carefully guarded there, and escape. That has happened. Recently in the States a very dangerous criminal, a train robber, succeeded in satisfying the prison surgeon that he was insane, upon which he was taken to an

asylum, and escaped. I think the Minister should provide that the prisoner shall not be allowed out of the penitentiary unless he is clearly proved to be insane.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We provide the double check, consisting of the certificate of our own surgeon, and the approval of the local authorities, which, in most cases, depends on the certificate of two physicians.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the opinion of the two physicians will be much more than an echo of the original opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is from the standpoint of the province.

Mr. EDGAR. If you provide in the Bill that the dangerous lunatic should not be taken away from the prison until he had been accepted as insane, there would then be the double check before removal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He never leaves custody.

Mr. EDGAR. He does not leave custody, of course, but my hon. friend's point was that a dangerous prisoner, feigning insanity, might deceive a surgeon, and be sent out under insufficient protection, and escape.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We must take that risk, which I think is not great.

Mr. EDGAR. But it would be easy to remove that risk by inserting the words: "Before removal from the penitentiary."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the point my hon. friend urges arises from a misapprehension of the manner in which patients are admitted to asylums. No patient is admitted on the certificate of one physician; of course, in this I speak for my own province only, he requires the certificate of two physicians. The examination will undoubtedly take place in the penitentiary, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, in this Bill, provides that the examination by the surgeon in the penitentiary shall be really a groundwork on which application is made to the provincial authorities for the admission of the prisoner to an asylum. Then the usual course pursued is to employ two physicians to examine and report, and upon their report the patient is admitted to the asylum.

Mr. EDGAR. That is exactly what I contend for. All I want is the additional protection of whatever may be required in the province.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We shall have three physicians instead of two.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, but where?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the man leaves our hands.

Mr. EDGAR. That is all I ask, that you should insert the words "before removal"; otherwise the prisoner might be taken away under such guard as the warden chose, without a sufficient certificate of insanity.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am warranted in resisting the suggestion of the hon. gentleman——

Mr. EDGAR. Of the Secretary of State?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the Secretary of State went that far. We have the authority under the old Act to remove insane prisoners on the certificate of the surgeon, and now, in addition to the checks which the provincial authorities have adopted, and which are satisfactory to the people at large, we bring the opinion of another surgeon. I think these are sufficient safeguards.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it is necessary that safeguards of this kind should be provided. We had a case lately in which a man was committed to prison from the town of Windsor. It was claimed that he was a lunatic, and he was examined by two physicians and the prison surgeon, who declared him to be insane. The result was that, although he was sentenced for six years, after he had been in prison for six months, the Department of Justice turned him loose on the public without any reason whatever, and the next morning he was found with his friends on a front street in Toronto feeling quite happy and comfortable, and he is now in that city. We feel aggrieved at the injustice which has been committed in this case. We have applied to the Department of Justice for a remedy, and I may, perhaps, bring the matter up in the House again on a future day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned that case, which I have heard of. It occurred before I came into the department, and it is one of the cases that have led to this Bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. It was only April last.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The case I have reference to occurred about the time I went to the Department of Justice. Probably it is the same case as that mentioned by the hon. gentleman. There was a gross fraud practiced upon the Government in connection with a prisoner who had been sentenced to the term mentioned by the hon. gentleman. He feigned insanity, and satisfactory representations were made by reputable men that if he were pardoned his people would have him placed in an asylum at their expense. In order to carry out that proposition, a pardon was given to the supposed lunatic, but no sooner had he obtained his liberty than he threw off all guise of insanity and is now at large. Those

who were responsible for this fraud had their conduct mentioned in the proper quarters.

Mr. LAURIER. Who practiced that fraud.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The names are not familiar to me. I would have no objection to get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EDGAR. What penitentiary ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was the Central Prison, Toronto.

Mr. EDGAR. That is a very serious matter. I can understand that the salubrious air of Toronto would have a remarkable effect on the health of anybody, but I can scarcely imagine that the Government officials were in that case without blame. Still, the Government, just as in this case, are prepared to place in the hands of one surgeon—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Three.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, but he is not correct in that statement. This Act provides that if one surgeon of a penitentiary states that a man is insane, that will be sufficient authority for the warden to take that man out of the penitentiary and convey him to the other end of the province, under more or less restraint, and deliver him over to a provincial asylum. My hon. friend says he will have the protection of those two other medical examiners. What will be the use of that, if this man is not insane and makes his escape ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We move prisoners every day.

Mr. EDGAR. But they are not supposed to be insane and are carefully guarded.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We also move the insane. We take them from Dorchester, N.B., all the way to Kingston, which is the only place where we take care of the insane.

Mr. EDGAR. That should not be continued. There is no necessity for doing it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At present there is.

Mr. EDGAR. Not under the proposed legislation. Why not add a few words to make it clear that the explanation which the Secretary of State gives will be carried out, and that before a lunatic is removed to an asylum the certificate of two medical men, or whatever is required by the provinces, shall be obtained.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It would not be workable. Take Nova Scotia, where there is no penitentiary, how can you send a justice of the peace out of Nova Scotia to make an examination in New Brunswick ? He would have no jurisdiction. I entirely disagree with the hon. gentleman. You must bring your prisoner where you must comply with the regulations of the province ; and if he does not pass there, carry him back. It is simply a question of moving him, and that is a matter of frequency.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think that New Brunswick is going to maintain Nova Scotia lunatics.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not except they are paid, and the rate they fix themselves.

Mr. EDGAR. I am not aware that the authorities of one province will take lunatics from another province—pay or no pay.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is something in the contention of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), for although a patient must be examined and certified insane by two medical men before he is admitted to an asylum, patients frequently get well a short time after they go in. If that is done, the next examination which takes place is to ascertain whether the patient is insane or not. That is done by one medical man. It requires two for admission, but the patient may be let out on the certificate of one.

Bill reported.

SALARIES OF JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts, and to provide that the salaries of the judges hereinafter mentioned shall be as follows :—

Two judges of the Circuit Court of the District of Montreal, each $3,000 per annum ;

Five county court judges in Manitoba, each $2,000 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service, each $2,400 per annum ;

The local judge of the district of British Columbia, $1,000 per annum.

He said : I explained the chief change in Supply the other evening, when we took a vote for part of the salary of the Chief Justice of British Columbia, who is the local judge of admiralty. There will be two additional sums required to pay two additional judges who were appointed last session. Up to last session all these sums were included in the Estimates. By an oversight, the legislation is not similar, because years before it was not amended and thus made statutory ; but the votes had run on omitting the incorporation in the statutes of this clause. The additional appointments were in the case of the provisional judicial district of Nipissing, in the province of Ontario, and an additional county court judge in Manitoba.

These are the only two new appointments. The only other change, as I mentioned, is that in British Columbia. The chief justice, who was appointed a short time ago, by virtue of existing legislation, received some $820 less than his predecessor, which brought his salary down to the small sum of $5,000. It is not proposed to restore under this Bill, the salary as it existed from confederation, but it is proposed to increase the salary as admiralty judge by $400, instead of $600, giving him $1,000, and making it correspond with the salary of other local judges in admiralty. That is the local judge—I use that language advisedly, because the local judge means the judge in admiralty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much is this increase ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We give $400, instead of restoring the salary paid to the late chief justice, Sir Matthew Begbie, who was an Imperial appointee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the local judge ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief justice ; and under this he will not have the salary of his predecessor, but he will be $400 better off than he would be without it. We leave the salary as chief justice the same as it was, but this amount gives him a uniform salary as local judge with that paid to local judges elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This adds $400 to his salary ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has that effect ; but it has the justification of making his salary in admiralty the same as that paid in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to ; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman has hardly satisfied the committee that this is a fair deal, at all. I understood from the hon. gentleman that it was not the intention of the Government to take up the question of increasing the judges' salaries at present. Now, you are practically adding $400 to the salary of a judge who, if my recollection serves me right, receives as much in proportion to the work he does as any other judge in Canada. On what ground can Parliament justify singling out this one man from among all the judges in Canada and increasing his salary ? I do not think that this is a time for increasing judges' salaries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear. I agree.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In view of the stringent financial crisis which is still——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We are passing through it, though.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—It will be time enough to talk about increasing the salaries of officials when we get through it. From all indications, from the language of those who have the best opportunities of judging, we have a trying six months ahead of us, yet. I do not think that the expressions of the hon. gentleman hitherto justify him in asking the House to vote $400 a year to this judge. The late Chief Justice Begbie got a very handsome salary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; $5,800 can hardly be called a "handsome" salary for a chief justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But he had more.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And $600 in admiralty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Making $6,400, besides travelling expenses. Comparing that with the salaries of some of the leading judges in Toronto and Montreal, and, judging by the amount of work they are called upon to do, he was very handsomely paid, indeed. If the hon. gentleman is going to attach salary to the office on account of it being a chief justiceship, irrespective of the work to be done, he should remember that there are other parts of the Dominion to be considered besides British Columbia. I am not pressing this course at this time ; I do not acknowledge it as the proper rule. Every one recognizes the enormous amount of work the Toronto and Montreal judges are called upon to do, and Parliament has made a discrimination in the salaries paid to them. I do not say that they are paid enough ; I am not in a position to be able to judge as to that. But I do not think the general condition of the country will justify the increase of the salaries of any judges, much less that of this gentleman in British Columbia. It has never been contended by anybody that he is overworked. Of course, we want to pay him fairly for the honourable position he holds, and the work he does. The salary attached to this office under the late Sir Matthew Begbie is an ample salary, considering the resources of the country, and the peculiar financial position in which we are placed. And the Minister himself has not suggested any reason whatever for the increase, but has merely stated his desire to pay him as judge in admiralty the same as other judges holding similar positions elsewhere. That is not argument. The question is, discharging the duty of judge in admiralty and chief justice as well, are his salaries combined, enough for the work he does, and the dignified position he holds ? I think they are.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is very little difference between the hon. gentleman and myself so far as principle is concerned. He says, and rightly, that there is a general disposition in Parliament not to deal with the subject of increases of the salaries of the judiciary this session; and he knows as well as I know that, under any conditions, there is considerable prejudice on that score, and that the time does not seem to be appropriate for coming down to Parliament and asking for an increase. But he agrees with me. I am certain, and every man who has special information on the subject agrees with me, that, regardless of the opportuneness of the time, or of the popular feeling, the judiciary of this country is not adequately remunerated: that if we have erred in connection with the organization of the judiciary, perhaps it is more in regard to the number of our judges than in regard to their remuneration. And, if I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman was, as I have been, strongly of opinion that there ought not to be such a discrimination in regard to the salaries of judges holding the same rank in the different provinces—that the larger provinces should simply be supplied with the greater number of judges; that the judges of courts of equal jurisdiction and of the same importance in the different provinces should be considered as on the same plane. Nevertheless, Parliament has not taken that view, and so these points are undecided. And, in reference to another of them, I submit that this is a case that can be dealt with consistently with the various views that obtain on these other points. This is not an increase, in fact. It is simply to prevent an undue diminution of the salary in British Columbia.

Mr. LAURIER. How?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For this reason: The predecessor of this gentleman, without demur or complaint, or the suggestion from any quarter that the salary was too large, received $820 over and above the salary that the present chief justice is now receiving.

Mr. LAURIER. What was it before?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was the old salary paid before confederation. When British Columbia entered the union, that arrangement was adhered to, and Sir Matthew Begbie was paid that salary until his death. Then on his death, our legislation provided that the salary of his successor should be $800 odd less, bringing it down to the round $5,000. I ask hon. gentlemen to think of the changed circumstances in that country, at the time British Columbia entered confederation, before the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and before the railway development of that province had begun. Take the expense of living, a matter with which we are certainly more familiar than ever we were. Take, for instance, the difference in his duties, made with the assent of this House, and involving heavier expenses of living in that country. Under these circumstances, I say in common fairness it would be ungenerous of Parliament to hold to the strict letter of that statute, and degrade the office of chief justice by cutting down the salary by $800, when it is known that the next step Parliament takes in connection with the judicial salaries, will be in the direction of raising them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Parliament has done that already. Parliament reduced the salary after the death of Sir Matthew Begbie.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But we should remember that when Parliament did that, the province of British Columbia did not hold the relative importance in the confederation that it does to-day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not many years ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Take into account population, trade, or anything else; take, for instance, our knowledge with regard to the cost of living. Take the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; is it fair that the chief justice in each of those provinces should be paid $1,000 for the admiralty work, while in British Columbia the judge should receive only $600 for that work, and suffer a diminution of his salary of $800 as chief justice? I do not think it is a fair view to take. I do not think this resolution conflicts with the determination of the Government not to ask Parliament to deal with the increase of salaries of the judges. It was certainly in that spirit I submitted the resolution. I did not wish to act inconsistently with what seemed to be the general opinion in this House that we shall not deal with increases at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This gentleman will get $6,700 all round.

Mr. DALY. No; he is put on the same footing as the other chief justices.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He gets $5,000 as chief justice, and he will get $1,000 as judge in admiralty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That will give him $2,000 more.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The others are receiving too little.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why not level up?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In that general increase they will have a strong case. But their case is not now being dealt with. They are getting what they have always received.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are making out a case for them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So much the better for them. But we should not do what is unjust, or treat the chief justice niggardly, because it would make an invidious comparison. The comparison between the puisne judges and the chief would not be so great as it was a few months ago. Already we have voted in this House on this question; we voted in the supplementary Estimates the difference between $600 and the $1,000 for the present chief justice for the period of this year running up to June.

Mr. FLINT. I see by the Estimates that the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia gets $5,000. Does he get an allowance in addition to that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, $1,000 as vice-judge in admiralty.

Mr. FLINT. Where is that provided for?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is in the statutes of 1891. We vote this allowance and put it in the statutes. All the other judges are in the statutes. In 1891 we increased the salaries in the admiralty courts, and there the judge in admiralty in Nova Scotia appears, as you see, receiving $1,000.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice must admit that a few months ago when the present chief justice, Mr. Davie, was appointed to that position, the law did not provide a salary that he now proposes to pay to the chief justice. Mr. Davie was Attorney General of the province, and he knew perfectly well what the legal salary of that office was when he accepted the position. The Minister of Justice cannot pretend that he could not have got a good chief justice for the salary as the law fixes it. Surely the Minister of Justice will not tell the House that any private bargain was made with the Attorney General, that if he took that office his salary would be raised.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly not. I hardly think it respectful to the hon. gentleman or to the House to tell them that no such suggestion was made by the chief justice or by me.

Mr. EDGAR. That is what I was saying. As Attorney General this gentleman knew what salary was fixed by law, and therefore it is absolutely in the discretion of this House to consider whether they will raise the salary of that chief justice. He has no moral claim for any addition, and we have got to place this question on the broad ground of the policy of increasing judges' salaries. Now, I say that it is invidious and improper for this House to undertake to increase the salary of a particular judge over what the law gives him, and beyond what his salary was when he accepted this appointment, without making some general scheme.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister says that the judges of this Dominion are not sufficiently paid. I challenge that statement; I think the judges are very fairly paid. I think it is the duty of every layman in this House to offer pointed and determined opposition to proposals to increase the judges' salaries. Take, for instance, the judge of the city of Toronto. He acts as county court judge, as maritime judge, as surrogate court judge; and he also acts on important arbitrations for which he gets large fees. He discharges the duties of revising officer for that city, and if you add up what he receives for these several duties you will find that he makes something in the neighbourhood of $8,000 or $10,000 a year. Now, will the Minister of Justice say that that judge is not amply paid, and more than paid? It is a singular fact that when a position becomes vacant, either of a junior judge, or a senior judge, or a judge of a county court, even, there are any number of applications made by good and qualified men, men who are generally acknowledged as possessed of ample legal knowledge, efficiently to discharge the duties of the position. Now, if the salaries are so low that the judges are not sufficiently paid, it is a singular thing to find such a rush of applicants to get the appointments whenever a vacancy occurs. I contend that the judges of this country are well paid. I think if you count up all the amounts that the judges receive for the several duties that they perform, you will find that they receive a very ample income. In this case the Minister of Justice is doing an act that will virtually open the way for an application to be filed from every other judge for an increase of salary. He is proposing, outside of any reasonable expectation on the part of the judges or any provision in the Act, to pass a measure to increase the allowance of one judge. The moment that is done, every other judge will desire an increase.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not an increase. The Chief Justice of British Columbia, Sir Matthew Begbie, received $5,820 as chief justice, and $600 as judge of the admiralty court, making a total of $6,420. All I desire the House to do is, to enable the present chief justice to receive $6,000, which will be $420 less than Sir Matthew Begbie received.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The salary paid Sir Matthew Begbie was fixed by the Imperial Government, and was paid by the terms of union so long as he lived. It cannot be accepted as a guide as to the salary that should be paid to the chief justice hereafter. In 1891 the Government had this question under consideration. They submitted their views to Parliament, and the salary of the chief justice was fixed at $5,000. The Minister of Justice now proposes to make the salary $6,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not of the Chief Justice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly. The hon. gentleman attaches to the office of chief justice that of judge of the maritime court, and the joint salary makes the income of the chief justice one-third more than that of his associates on the bench. That is an invidious distinction, and in consequence the hon. gentleman will be compelled to increase the salaries of all the other judges. I ask the Minister of Justice what amount of business has been done by the judge of the maritime court in British Columbia? The salary was fixed at $600 per annum, while it was made $1,000 in Nova Scotia. We all know the great difference in the quantity of work in the maritime court, and as regards maritime contracts likely to come before the judge in British Columbia as compared with the admiralty judge in Halifax or Quebec. The Minister proposes to increase the salary, not on account of the amount of work done, or having regard to incomes earned by leading members at the bar in the province, but solely because a British officer and Imperial employee received a larger salary than Sir John Thompson or Sir John Abbott proposed to allow when the subject was under discussion in 1891. The amount was then determined by Parliament, and when it is now proposed to place at the head of the bench as chief justice, Mr. Davie, the Government would be going a long way in placing his salary at $2,000 more than the salary of any one of his associates on the bench. I should like the Minister of Justice to show the number of cases tried and disposed in the maritime court in British Columbia. If the hon. gentleman were to submit to the House that information a good deal of light would be thrown on the matter, and until he can show that the work of the chief justice is so much more onerous than that of any of the other judges, he will not have established a case to make the discrepancy greater than it now stands.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman has stated that there would be an invidious distinction made if this Act provided that the chief justice should receive an extra $1,000. I think there would be an invidious distinction made against British Columbia if this $1,000 were not granted, for the reason the chief justices of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick receive $1,000 each by virtue of their positions as judge in admiralty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They have something to do for it.

Mr. DALY. Does the hon. gentleman not see as much reason or necessity for having a local judge in admiralty in British Columbia as in Nova Scotia? This whole question came up in 1891. The salaries of the different judges in admiralty were fixed. The judge in admiralty in Quebec was placed at $2,000, so long as the present appointee held the office; in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the salary was placed at $1,000, instead of $600; in Prince Edward Island, at $800, and in British Columbia, at $600. The reason the admiralty judge in British Columbia received only $600 is the fact that Chief Justice Begbie was in receipt of a salary of $5,820. That was the reason why British Columbia was not levelled up to the position of the other provinces; and all the Minister of Justice asks by this legislation is to place British Columbia relatively in the same position as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. As the Minister of Justice already pointed out, Sir Matthew Begbie received $6,420, and the present proposition is to give the chief justice $6,000, or $420 less than his predecessor. In allowing the chief justice $600 per annum as judge of the admiralty court, he is placed in the same position as the chief justices of the courts of Ontario, who receive $6,000 per annum. We are not adding any burdens to the people, because the result of this legislation will be to give Mr. Davie $420 less than was paid to his predecessor.

Mr. LAURIER. All the statements made by the Minister of the Interior are rebutted by the facts of the case. These salaries of judges of admiralty court were revised in 1891, and the scale was then established. Under it the admiralty judge of Quebec is paid $2,000, of Nova Scotia, $1,000, of New Brunswick, $1,000, of Prince Edward Island, $800, of British Columbia, $600.

Mr. DALY. The sum paid in the case of British Columbia was on account of the salary received by Sir Matthew Begbie.

Mr. LAURIER. What is there to show that? Unless there is something on the record to show differently, these salaries were graded upon work done. No other conclusion can be arrived at. If the hon. gentleman is able to show that more work is done in British Columbia than in the other provinces, then there will be some force in the contention presented by hon. gentlemen; but until that is shown we must hold the opinion that the salaries were graded according to the work done, and on no other consideration.

Mr. DALY. Suppose that instead of making the chief justice a local judge in admiralty, we took the senior puisne judge. His salary is now $4,850, and if you gave him the present sum of $600, you would raise him $1,400 over and above the other puisne judges and over the chief justice, and it would be an invidious distinction.

Mr. McMULLEN. The demand made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that we should know the amount of duties devolving upon this judge, and the work

performed by him during the year, is a reasonable demand before we are asked to increase his salary. My hon. leader has drawn the attention of the House to the fact that the Act as changed in 1891 provided for a distinct sum being allowed to these several judges, and that should be sufficient. Why should we be asked to pass a special Act to favour one particular judge? The only excuse for increasing his salary should be that he has more work to perform. Judges are permitted to hold a great many of these offices for which they receive a salary and do nothing in return. I have just grounds for believing that although the admiralty judge in Toronto receives $600 a year as such, he has not had one single case within the year. Is it right that the country should pay $600 a year to a man for doing nothing? This Act must be an advantage to the judge in British Columbia, or else it would not be introduced, and before we pass it, we should know if he has any increased duties to perform to justify it. If he only performs ordinary routine; in the name of common sense, and in the name of the financial position of the country, why should we be asked to spend this money?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I believe that the House is entitled to all reasonable information pertinent to the Bill, and I have no objection to bring down all the information in my possession before the Bill goes through the different stages. I am surprised, I confess, that hon. gentlemen should take the view they do in this case. This is done to prevent a very unfair grievance, and it is not a substantial increase. I would appeal particularly to members from the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There are no differences of opinion amongst the well-informed, but that the judges there are not fairly remunerated for their work.

Mr. McMULLEN. That opinion is confined to the lawyers only.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think so, because the people who suffer from underpaid judges are the business people. You have a state of things in Ontario, for instance, that will illustrate the difficulties that are found in getting good men to go upon the bench and give their services to the judiciary at the best time of their lives. There is an intention exhibited on the part of the Government to increase the salaries of judges at all events in the east, at a proper and suitable time; but that comparison will be most invidious if you have it said that in British Columbia the chief justice is to receive all told for the position of chief justice and judge in admiralty $5,600, whereas the chief justices in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia receive $6,000, and if I remember right, fees in addition. Fees are not paid in British Columbia, but when I practised in Nova Scotia fees were paid to the judge in every case in the admiralty court. I submit that the comparison will be more unfair because hon. gentlemen will agree that the cost of living is, I believe from limited experience, greater in British Columbia than in Nova Scotia. I do not think that for the sake of this $400 a year, to the office of chief justice, that we should take such a narrow view of the situation. The comparison is therefore, that the chief justice of British Columbia at this time and under these circumstances, should not suffer a cutting down of salary by $820, but that he should simply be in the position that the difference between his salary and that of his predecessor, which was not large, shall be $420.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice with more ingenuity than, I think, judicial fairness has presented his views. He represents that the Government is asking this House practically to reduce the salary attached to this office, and that the present incumbent shall receive $400 less per annum than the previous chief justice. The salary of the present chief justice is not based upon what the prior chief justice received at all. The statute which confronted the present chief justice, when he determined to accept office, was perfectly explicit upon that point. It reads as follows:—

> During the incumbency, the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court of the province of British Columbia shall be as follows:—the chief justice of the said court, $5,000 per annum, provided that, during the incumbency of the present chief justice his salary shall continue to be $5,820 per annum.

Thus, by the law which confronted the present occupant when he determined to accept the office, the salary was to be $5,000 a year. Therefore, how can it be said in fairness that the Government are asking the House now to reduce the salary from $6,420 to $6,000? It is a plain proposition to increase the salary, nothing else, and if acted upon in the case of one judge, it will be a precedent for similar action all along the line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I have counted the number of judges mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, and I find that last year we paid salaries to 195 judges of all kinds, superior, county court, and so on. If, without rhyme or reason, you arbitrarily select one judge to-day and increase his salary $400, you establish a precedent for similar increases in the case of the other 194; so that you are asking, not for $400 a year, but for 195 times $400. A short time ago an appointment was made to the office of postmaster in Montreal, for which the salary at the time was $3,000, if I remember rightly, and it was increased $1,000 —why? Not because the duties justified the increase, but because it was said that the postmaster in another city was receiving

$4,000. And so, if to-day you grant an increase of $400 a year to one judge, you will be called upon to repeat the transaction 195 times. Now, this it not the first attempt the Government have made to increase the salaries of the judges in an arbitrary way. Last year they introduced a proposition to authorize them to superannuate any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada who had been fifteen years in some minor position, in the Vice-Admiralty Court or elsewhere, on full pay, if they saw fit—a proposition applicable, in the first instance, to seven judges, and seven judges only. If that proposition had been acted upon, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have been extended until ultimately it found its way into all parts of the Dominion. Is it not reasonable to suppose that this proposition will be extended in like manner? I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, if he is free to tell me, why, frankly, he is asking the House to do this. The present incumbent has been recently appointed. He was a politician, the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia, and he knew what the law was and what his rights were going to be. How comes it now that the Government are asking the House to do this deed? Was there any understanding with this gentleman that the House would be asked to increase the salary? Will the Minister answer that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I will not answer it.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the answer I expected, and I will draw the inference.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are welcome to draw an inference.

Mr. MULOCK. I draw the inference; I may not be warranted in doing so, but if the Government were frank with the public and the public's representatives, they would give us the information and we would not be compelled to draw inferences. I think nothing could warrant the action of the Government, unless there is some understanding between the Government and the judge that this application would be made. The fact that the Minister of Justice is unwilling to deny such a statement, is, I think, some justification for our drawing that inference. For my part, I object to this arbitrary and unfair method of dealing with the salary of this judge.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the Minister of Justice has made out a very good case in his efforts to convince the House that this man is entitled to the proposed increase. If it is based on increased cost of living, all the information that we have is that the cost of living to-day is not half what it was when Sir Matthew Begbie was appointed. At that time, a meal in the west cost $1, whereas at the present time, I understand, living is nearly as cheap there as it is in the east. I do not think it can be due to an increase in the work of the admiralty court, because I do not think the extent of population and the amount of shipping in British Columbia would justify us in supposing that there has been any great increase. If there has been, I think it would be proper for us to ask the Minister of Justice to show that such is the case. Then, if it is claimed that this proposition is made in order to level up the salary to the salaries of other judges, I do not think that is a good argument, because it would then be our duty to inquire whether the other judges were not getting too much. I do not think it is a good argument to say that it is making an invidious distinction not to put the salaries of the judges in all the provinces at the same figure, because the provinces are not all equally important. I think the true ground on which to base the salary is the amount of work to be done, because it cannot be fairly argued that a man who does a smaller amount of work is entitled to as large a salary as the man who does more. I agree with those who hold that our judges are fairly well paid at present. If we compare them with other men in the country who are equally able, and who do as well the work entrusted to them, I think the comparison would be all in favour of the judges. Take the allied profession, the medical profession, and what is the amount of salary attached to the best positions under the Government? It is about $2,000, or from $2,000 to $2,400 at the highest: and the men holding these positions are obliged to give all their time to them. The amount of money they have expended in acquiring a knowledge of their profession is just as great as that which lawyers have to expend in studying their profession, if not more, and their services to the community are worth quite as much as the services of the judges. Therefore, if that comparison is made, it must certainly be against the judges. But one hon. gentleman said that we cannot get the best men in the profession to take a judgeship when such a position becomes vacant. I do not think that is the usual experience. If you open a judicial position to which a salary of $4,000 a year is attached, you will have all the lawyers in the country rushing after it and it will take a body of policemen to keep them away. I agree with those who say that this is only the beginning. An effort was made some years ago to raise the salaries of the judges all round. I am not one of those who believe that their salaries are too low. It may be said that I do not know anything of their work, but I believe that they are proportionately no better than men in other professions. Take ministers of the Gospel, and you will find that the salaries they get are much below those of the judges. The same holds true of the medical profession. There is no justification for the very high salaries the judges are getting and still less justification

for increasing those salaries in particular instances. I agree with those who say that when the chief justice took this position he knew what the salary was, and was willing to accept the position at the salary, and the cost of living was just as great then as it is to-day and no doubt the amount of work also.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was a little taken at the argument of the Minister of Justice, at the inception of the debate, that the late chief justice of British Columbia had received a certain sum and it was therefore not fair that we should pay the successor a much less sum. But my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) entirely knocked the bottom out of that argument, because he showed that the late Chief Justice Begbie's salary was fixed as part of the terms of the union. But the Parliament of Canada specially provided that on his death such excessive salary should cease and his successor would only receive $5,000. To-day we are practically revising a matter which was very carefully considered in 1891. We all remember the discussion that took place when the late Sir John Thompson introduced the Exchequer Amendment Bill providing that admiralty judges be appointed all through Canada. A return was then brought down showing the amount of work done in the various provinces. The largest number of cases was in Nova Scotia, and next came the city of St. John, N.B. Prince Edward Island had only five cases, I think, in three years. What had British Columbia? One case in three years. Sir John Thompson, when the return was brought down, saw how the case stood and fixed the salary in British Columbia at $600.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief justice then received $5,820.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the hon. gentleman knows that he received that sum because he was an Imperial officer before the union. It was for that reason not thought proper to cut down his salary. But Parliament specially provided that his successor should only have $5,000. Sir John Thompson said that he did not think it was fair, under the circumstances, to allow more than $600. We fixed his salary then, after full consideration of the work done in all the different provinces. Some of the judges got more and some less, and the late Sir John Thompson said he thought the existing judge in Quebec was paid twice as much as he ought to get, but that the salary should continue during the incumbent's life and be cut down one-half after his death. What are we asked to do to-day? The very moment the chief justice of British Columbia dies, we are asked to raise his salary $400 more than we fixed it at in 1891. If you are going to increase this judge's salary without a scintilla of evidence that the work has increased or that the cost of living has increased, you will be setting a precedent which will compel you to raise the salaries all along the line. The matter of $400 is not much but the principle involved is a serious one, and I do not think the circumstances justify the hon. gentleman in asking us to adopt this resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is merely a resolution to bring in a Bill. I have said to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I shall be very happy to lay the information he has asked for before the House. Perhaps the House will allow us to report the resolution and bring in a Bill on the understanding that I will not go on with the Bill until I give hon. gentlemen the information they desire.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we adopt the resolution, we will be committing the House to the principle.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to report the resolution, but I cannot consent to its taking another stage to-day.

Mr. PRIOR. Although I suppose this is a matter on which lawyers are expected to argue and not ordinary laymen, yet, as a British Columbian, I may be allowed to say a word. Hon. gentlemen opposite have worked themselves up into a tremendous state of excitement because the Governmnt see fit to bring forward a Bill to give a salary to our new chief justice which they consider commensurate with the service he does the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are kickers on your side too.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) has insinuated that the judges of British Columbia do not do nearly as much work as those in other portions of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman's words are open to that inference, and also the remarks of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I am not a lawyer, but I know that the lawyers and the people generally in British Columbia are of the opinion that the judges are hard worked.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One case in three years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the admiralty.

Mr. PRIOR. The admiralty court is not the only court. It is very amusing to British Columbia members to see the facility with which hon. gentlemen opposite change their opinion. When the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and others were in Victoria, they could not say too much with regard to everybody's salary being raised and money

being spent on the harbour and in every other direction; but on the very first vote asked for in this House in relation to British Columbia—the small amount of $400—they take up the whole afternoon trying to stop it. Not only that, but on every occasion I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to oppose railway subsidies and increases of salary in every possible manner. The gentleman who has just been promoted to the office of chief justice in British Columbia has been known all his life as a most hard-working man, who works day and night in his profession, and I do not think that anybody in British Columbia, no matter to what side of politics he may belong, would say a word against our giving to him as large a salary as we can legally. Whether that $400 can be given legally or not, I am not in a position to say, but I deem it my duty to protest against the view being allowed to go forth uncontradicted that British Columbia judges do not perform a fair amount of work for the salaries they draw. As regards the cost of living, there is no comparison between British Columbia and the eastern provinces. There are some few things, such as fish, pretty cheap, but the general cost of living—wages, house rent and everything else—is far higher, and it is only fair that the chief justice and the other judges there should have larger salaries. They have to travel all over the country and endure much hardship and inconvenience. They have to put up at most miserable hotels in some portions of the outlying districts, and the work they do gives satistion to everybody. We require the very best men we can get as judges in British Columbia and elsewhere, and it is only by paying reasonable salaries that we can get such men to take the positions. Now, I only hope the Minister of Justice will see fit to bring down the return of the work that is done, because I have no doubt that that return will show that the work done is as much as that done by any other judges in the Dominion. In regard to the admiralty court, although there may not be very many cases, there are still a very great many more than there used to be. There must be, because I find that, by the navigation returns, the increase in tonnage has been very large, indeed. Last year, the tonnage in Victoria was 755,691 tons—that is, arrivals. Gentlemen will understand how large a tonnage this is when they consider that Halifax has only 670,000 tons. Nanaimo had a tonnage of 329,655, and Vancouver of 307,654, and the total for the province of British Columbia was 1,482,413 tons. In Nova Scotia the total tonnage for Halifax, Pictou, and a long list of other ports was 1,439,000, a little less than that of British Columbia. That may give hon. gentlemen opposite some idea as to the work there is in the admiralty court.

Mr. PRIOR.

Mr. LAURIER. As the hon. gentleman has referred to me, I have no objection to repeat here in much more emphatic language what I said in British Columbia. I referred to the fine harbour of Victoria, and I said then, as I say now, that it was a disgrace that the rock near the entrance of this fine harbour should be without a light. Let me say to my hon. friend that if I had had the honour to be the member for the city of Victoria, I would have used my influence with the Government of which I was a supporter to have a light put upon that rock, rather than to have a post-office in the city over the site of which there has been a squabble ever since between their friends and among the faithful. I do not admit the justice of the hon. gentleman's remarks as to the Opposition finding fault with this vote. The hon. gentleman must be aware that the vote we have now in view is to remunerate a gentleman, whoever he may be—the chief justice or any other—who shall administer the functions of admiralty judge in a proper manner. Now, this was taken into consideration three or four years ago by the late Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, who stated that, in his judgment, $600 was fair remuneration for the work to be done, especially considering that—whatever the hon. gentleman may say as to the tonnage—for three years there has been only one case before the admiralty court. I am prepared to say here, and to repeat in the city of Victoria, if I have the good fortune to go there again, that, if there is but one case in three years before a court, $600 is at least fair remuneration for the judge at that court. I think the hon. gentleman will not gainsay what I say in this matter. And, if he will discharge his duties properly to the city of Victoria, instead of fighting for this petty item, he will see to it that there is a light on the rock at the entrance of the harbour.

Mr. PRIOR. May I ask the hon. gentleman what rock he refers to?

An hon. MEMBER. He is thinking of Vancouver, not Victoria.

Mr. LAURIER. No, no; I mean Victoria.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that, on the understanding I mentioned, I would move to rise and report the resolution, resuming the discussion when the Bill is before us.

Mr. CORBOULD. I endorse every word the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has said. As this subject is to be discussed when the Bill is before us, I would rather reserve what I have further to say until that time.

Resolution reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia pay and allowances—Permanent Corps and Active Militia..... $45,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Militia might explain why this grant of $45,000 is necessary, and to what services he proposes to apply it.

Mr. DICKEY. The militia vote of last year, as presented to the House, was $482,000. Subsequently, during the session, without any particular reason being given to the House, it was cut down by the sum of $82,000; so it passed the House at $400,000 odd. It was intended, I understand, at that time, to promote economies in the permanent corps, and in the expense of the attendance of members of the active militia of the schools of instruction. But, though something was done in this respect, the department was not successful in keeping the expenditures within the $400,000. They did not go over the original amount asked for; had that amount of $482,000 been taken, this vote would not have appeared. But they are $45,000 short on the expenditure for the permanent corps and militia attending the schools, and this vote will be applied to those purposes for the current year. But the militia vote for last year has not been all expended. However, owing to the Order in Council passed some years ago, the old practice of transferring votes from one purpose to another within a department has ceased, and, therefore, we are not able to apply the unexpended amounts on the other militia items to this service, and we are obliged to come to Parliament for a specific appropriation. This is really asking for leave to appropriate some of our unexpended balances to the particular item I have referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What items do you expect to save on? As I understand, the Minister contends that although this is apparently an additional vote, he won't exceed the sum total, because he will save in other quarters.

Mr. DICKEY. There was a vote for the purchase of arms, which has not yet been used.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the amount of that?

Mr. DICKEY. Between $65,000 and $80,000. That was the reason the other amount has been reduced.

Mr. MULOCK. At this stage, perhaps, it would be interesting if the Minister of Militia could inform the committee whether he has adopted any policy, subject to the endorsement of the House, as to the expenditures upon permanent corps. There is a general feeling throughout the country that too large a portion of the grant for militia purposes is being spent upon the permanent corps. It was argued at the inception of this feature of our militia service, that the establishment of permanent corps would have the effect of placing in various parts of the Dominion, schools where men could obtain the necessary qualifications to entitle them to command companies or battalions. This system has been in force for many years, and has resulted in the establishment of a small standing army in our country that is gradually eating up the grant for militia purposes. As to whether it is accomplishing the object to which I have alluded, I can offer no opinion myself; but I can say that I have received the advice of reliable members of volunteer regiments high up in the service, and I will give to the Minister of Militia the opinions that I have received from them upon this question. With reference to schools established for the purpose of qualifying gentlemen to take commands, I am told that they practically fail to accomplish that object. Under a former system young men were enabled to attend military schools at other than business hours during the day, to receive instruction, and in due time to qualify themselves for commands. At that time there being no barracks, no permanent corps, the young men boarded in their own residences, and were able to discharge their ordinary avocations, the hours of the schools being adapted to the demands of their occupations. But with the establishment of these permanent corps, a new plan has been inaugurated. Now the candidates are obliged to go into barracks, they have to give up all their other callings during the time that they are in barracks, and are obliged to undergo considerable expense. I may say that on this point, I am not giving my own opinion now, but I am giving the opinion of men high up in the militia, one of them being an official enjoying deservedly the confidence of the country, who has seen a great deal of militia service, has been for years in the service, and is as high up as any Canadian can be. He is at present engaged as actively in promoting the militia service as is any man in Canada; and I give you his opinion, amongst others, to the effect that the graduates of the permanent corps to-day are not any better qualified to take commands than were the graduates of the old military schools conducted as I have mentioned. He gave me as an illustration his own experience. This gentleman told me that he had received his certificate under the old regime, and although a considerable interval had elapsed between his qualifying and receiving a command, yet when he was gazetted as a subaltern, he found himself thoroughly qualified to take command of his company, and in due time he obtained a first-class certificate, and now he is a field officer of the

first rank. The present system, then, is not only very expensive, but is a system which practically defeats the object in view. Under the old system, young men attending colleges, putting in their winters at various centres where the system of training and examination obtained, were able to qualify in considerable numbers and then return to the country, and become centres for diffusing the military education acquired by them in this way. Thus there were gradually scattered throughout the country a great many young men ready to take commands whenever vacancies occurred. To-day, how many, in comparison, can qualify? I have not got the figures; but if it is to-day, as I understand, the rule that a man must give up his whole calling and go into barracks for the time being, how many men in our country are able to afford that? The system now in existence discriminates against a great army of industrious people with callings that demand their whole time. It prevents graduates and undergraduates of our various colleges taking practical advantage of the system, and it limits the number. The old system was elastic and inexpensive, and almost any person of industrious habits could, without loss of a day, qualify himself to take command of a company, or even of a regiment. Now, it is only those who are out of employment, or who can so arrange their affairs that they can for the time being give up their ordinary calling, or those with means, who are able to take advantage of this system. The system, therefore, appears to be entirely failing to accomplish the object in view, that of disseminating a military knowledge throughout the Dominion; and it is in addition, absorbing a large portion of the money that should go for the maintenance of the rural battalions. Under these circumstances, I, for one, will be pleased to learn whether the Minister of Militia has considered this question, and if so, whether he is prepared to give his opinion to the committee.

Mr. DENISON. I am glad that the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) has made this suggestion, because it is the plan that I suggested some two or three years ago. I then proposed to revert, more or less, to the old system, or to engraft the old system of schools, if possible, on the present. I explained then my reasons somewhat in the line just taken by the hon. member. I also then showed that very few men could go through on account of the difficulties of leaving their business. There are also other objections, one of which is that a man has either to go in as an officer and go to the expense of purchasing his uniform, or else he has to enter the ranks and attend school, either as a non-commissioned officer or as a private.

Mr. DICKEY. I would suggest to the committee whether, with the view of saving time, we should not let this question lie over, because it will have to be gone over again at a subsequent period. When the Estimates for 1895-96 come up, I shall be called upon to state the policy of the Government as regards the future. This is a vote simply to provide money for the current year, and although a discussion at the present time would probably be quite regular, still I am afraid that if now we have to go into it, the discussion will be repeated on the main Estimates.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not take the discussion now as well as any other time?

Mr. DICKEY. I am quite content to do so, but I think we shall have to go over it all again. I am quite satisfied to briefly state what my own ideas are, but for the sake of the committee, I desire to postpone a long discussion on the whole system at this stage.

Mr. DENISON. There is something in what the hon. Minister has said, but any remarks I make now it will not be necessary to repeat afterwards. As I shall occupy only a short time, I may as well conclude the remarks I was about to offer. I was going on to point out the advantages of the old system, and I hope the Minister will look into it, and have an inquiry made and see what can be done. There is no doubt that under the present system we do not get as much advantage from the schools as we ought to obtain; when I say the schools, I refer to the permanent corps, in the expense of which there has been a steady increase for years past. For the ordinary militia about $290,000 have been appropriated each year, that is, for the drilling of the militia proper. While that amount was greater during the seventies, since about 1880 the expenditure has remained practically stationary, or at about $290,000. The total amount appropriated for the whole militia has somewhat increased, and now it is in the neighbourhood of $1,300,000. What I complain of is, that while the ordinary militia estimate has been reduced and curtailed, and the militia more or less starved, the difference has been expended, I might almost say lavishly, in increasing the permanent corps. There is no doubt that the militia expenditure proper, the amount expended on the men of the force, is a popular expenditure, in fact there is no more popular expenditure than that made on the militia of Canada, but we must not allow the whole amount of the estimate gradually to be diverted from the regular militia, and be expended in paying a staff and permanent corps.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DENISON. When six o'clock was called, I was endeavouring to point out to

the Minister of Militia the necessity of grafting the old system of schools upon the present system. Under the old system, the cadets were given a cheap uniform by the Government, and after a couple of months' instruction they were examined, and if found capable of passing the examination they were given a certificate; and if not, they were allowed another month, and then if they failed they were returned without a certificate, or, if they succeeded, they received $50 and got their certificate. This was a cheap and inexpensive way of instructing a very large number of men, and could, I think, very easily have been grafted on the present system. While I do object to some of the large expenses on the permanent corps, I must not be understood as being opposed to them. I am in their favour in their proper place, but it is not desirable that we should go on increasing the expenses of the permanent corps, year after year, and reducing the expenditure on the regular militia. If we follow that course, in time we will have an expensive set of schools, without any militia to instruct, and that, of course, would do away with the necessity for schools, staff, and everything else. Some means ought to be adopted to try to retain the equilibrium between the permanent corps and the regular militia. I would like to add that while we spend $1,300,000 on militia, and are only enabled to drill one-half of the regular militia, if we could increase that vote by $150,000, or else reduce expenditure in some other way, we could drill the entire militia, which would be of great service to the country. I regret that General Herbert's term is about to expire, because I consider that he is the best general we have had since the time of Sir Patrick Macdougall. However, his five years are about up, and I suppose we shall have to part with him. As an officer of the force, I say he has done a great deal of good in every way. He has helped on the efficiency of the militia generally, and especially has he improved the permanent corps, and made them much more efficient. I would like to read some extracts from a letter evidently written by an officer, or an ex-officer of the force, and which appeared in the "Globe," on the 21st of May, 1895. It shows the manner in which the militia expenditure has been drifting towards the permanent force. He says:

> There is little sign in this country of men who have served in the permanent force being of use as non-coms. in militia battalions; and General Herbert's own express statistics show that the number of men in it who are available as extra instructors is nominally 1 1-5 per cent. Practically, the only use of the men of the force as instructors would, if carried out, be to drill with attached non-coms. from the ordinary militia force, and to furnish the men by drilling whom attached officers may qualify.

Again, he says:

> Again, a large sum is expended yearly for clothing. The private in an average city battalion, as he stands on parade, has his tunic, a pair of trousers, a great coat and a forage cap—in some corps he provides these himself—coming from the Government; his helmet and leggings belong to his corps, and his underclothing and boots are supplied by himself, and exceedingly inefficient for actual campaigning these articles, especially the boots, usually are. And there are many corps whose Government clothing is worn out and shabby to the last degree. Compare with him the man of the permanent corps, provided for, from helmet to boots, with winter and summer clothing and necessaries, and judge as to what share of this allowance for clothing goes to the permanent corps, who are daily in uniform, and what share to the rest of the militia, who wear their clothing only during drill. The benefit of the outlay upon furniture and utensils, &c., goes to the instructional troops. Of late several officers and men have been sent to Britain for instruction, and this swells the expenditure by over $2,000.

He gives an estimate that he has made up, evidently as carefully as he could, of what the permanent corps takes out of the militia grant of $1,300,000. He says:

> The account for the cost of the permanent force, looked at in this light, mounts up as follows:—

Pay and allowances	$215,033
Provisions, supplies, &c.	98,472
Clothing and necessaries, say	50,000
Remounts	6,684
Artificers, horse-shoeing, &c.	8,560
Barrack services	17,006
R.C.A. Institute, Quebec	500
Expenses of trip to England	2,023
Change of uniform, R.C.D.	750
Modern rifles	16,156
Military properties	47,263
Warlike and other stores, say	20,000
Total	$482,447

Then he goes on to say that each certificate costs the country $1,564. Of course, I do not consider that is a fair estimate, because we no doubt have the permanent corps there and the militia behind them as a police force, and for helping the civil power if necessary. Under the old system of schools, I fancy that each certificate did not cost the country more than $100 or $150. I would again press upon the Minister of Militia the desirability of looking into this matter and endeavouring to graft the old system of schools upon the present system; and to see if it cannot be carried out in conjunction with the present system in an extensive manner.

Mr. DICKEY. When I deprecated extended discussion on this vote, I assure you it was not that I wanted to avoid a discussion on the militia estimates, because, as everybody in the House knows, I am entirely ignorant of the details of the department I am now administering, and I shall be more than glad to have suggestions from every quarter of the House, from gentlemen who are much more competent to deal

with the matter than I am. It is, therefore, not for any purpose of precipitating a general discussion that I say anything at all to-night upon the general policy. I am indebted to the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) for the suggestions they have made, and I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Denison) that his suggestion with reference to incorporating the old system of schools upon the new will receive my earnest attention, when I have time to make some reforms in the Militia Department, as I sincerely hope to be able to do. With respect to the permanent corps, I may tell the committee that my present intention is to reduce them to 800 men and officers, which the committee will see is a very material reduction. I also hope to make them more generally serviceable in the drilling of the active militia, and the furnishing of drill instructors. I do not know that at the present time it is necessary for me to say anything more upon this particular item. The vote asked for is a vote for the current year, and in connection with the policy of the department for which I am not personally responsible. It does not apply in any way to the reduction I propose to make in the permanent corps; that will come in the next year's Estimates. It is asked from the House simply to discharge the obligations of the Government with regard to the present establishment of the permanent corps.

Mr. SCRIVER. What is the strength of the permanent corps now?

Mr. DICKEY. It is quite up to the average of 1,000 men.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the Minister of Militia takes the advice of any member of this House in the administration of his department, he will be the first Minister who has ever done so since I have had the honour of a seat in Parliament. We have had discussion after discussion on militia matters, and I have never yet discovered that the slightest result came from them. It was pure waste of time, so far as the force is concerned. The Militia Department went steadily on in the path in which they started some years ago, magnifying the permanent corps into a standing army at the expense of the rest of the force. Last year they increased it beyond what the law allows; but this Government pays no attention to the law. The law allowed 1,000 men, and they increased the force to 1,100. Now they propose to reduce to 800 men, and they might reduce it very much more. I think 500 men would be ample for the country or the force. I am not averse to the schools of instruction, but I do protest against their body being regarded and kept up as a standing army at the expense of what is really the army of Canada, that is, the active militia. While I think it would be very proper to postpone the general discussion of this question until the main Estimates are before us, a word may be said of the way in which the Government have treated the force during the past year, showing how little the interests of the officers and men of the force have been consulted as to what is their chief interest, the annual drill. Twelve months ago they were under orders to go to camp. That order was not rescinded until the time had elapsed when we should have been in camp. The officers and men went to considerable trouble and expense in preparing for camp, and nothing came of it; all that trouble and expense was thrown away. Naturally, the officers and men felt aggrieved that, after having been ordered to camp and having made preparations for it, no provision was made for their going. This year, about the 15th May, we were told most unexpectedly—for there was nothing in the Estimates for the purpose—to prepare for camp, barely more than four weeks being allowed for preparation. I would like the hon. Minister to understand one thing, what I have not yet been able to get any previous Minister to understand, that there is nothing more injurious to the force than to give these orders for drill without sufficient time being allowed for preparations to be made. Unless the men know early in the spring that they are going to camp, they make other engagements; and it is exceedingly unfair, both to employers and employees, to order camp at short notice. When an employee goes to his employer and informs him that he has been ordered to camp, the employer naturally asks him, "Why didn't you tell me before?" and it is not unnatural that he should say, "If you go without giving me notice, you need not come back." Therefore, it is exceedingly necessary that there should be some certainty about this matter. With regard to the general subject of the instruction of the force, I am quite prepared to advocate the continuance of the schools on a very much reduced scale, and their being treated simply as schools of instruction and nothing else, which could be done with at least half the men now employed. At present they are perfectly useless for instruction. The whole work is done by two or three non-commissioned officers, and the rest of the expense is practically thrown away. However, I do not intend to go into a general discussion to-night, partly because I have found it to be useless to do so, although I do hope, from the spirit shown by the present Minister, that we may look for better things in the future. I am afraid that the Minister of Militia is a very unimportant member of the Cabinet, for the interests of the militia force are always the last to be regarded and the first to give way to political exigencies, as I think has been plainly seen this season. It is perfectly clear that there was no intention to drill the force when the Estimates were brought down. However, it is some satis-

faction to see that the proposition to allow the force to go another year without drill was so exceedingly unpopular in the country that at the last moment the Government had to give way. That is not the way the force should be treated, and I trust it is the last time that it will be so treated, for nothing would sooner bring about its complete demoralization and disorganization. I trust that we are now going to enter upon a new regime with a Minister who will consider the interests of the officers and men who make great sacrifices to keep up the force, and that ultimately we may arrive at the object we most desire, that is, an annual drill, instead of the present fluctuating system.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to express my pleasure at the remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia, if he will only carry out the suggestions that he has made. We have had such promises made very often in the past, but instead of the department making some improvement, they have made changes which, I think, will be admitted by all connected with the force to have been unsatisfactory. I say with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that if the present system of administration goes on, we shall have the whole force disorganized. There is not the slightest doubt that the administration of this year has given a great deal of dissatisfaction. The disappointment of not going out last year on the part of some battalions that expected to go out, and that had made preparations for doing so, and again this year the calling out of the battalions on short notice, have greatly incommoded the officers and men of the force. However, it is almost too late to find fault with that now; we have to make the best of it. I simply want to take the opportunity of pointing out to the Minister the very great desirability of adopting some new system that will be satisfactory to the country, and at the same time within the amount of money which the country is willing to advance for militia purposes; and then the system should be carried out faithfully in the best interests of the force. I must say that during the last few years a great deal of dissatisfaction has arisen, and while I would not undertake at present to offer any particular suggestions as to what should be done, or to criticise the permanent corps as it exists at present, if it were possible and in accordance with public opinion to grant a larger amount of money for the maintenance of the militia force in the country, it might be a good thing to have a permanent corps something on the basis now existing; but if that is not practicable, then it will be necessary to adopt the suggestion made to-night by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) and others, to reduce the schools to the position originally intended, that of schools of instruction, instead of spending the amount of money which is at present expended at the sacrifice of what we consider the best element of the force, the militia in the rural districts. I wish to take this opportunity of saying to the Minister that I think the present system of brigade camps requires his very careful consideration. Speaking for the battalion to which I belong, in the section of the country which I represent, we have found this system of brigade camps very unsatisfactory. I am confident that the officials of the department, many of whom we all know to be very efficient gentlemen, could, if consulted, and asked to give the benefit of their experience, devise a scheme that would be very much more satisfactory to the country, and certainly to the militia force. One of the causes for the great dissatisfaction existing with regard to brigade camps, is this: In the rural districts, under the old system, when we had drill at the headquarters of the battalion or company, we had the best young men in the country belonging to the companies. I remember that, when I first belonged to a company, it was almost by a vote of the members that a young man was allowed to join. They were careful in the selection of their members, but, under the present system, especially in the rural districts, it is impossible for those young men to go out and join a camp. In making up the force, volunteers are taken from those who are of very little use at present, and likely to be of less use in the future. That is not the class of men we wish to see in our volunteer force. We must all recognize the fact that the young men, the sons of the best people in the districts in which they live, the young men who are likely to be the future citizens of the country, are the ones we desire to see interested in the force. That must be taken into consideration. Again, as no doubt has been pointed out to the Minister already, it is very questionable whether the education in the brigade camp is better than that obtained by drilling at battalion or company headquarters. These are matters of the greatest importance to be considered by the hon. Minister in the near future. There can be no doubt that at present the greatest possible dissatisfaction exists among officers and men. That dissatisfaction must be removed and the men must become interested in their work, and proud of their companies and battalions. They have to sacrifice a good deal both of time and money. The spirit which prompts them to take an active interest in the force is a spirit of the best patriotism, and I hope that the hon. Minister who has newly taken the position will, as he has promised to do, look into this matter. I recognize the difficulties he has to contend with, and I know that conflicting opinions will be given him, but I would suggest that if he would take some advice from those who are more in

touch with public opinion and the wishes of officers and men, he will find some practical scheme which will be more satisfactory to the country than the present one.

Mr. HUGHES. It was not my privilege to hear the explanation of the hon. Minister, or the statements of other hon. gentlemen who followed, except the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I would take the liberty of saying, in connection with the remarks of that hon. gentleman, that, in my opinion, the system of brigade camps should be viewed from an entirely different standpoint from the one he took. In the days when he and I joined the force, no doubt all the good boys of the community did join as the hon. gentleman has said. However, I think if he would analyse the men who make up the rank and file to-day, he would find that they are equally good as those who wore the jackets in the old days of 1866, and onward. The hon. gentleman gave as a reason why he favoured drill at company or battalion headquarters in place of brigade camps, that the better class of young men joined the force in the former case, and this he said was the cause of the superiority of the force of the old days. The first drill that our volunteers had, except in the days of the old independent Rifles, was in 1868, That was battalion drill at battalion headquarters. The next year the same course was followed. But, in 1871 was begun the system of brigade camps, and from 1871 to 1875 are the crowning years in the history of our volunteer force. Fortunately or unfortunately, during the regime of our friends opposite, the Government were seized with a desire to create a permanent force, and to cut down the militia. Speeches were made in Parliament at that time which certainly were unbecoming loyal Canadian citizens; letters were written concerning the volunteer force and militia that would do anything but credit to any citizen of the Dominion; and the policy was adopted of creating a permanent force, and gradually disbanding the volunteer force, except in the cities. Unfortunately, when the Liberal-Conservative party came into office in 1878, they were, as far as the militia policy of the country was concerned, inclined to follow the lead set them by the Liberal party; and in that respect I must complain of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government from 1878 onward. To a very large extent they followed exactly in the footsteps of the Liberal party when in power.

One reason why I think brigade camps should be preferred to the system of drill at company or battalion headquarters, is that company headquarters camps were never tried but for one year, and then they were such an outrageous failure that they were abandoned for all time to come. The brigade camp is superior for many reasons. The men naturally like to leave their homes for an excursion; and, in travelling they gain experience in boarding and disembarking from trains, in looking after their horses and weapons, setting up their tents, and so on. Besides, at almost every point where brigade camps are located, we find old military ruins or fortifications. At Kingston we have the old Fort Henry, and the historic Fort Frontenac, and those old Martello towers, if useless to-day, tend to create a military spirit and send the boys home, who have never seen anything of the kind, with a broader idea of military life than if they had drilled round the fields of their own battalion or company headquarters. I am satisfied that the experience of military men is almost unanimous in favour of brigade camps as against any other class of camps.

As to the permanent corps, my views have been placed before the House for a number of years in succession. The permanent corps, to my mind, are altogether too large and cumbersome at the present time. As I pointed out in detail last session, the permanent corps were established for one of three purposes—as a standing army, as a police force, or as training schools for the militia. If they are intended as a standing army, we have no use for them; if as a police force, they are much too large for the purpose; and if as military schools, they do not to the best serve that object. The cost of getting certificates from these schools is altogether too great. I speak now of the whole cost of the permanent corps, and comparing the total cost with the number of certificates, the expenditure cannot be justified. On other occasions I have made this suggestion, and I have yet to see that it can be improved: If the permanent corps were reduced in strength—not the total strength, mind you, of the available force, but the actual number of men enlisted for the three years' service—by 50 per cent all round and their places supplied by cadets on the old plan attending these schools for certificates, I am satisfied much greater gain would accrue to the country at much less cost than at the present time. We might have each of these permanent corps filled up with 50 or 75 drilled men as cadets, not to go there in the sense of privates or sergeants or officers, but simply cadets attending the school for instruction. There would always be a large number of these men as capable of taking places as soldiers as the men now in the permanent corps. We should then be sending every week or every month back to the country a large number of trained men to take their places in the battalions throughout the Dominion. The schools should be supplied on some systematic basis from every battalion throughout the district. It would be very easy for the brigade major of the district, or the deputy adjutant-general of the district to notify each officer commanding a corps, or each officer commanding a company that on

a certain day there would be a vacancy in the school for a certain number of men from his company or corps, and he should be held to account in case he failed to furnish the men to take their places in the military school. By this means you would keep the schools up to the present strength—and far beyond it, I believe—with men who would be changed every two or three months and who, at the end of their period of instruction, would return to their homes taking with them the useful lessons they had learned. We should then have battalions filled with these properly qualified men, and to be dispensed with.

One reason while the old companies and battalions were so efficient is that from 1866 onwards, our schools were well filled with cadets. These cadets returned to their homes with their certificates and became members of their local battalions. And I venture to say that when my good friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) joined the militia force, there were in his company five or six men who had passed the military school and were capable of instructing in drill. And I venture to say that to-day in the whole battalion of my hon. friend from Oxford—and our own battalion and others are the same—you would scarcely find as many men qualified to drill as were found in one company in the old days. I can point to reports of officers on our own battalion back in 1870-71, when they were inspected by field officers of the British service, where it is shown by the record that these men "surpassed in physique the regular soldiers of the British service, and so far as field movements were concerned, they were the equals of any soldiers in the British army." We can point to the record of our volunteers last year in camp at Lévis, where the boys from our city and rural battalions were drilling: and it is a well-known fact, that after the first four weeks in camp, these men from our rural and city corps attached for service, were the equal of any corps of the permanent force in camp at Lévis. At the present time I shall not go into details in regard to the permanent corps, but when the main Estimates come up I may say a few words on the subject.

Another suggestion I would make which the Minister may consider. At the present time each captain of a company receives a certain sum per annum for drill instruction and care of arms. I would not deprive these captains and commanding officers of corps, who, in many cases, have organized the bodies they command—I would not deprive them wholly of this money; but I think that half the amount, a total of from $30,000 to $40,000, can very properly be taken from them, because we know as a matter of fact that the money for drill and care of arms is not properly earned by these officers. I would take this money, and with some saved from the permanent corps, for each regiment or battalion I would appoint a drill instructor, a non-commissioned officer, who would act, possibly, as sergeant-major of the regiment and would be under the direction of the officer commanding. It would be his duty to look after the arms and to drill the squads, preparing the men for sergeants and non-commissioned officers' certificates and training the men so that when they were sent to obtain certificates in the permanent schools, they would go there fairly well qualified. If this were done, I am satisfied that the arms of the battalion would be found in good condition, and there would be a spirit aroused in the force that would be well for the best interests of the country. Another suggestion I would make—a mere detail—is this: At the present time the band and staff-sergeants are distributed, some to each company. There ought to be a separate pay-sheet made up for band and staff-sergeants; in other words, these might be counted as a separate company instead of part being counted in the strength of each company. Very often a captain who is apt to be dilatory in the performance of his duty, who puts off making up his roll to the last minute and wishes to earn his $40 as easily as possible, says: Well, I can fill up with band and staff-sergeants, anyhow. And we find in experience that this works very injuriously to the force. In our own corps we make up a separate pay-sheet for band and staff-sergeants. We have always had difficulty with the paymaster over it, but we have always managed.

One other point that may be mentioned, even before the main Estimates are taken up, is the rifle. There are one or two suggestions I will take the liberty of making. Up to the present time the British Government have not finally adopted the Lee-Metford magazine rifle; in fact it is doubtful if they will decide to use it. The magazine rifle is a good weapon, but until the British Government actually decide as to its adoption, it would be folly, according to my opinion, for this Government to adopt any rifle permanently. Meantime, there are, at the present moment hundreds of thousands of Martini rifles stored in the magazines and armouries of the British service. When the Snider-Enfield rifles were given over to this country, they were given, I believe, without cost to the Dominion of Canada, merely on the guarantee of this Government that these rifles should be properly cared for and returned when called upon. I would suggest that the Martini rifles at present stored in Great Britain might be drawn upon by arrangements between the Governments of Canada and Great Britain, on the same terms as those upon which we obtained the Snider-Enfields; and we could arm our force from one end of the Dominion to the other with the Martini-Henry

rifle, a rifle which for accuracy of fire and for length of range, is at all events quite sufficient for any purpose for which we are likely to require it in our day. The rifle is infinitely superior to the Snider-Enfield, which has been in use thirty years, and that is a very long time to stand service. I think the Martini-Henry could be placed in the hands of the volunteers at no cost to the people of this country, and I am satisfied that the best riflemen in the country, as well as the raw recruits that we find in various camps, would be well satisfied could they have the Martini-Henry in their possession.

Another point I would suggest to the Minister is this: The main object of our militia at the present time is to afford a nucleus for a larger force in case of actual war. Therefore I condemn, and I am satisfied that the military men of the country, as well as those in this House, will condemn the policy that has been pursued by the department in recent years of cutting down the framework of the militia force to the very lowest possible notch. Every officers having anything to do with camps knows that he cannot possibly get along with less than four sergeants, yet he is allowed on the average but one and five-sixths of a sergeant: and the mystery to every officer, having anything to do with rural corps, is to know how he is going to cut the sergeants up so as to divide them around the companies. There should be four sergeants to every company, three officers to every company; and there should be the regular two surgeons to every battalion, but the surgeons are cut down to one for every battalion. There is only one major allowed to every six-company battalion. The whole framework of the force has been torn to pieces, and I maintain it is the framework that should be kept up efficiently, so that in case of actual warfare ,these men will be able to fill up the companies of their various corps with large numbers of men, and the whole be ready to be put into the field.

Again, I understand, in fact I know, it is the custom in some of our brigade camps to take the officers of the permanent corps and place them in command of men who are their seniors. For instance, the present camp that is going to be held at Niagara will, as I understand, be in command of an officer who is a junior to many other officers who will be there. I do not know the object of the department in doing that: I do not see that it can be done short of an Act of Parliament; and yet we find a large number of instances of that kind throughout the country where officers of permanent corps are placed in command of men who rank above them, and who are their seniors. I am satisfied that if these officers thus superseded were to bring the matter to a focus, it would be found that the order issued by the department was not capable of being carried out: in other words, the department is acting illegally in placing such men over their seniors in command of these camps. I understand that the present intention is to place Col. Buchan in command of the Niagara camp, who is junior to a large number of men in that district; and I think the same remarks will apply to other districts throughout the country.

I may also say that the volunteers who have served for many years in this country at great personal expense to themselves, will be pleased to know that the Minister has given assurance, as I understand, that the medals or decorations issued by the British Government for long service are to be forthcoming for those Canadian volunteers who have served in the Canadian militia. This has been in abeyance for a long time. It is not a fact that the volunteers asked for this, but some three or four years ago it was announced that this decoration would be given to the volunteers of Canada. It has been dangled in front of their eyes, and a large number of officers who wished to retire, but who wished to remain until they secured that decoration, have been deceived, have been bamboozled into holding on to office in order to get this decoration, and finally have retired without it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Bamboozled?

Mr. HUGHES. Possibly bamboozled is not a correct military term. It does not apply to the action of the present Minister of Militia, but possibly to some newspaper reports. I hope the Minister of Militia will take this matter up in the interest of the old volunteers, the good boys who joined the force away back in the days of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), when he and I and others joined the force, and see that we are rewarded for our long services and good conduct by this "old country" badge.

Mr. FORBES. You ought to have a leather medal.

Mr. HUGHES. We keep the leather medal for those who shoot only with the mouth.

Another matter that I will bring before the Minister of Militia is the question of brevet rank. A large number of our quartermasters—I believe our good friend from Oxford is a quartermaster, and I have two or three other instances in my mind—have been in the force a great many years, yet under the present rules these men can obtain no higher rank than that of honorary major. I would simply recommend to the Minister that he consult the military authorities throughout the country as to whether it would not be advisable that these men should be recognized. Take, for instance, the best shooting man in the Dominion, Major Mason, of the 13th Battalion of Hamilton. He has been in that battalion since the Fenian raid days of 1860, and long anterior to it, and notwithstanding all the time that he has given to rifle shooting, and to the organization of that battalion,

and to the militia of Canada generally, he can obtain no higher rank than that of major. There are many other cases like his to which I would draw the attention of the Minister. I think that when the department saw fit to abolish the brevet rank, it made a very serious mistake, and did an injustice to a large number of officers. At the present time a man has to serve ten years as captain before he can become a brevet major; and he has to serve a lifetime, excepting in an artillery corps, before he can become a brevet Lieutenant Colonel, under present regulations. In many of the rural corps of this country there are officers who hold no higher rank than captain, who are seniors to very many city colonels in the Dominion, and who were in the force and were officers previous to the entrance of the latter into the force. I say this, not that I have any objections to the city corps; for I have proven myself their friend on many occasions, but I am merely pointing out the injustice that is done to many officers in the rural corps where old officers have held on to office for a large number of years, as compared with the officers of city corps. If the Minister will take this into consideration, I am satisfied that he will decide to make a change in the line I have suggested.

There is another point——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Go on.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not in the least bit of a hurry to get through; I can keep it up for a good deal longer. Owing to the unfortunate state which the militia is in, and the unfortunate precedent set by my good friends of the Opposition in office, and followed unfortunately by our friends since their accession to power, the militia force is in great need of reorganization at the present time; and I do not intend that the little by-play of any hon. gentleman shall deter me from placing my views before the committee on this matter. Another suggestion I wish to make is this: At the present time, owing to the great increase in numbers and the reduction in the use and price of horses in the United States, owing to the fact that electricity has driven horses from street cars, owing to the fact that horses can be purchased in the United States and Canada for a mere song, I maintain that the amount of money paid to-day for the service of a horse in our annual camps should be reduced 50 per cent. A horse to-day is not worth much over half what it was twenty years ago. At that time the pay of a horse was $1, and the pay of a man was 50 cents. To-day the pay of a horse is $1 and the pay of a man 50 cents. Our experience with the cavalry corps and artillery corps is this, that a man will not join an infantry corps so long as he has any opportunity of bringing a horse to the camp and earning $1 for the horse and 50 cents for himself against 50 cents for a man in the camp. I suggest, and I am satisfied the suggestion will commend itself to the good sense of the Minister of Militia as well as to a good many hon. members of this House, that the pay of the horses should be reduced to 50 cents per day, the same as the pay of the men. When the general Estimates come up I may have occasion to offer some further remarks; in the meantime, I commend the suggestions I have offered to the consideration of the Minister of Militia, and I am satisfied that they will, at all events, receive his serious consideration.

Mr. CASEY. These amounts in the Estimates have been incurred already far in excess of the Estimates of last year, I suppose. Can the Minister tell the committee how much of the first item has been spent for the permanent corps, and how much for the active militia?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not able to give the information at the moment, but I think from $40,000 to $45,000 on the permanent corps; $400,000 was granted under the head of permanent corps and active militia last year.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that $308,000 was for pay and allowances. How does it occur that as regards the permanent corps, which include a fixed number, there should have been an expenditure of $40,000 in excess of the estimate?

Mr. DICKEY. I have already explained that the amount voted for the total service, grouped under permanent and active, was $482,000; but before the session closed, the department, thinking they could save $82,000, omitted that amount, and a vote was taken for only $400,000. The department expected to make reductions in the permanent corps, and in attendance at schools. Instead of the attendance at schools diminishing, it nearly doubled last year, and the strength of the permanent corps was not reduced; so an increased expenditure of $47,000 was involved beyond the amount voted, but the amount was $35,000 less than the original estimate.

Mr. PRIOR. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of hon. members who have discussed this question before the committee, and I must say my interest was tinged with a good deal of regret owing to what I heard said by the Minister of Militia in regard to the permanent corps. The hon. gentleman informed the committee that it was his intention to reduce the number of the permanent corps. Although there seems to be a unanimous opinion among commanding officers in the House as to the advisability of that step, even though I may stand alone, I must say that I believe it will be a fatal mistake if the hon. Minister does anything of that sort. There may be localities in which some of the corps may be cut down with benefit to the general service, but I think it is a force that should be kept up to a strength of at least 1,000 men, and maintained

in its present state of efficiency. A strong reason why hon. gentlemen present have spoken in the way I have indicated is owing to the fact that there is only a certain amount of money voted for the militia, and they think that because the permanent corps receive a considerable sum, the ordinary militia is starved. Well, Sir, there may be something in that argument, but the remedy lies not in cutting down the permanent corps, but in inducing Parliament to vote more money for the militia force. I do not think that very many people in this country would refuse to sanction such an increased expenditure, and certainly there are not many members of this House who would not sanction a larger vote if the Government would bring it down. The militia of Canada is a force which is to be relied upon to do its duty if any trouble arises, and it is very well to think that no trouble will arise because no trouble has occurred for a long time; but we see every other nation in the world maintains a standing army, although I do not believe that Canada has reached such a position as to maintain a standing army of any magnitude, still, the least it can do is to maintain a large force of properly trained and efficient militia. I am sure if the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) were to secure the passage of his Bill for the enfranchisement of women, there would be no more popular vote in the world than the militia vote, because whatever we men may think of the safety of the country, we know the ladies expect us to defend them, at all events, whatever we may do as regards ourselves. I was very sorry to see that the vote for the annual drill of the militia is such a small one. The item states, "$220,000 for drill in camps of instruction of the rural corps." I should like to ask the Minister whether he intends to drill the city corps, and to drill the artillery. I am informed that owing to pressure brought to bear on him lately by a large number of commanding officers, from different parts of the country, who waited on him and urged their claims, the Minister intends to drill the city corps, but not to drill the artillery. As I am, I believe, the only artillery officer present, the responsibility falls on me to see if I cannot change the mind of the Government in regard to the drilling of the artillery, and give good reasons therefor. Any one who knows anything about military affairs must be perfectly well aware that if there is one branch of the service which requires constant drilling and attention, and constant reading up of the red book, it is the artillery. The men have to do double duty, they have to learn their artillery duties as well as infantry drill, and I would ask the hon. gentlemen present commanding infantry corps not to think I am in any way belittling the infantry corps of the country. What I am stating is a fact, and they know it as well as I do. The artillery officer has to pass a much stiffer examination. He has to keep thoroughly well read up from year's end to year's end, or he is no good at all as a commanding officer, or an officer of any kind. The sergeants have to be better educated, and have to learn a great deal more, and especially in the field artillery you have to have smart men and men of good intelligence. Well, Sir, it is impossible that the men can miss drill for a year or two, without the force suffering, and suffering very materially. I therefore trust that the Minister of Militia will use his best endeavours with the Minister of Finance—or whoever it is who gives the order that the drill pay shall be forthcoming—and see, that whatever branch of the service is to suffer it will not be the artillery. It is very poor policy indeed for this Government, or for any Government, to economize with the militia. Let them economize in something else, but do not let us run our country into danger by thinking that we have a militia force to defend us in time of war, if any such should occur, and then when the time comes, to find that the men are only on paper, or that, if we have the men, that they are not efficient soldiers. I am specially interested in the artillery, and if hon. gentlemen will pardon me I will cite as an instance my own regiment. We have been put under a new establishment, and raised from 175 to 525 men. Every commanding officer knows the time and money it takes to keep a regiment of that size up. We have just got our regiment in a pretty efficient state, and if we were not allowed to drill this year the consequence would be that we would lose half the men. They would say: The Government have not taken an interest in us, although we have done our best on our part. A great many of the officers have gone through three months hard work in the short course. They have purchased their uniforms, and if they see that the Government does not care for them, how can we expect them to care for the Government or for the militia? Another feature of the British Columbia garrison artillery is, that if they are not drilled and kept efficient, this Government will be breaking faith with England. We have come to an arrangement with the Imperial authorities with regard to the building of forts at Esquimalt. I believe the total amount spent on the fortifications there will amount to nearly £1,000,000 sterling before they are completed, making them the most modern kind of fortifications. The Imperial Government has a small company of 100 royal marine artillery to take charge of the guns and keep them clean, but the agreement with the Imperial Government is that Canada shall man those guns. That is the reason that the British Columbia garrison artillery was raised to the present strength of 525 men. Unless the Dominion Government provide

that these men and the officers commanding them are efficiently drilled and properly qualified to take charge there. In case any trouble arises, they are, I say, breaking faith with the Imperial authorities. I therefore urge on the Government that the British Columbia garrison artillery should be drilled this year and every other year. I also have heard it stated that the Government might allow enough money to drill the artillery force for eight days. Well, I think that is very small potatoes, indeed. The men are supposed to draw drill pay for 12 days, which amounts to $6 a man, but dozens of my men have put in between fifty and sixty and seventy-five drills a year, and yet they only get paid for twelve. I hope that the Minister of Militia will use his best endeavours to see, that not only the rural and city battalions are drilled, but that also the field batteries and garrison artilleries shall be drilled as well. I heard with great pleasure what the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said with regard to the new rifle. I am perfectly certain that if this Government could see their way to make some arrangements with the Imperial Government to get a number of Martini-Henry rifles, that the entire force would be very well pleased for the present. In time to come, when England, and France, and Germany, and other nations have come to some sort of opinion as to which really is the best rifle, I do hope that we shall be armed with it; but at the present time I do not think that it would be good policy for this Government to invest in the Lee-Metford, or any other rifle. Let us use the Martini-Henry. It is a good rifle for the militia, a good rifle for recruits, a good rifle for a good shot, and, I think, all would be perfectly satisfied with it. I shall have another opportunity, Sir, of saying a few words in regard to other militia matters when the ordinary Estimates come up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If there is any truth at all in the doctrine, that in a multitude of counsellors there is safety, the Minister of Militia is very much to be envied to-night. I am not going to anticipate the discussion which he promises us. I shall be very glad indeed to hear what system he is likely to recommend to the House, when he has had time to consider it, and I am quite aware from recollection that he will have a great deal of trouble in introducing any system that is likely to please even his own supporters, let alone the gentlemen on this side of the House. I do not want to treat the matter in any shape as a party question. I never have done so, and, I think, I might say that it has not been done on this side of the House. We are all agreed in desiring that whatever may be done as to our militia, it may be done so as to give us a respectable force which every Canadian could and ought to be proud of. I am bound to say that such little experiences as we have had, have not been at all discreditable to the material of which our force was formed; nor did they compare badly—I think I may say that—in our recent experience, with the conduct of Her Majesty's regular troops when exposed to similar antagonists.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But, I would say this to the Minister of Militia, and I think on the whole that the common sense of the House will agree with me in respect to it: whatever the Government decide to do, whatever policy they choose to adopt, whatever number of militia they think necessary to maintain, I trust that they will rather aim at quality than at quantity. For my part, I would rather see a much more moderate force liberally treated by the Government and fairly dealt with, than an attempt (which I think we have been making for too long) to sustain a larger force than the funds at our disposal allow us to discipline and handle properly. I think the hon. Minister, whatever course he decides upon, will be well advised to bear that in mind, and to see to it, that he does not ask Parliament to maintain a larger number of militia than the funds at his disposal will enable him to keep in good order.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to endorse to a certain extent what the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has said. I agree with him that this country ought to be able to keep up as large a regular force as we have now, and a sufficient force of volunteers besides. But at the same time, if the Government cannot see its way to vote sufficient funds for both. I would rather see the permanent force reduced, because I think that if the money that Parliament is prepared to vote is not sufficient for both, the funds could be applied to better advantage in keeping a larger number of volunteers, than in spending so much of it to maintain a small number of the regular force. I also, for once, agree entirely with what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said, that it is most important that the number of militia, both in establishment and men, should not be larger than can be maintained and drilled every year. If they are not, there are two great deficiencies in being able to keep up a proper force. One is that you cannot keep the men together, and the other is that they are always dissatisfied. The officers find great difficulty in keeping their companies up and in getting the officers to qualify properly, when there is an uncertainty about their being called out at regular periods. Therefore, I would ask the Minister, in considering this matter, to make that one of the essential points. I

think we can afford to keep up the present number of the volunteer force, and if we cannot do that without reducing the permanent force, I would say, reduce that force. But, speaking for myself, and as one coming from an old part of Ontario, and knowing the responsibility I am taking, I am satisfied that my constituents would be prepared to support Parliament in voting enough money to maintain both the thousand men of the permanent force and the present strength of the militia force and to drill the latter every year, and also to secure the best arm that modern science has been able to invent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that the hon. Minister of Militia does not desire to discuss the general policy of the department upon this vote, but that he prefers to do so upon the main Estimates. That being so, I shall so far comply with his wish as to confine my observations to the item which we have now before us. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, who has, no doubt, been informed on the subject, whether an unusually large percentage of the men in the permanent force have not left that force without leave—practically deserted ? I understand that nearly one-fourth of the men of that force are not actually in the service at the present time. If that be so, the hon. Minister will, no doubt, be saved the trouble of the reduction which he proposes to make, because that reduction, as a matter of fact, has already been accomplished. Then, there is in this appropriation $33,000 for clothing. Now, I understand that a very large quantity of clothing was purchased by his predecessor, and that it included some 60,000 coats of oilskin or waterproof. I believe it is necessary that these coats should be separated from each other to be kept in good order, but these were left together in a large parcel, and when the inspector of clothing came to examine them, he found it impossible to separate one coat from another without tearing them to pieces. They had been left unpacked, and when the warm weather came they adhered to each other ; so that the whole purchase was rendered practically valueless. The hon. Minister, no doubt, can tell us how far that is so. Then, one hon. gentleman has spoken of the importance of drill and of the unpopularity of the service to-day compared with what it was in former years. Whether we have in Canada any person competent to take charge of the militia force as Major General, I will not pretend to say. With the number of graduates that have been turned out at the Kingston Military School, which has always seemed to me to be a very important institution if properly managed, there ought to be some person competent to occupy that position. I do not pretend to say that the gentlemen who have been sent from England to this country to take charge of our volunteer force are not capable men : but their notions of the force and of the way to maintain order and discipline and promote efficiency are so much at variance with the habits of the population of this country, that it is very difficult to maintain the popularity of the force and to get into it the class of men my hon. friend from North Oxford says are desirable. When they are spoken to in the manner in which almost every man of military training from the other side of the Atlantic thinks appropriate in addressing those whom he deems wanting in duty, in efficiency or in proper regard for military etiquette, they are not inclined to consent to be spoken to as if they were scarcely entitled to the rank of freemen. I think that is a matter entitled to the serious consideration of the Government, if the force is to be made a popular one.

Mr. DICKEY. I am not at all aware of any diminution in the permanent force from the cause mentioned by the hon. gentleman, though, if his information is better than mine, I cannot say that I shall particularly regret it, for it will have done very easily what we intend to do, as he himself says. As to the destruction of oilskins, I am quite sure the hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension. I am informed by the superintendent of stores that that is an entire mistake. I do not know what foundation there is for the statement ; if there is any, it must be in a very small degree. However, I will make direct inquiries on the spot. With respect to the Major General Commanding, that, of course, is a very large question. There is a great deal to be said in favour of a native commanding officer, and also a great deal to be said for an officer connected with the Imperial service. I would not like to commit myself by cutting off that link which binds our militia system to the Imperial service, and which assures us a similar standard, not only of manners, which may be objectionable, but of efficiency and 'esprit de corps' in the volunteer force here to that in the regular force in England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With regard to the clothing, I believe my information is correct. I am informed that the statement was made in the presence of the Major General himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to the first item, I would ask the hon. Minister, when he is making the inquiries about clothing, to find out how it is that 1,188 greatcoats were sold to the Indian Department at $1 a head ? Also, a large number of blankets at 50 cents, and of trousers at 25 cents a pair ; fur caps at 25 cents, and helmets at 25 cents ? They may possibly have been returned or worn-out clothing.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman is, no doubt, aware that worn-out clothing is returned to store by requisition. Some is destroyed, and that which is of any service is

made use of. Clothing in the militia service has a regulation life. It lives three years. It may be worn out the first year, but it must live three years. It comes back at the end of the three years; and, as far as the overcoats are concerned, they were returned to store after being used—some had three years, and some had ten years' wear—and sold to the other department, which was able to make use of them. The other items I am not so sure about.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the overcoats averaged three per year to each volunteer.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman is certainly wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister say whether the entire number of overcoats sold, 1,189, was all returned, or consisted partly of stock that was in store and had not been given out, but had become damaged or moth-eaten?

Mr. DICKEY. I speak entirely from instruction; I know nothing myself. The statements of the officials are clear and distinct, that they are all old overcoats returned, and I have no doubt it is correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. The same remark will apply to the fur caps and helmets?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. The $45,000 for pay and allowance, which we are asked to vote now, and the $33,000 for clothing and necessaries appear to be both due to an attempt at economy on the part of the hon. gentleman's predecessor. The hon. gentleman's predecessor reduced the estimates last year considerably below what they were first put at, and, in consequence of this attempt to make a good showing for the year, we have expended $78,000 more than was actually voted last year. In other words, the Government got the credit last year of making a reduction of $78,000 in the militia estimates, which reduction was not made at all, because we are now asked to make up for it in the supplementaries. I wish also to call the hon. Minister's attention in connection with item for monuments on battlefields to the fact that there is an important battlefield in my own constituency—one of the most historic of the war of 1812. It was here where Tecumseh fell. That battle was more important in its results than many others in the war of 1812 which have been commemorated, and I think something should be done to mark this place. It is near Moraviantown, an important Indian reserve. With regard to the question of rifles, as the matter has been brought up, I can hardly avoid urging on the Minister that, in the first place, the chief object in volunteer drill throughout the country should be to obtain a large number of good marksmen. The first thing to be kept in view is to teach young men how to shoot straight, and they ought to have the best rifle we can get for them. I was for a long time of the same impression as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), who urged that the Martini-Henry was a good enough rifle. But since I have seen something of the shooting of the Lee-Metford rifle, I am much shaken in my opinion. It is as much ahead of the Martini as the Martini is ahead of the old Snider. It is much lighter to carry, and the ammunition is much lighter. A Martini bullet weighs as much as the whole cartridge of the Lee-Metford. I am not speaking of the Martini-Metford, because I consider that rifle the perfection of clumsiness and inconvenience. It is very much heavier than the Martini or Snider. In the Lee-Metford the breech action has not yet been so thoroughly tested in actual service as it ought to be. It has a partial disadvantage in the fact that it is a magazine rifle. I do not believe that soldiers have any use for a magazine rifle, unless they are in the face of some such enemy as the Soudanese or Zulus, who come on in endless droves until actually shot down. I cannot understand that, in any battle between ordinary Europeans, it will be necessary to keep up that awful fire for a few minutes which the magazine rifle is capable of keeping up. In ordinary service, the possession of a magazine rifle might lead to a waste of ammunition. If the Lee-Metford rifle can be got at a reasonable price, it is undoubtedly vastly better than the Martini. But if the price has not yet diminished sufficiently, I would urge that, at all events, every Snider in the service should be superseded by the next best rifle, the Martini. There is no excuse whatever for keeping the Snider-Enfield in the hands of our volunteers any longer. It is as much out of date as the Brown-bess, and the constant use of it will only incapacitate the volunteer for the use of a better rifle afterwards. As to the question of the permanent corps and the active militia, I am strongly of the opinion that if there is to be a reduction of expenses anywhere it should be at the cost of the permanent corps. Our only need for this permanent corps is to afford a pattern for the volunteers, and to provide drill sergeants for the much larger force that would have to be used in case of any emergency. The expense in connection with the volunteers is widely distributed throughout the country. It creates a little plentifulness of money in many places, and the expense is not so much felt as where it is spent for a small number of men in barracks; and I think we all agree that the main expenditure should not be so much to keep up an efficient force of regulars as to spread over as many men as possible a certain knowledge of drill and a very considerable knowledge of rifle shooting. We ought to make our people as expert with the rifle to-day as the yeomen of England were with the long bow many years ago. I do not know that the members of this House would require much

training in drawing the long bow, but we should make Canadians as much superior to the rest of the world in rifle shooting as the yeomen of England were superior in the middle ages to the rest of the world in the use of the long bow. I will reserve what else I have to say until the main Estimates are before us.

Railways and Canals—Capital—Sault Ste. Marie Canal—construction..... $310,000

Mr. HAGGART. This estimate is for the purpose of covering the following items: Hugh Ryan & Co., section 1, $100,000; lift lock, $91,600; lock gates, $16,000; power pipes, $6,300; lock valves, $9,400; motor houses, $3,700; difference in cost between native and Portland cement, $14,000; construction, section 3, $39,100; Canadian Electric Company, electric machinery, $7,350; William Kennedy & Sons, water-wheels, $3,000; Canadian Locomotive Engine Works, machinery for gates, $500; Miller Brothers, gate pontoon, $3,000; concrete piers, and anchors for movable dam, $8,300; salaries of staff, $5,500; sundries, $2,250.

Mr. McMULLEN. Would the Minister say whether the articles he has named were supplied by tender—outside of what was done by Ryan & Co.?

Mr. HAGGART. The water-wheels from Kennedy & Co. were not got by tender.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where do Kennedy & Co. live?

Mr. HAGGART. Owen Sound.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any other items in which there were no tenders asked for?

Mr. HAGGART. There is the gate pontoon, $3,000—supplied by Miller Brothers, of St. Catharines.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were the amounts of money paid to Ryan & Co. paid on a schedule of prices, or was any sum paid outside of the schedule?

Mr. HAGGART. It was all paid under schedule prices, except the lock gates, for which a lump sum was paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much?

Mr. HAGGART. There is about $16,000, in this estimate. They made a contract for the lock gates of $67,500, on which they received $51,037, and this is the difference.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister mentioned a change in the cement. What was the increase in price on account of that?

Mr. HAGGART. It was one dollar for 400 pounds.

Mr. CASEY. You mentioned a lump sum of $100,000 paid to Ryan & Co.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a balance on the schedule of prices.

Mr. CASEY. It seems remarkable that it should be the even $100,000. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. HAGGART. It may be a few dollars more or less; the final estimate has not yet been made up.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says, I understand, that there was a change from native to Portland cement. Are we to understand that the original contract called for native cement?

Mr. HAGGART. The terms of the original contract called for native cement, and I thought it was to the benefit of the work that it should be changed to Portland cement.

Mr. LAURIER. Why?

Mr. HAGGART. Because it is a much superior article.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; but surely this might have been thought of before as well as after. How is it that these changes come after the contract is made, and invariably result in mulcting the public in large sums of money?

Mr. HAGGART. Almost anybody knows that Portland cement is better than native; and the relative prices are as well known as the prices of different grades of sugar.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a surprise to me that the hon. gentleman, if he knew it before the contract, did not act upon his knowledge.

Mr. HAGGART. Unfortunately it was fixed before I took charge of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As this question and some other matters arising out of the construction of this canal, are being made the subject-matters of examination before the Public Accounts Committee, I think before the hon. gentleman asks the House to vote this money, it would be well for him to give some information to the committee, a general statement showing, in the first place, what was the original proposition with respect to the construction of this canal, what price the proposers informed the Government that the work was going to cost. Then I would suggest that the hon. gentleman inform the committee of the more marked changes that took place in that contract since, the length of time that the completion of the contract was extended, and the bonus or additional sums of money which that extension and those changes cost the country. Having that general information, the committee would be in a better position to discuss this item.

Mr. HAGGART. I was intending to make a full explanation of all these changes on the main Estimates, but I can give the explanations just as well now. The design of the canal upon which the contract was en-

tered into, was for a lock 600 feet long and 85 feet wide, with 16 feet 3 inches of water on the mitre sill. The width of the prism was to be 150 feet, with a depth of 18 feet of water below the lowest known water-line. That was before the first contract was let. The first contract was let on the 20th November, 1888. The then estimated cost of the canal was $4,000,000. I may state to the hon. gentleman that the canal will be completed for a cost nearly $500,000 less than the estimate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that estimate of cost submitted to Parliament at that time ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. On the 20th November, 1888, a contract was entered into with Messrs. Ryan & Co., for the construction of lock and prism covering a length of about 3,500 feet. On the 30th January, 1889, a further contract was given to these contractors for the construction of the lower entrance, covering a length of about 5,300 feet. On the 26th March, 1888, a contract was entered into with Messrs. Allan & Fleming, for the construction of the upper entrance, covering a distance of about 9,300 feet ; or a total length of about 18,100 feet, the whole work to be completed on the 10th May, 1892. Some time after the works were commenced, strong representations were made for a change in the plan of the lock by increasing the size.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What time was that ?

Mr. HAGGART. That was some time after the 20th November, 1888. The change in the contract for the lock was then made, an agreement being entered into on the 13th June, 1891, by which the contractors undertook to execute the additional work, the whole contract to be completed on the 10th May, 1893. Then the work was started on the modified plan. A discussion took place, as the hon. gentleman will remember, in December, 1891, which led to a further modification ; and on the 23rd December, 1891, an Order in Council was passed changing the dimensions of the lock, adopting a length of 900 feet by a width of 60 feet, with 19 feet of water on the sills at the lowest recorded water-line, provided reasonable arrangements could be made with the contractors. I think it was shortly after this time that I took charge of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was it on the hon. gentleman's personal recommendation that the Order in Council was passed ?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it was done before I became Minister of Railways. According to my memory, the only change I made was an extension of the depth of water on the mitre sills of the lock by one foot six inches, to make it correspond with the depth of water on the mitre sills of the American lock. But on account of the difficulties with the Americans a year or two ago, I made an arrangement by which they were to finish the lock a year before the time stipulated in their last contract, for which they were to receive $90,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What were they to receive for the other contracts you made respecting the deepening ?

Mr. HAGGART. The whole contract was to be completed on 10th May, 1893. My deputy has the changes in the different contracts, and the different prices, and will lay them before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As a matter of fact, did they finish it within the time the hon. gentleman stipulated ?

Mr. HAGGART. They finished it a month before the time contracted for, and received the $90,000 extra. It was to be finished in December, 1893, and I understand it was finished in the month of November.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the canal was completed in 1893, and ready for navigation ?

Mr. HAGGART. The contract with the Ryans I have referred to was never intended to be finished until this spring, because there was additional work to be done, in the shape of placing machinery for opening and shutting the gates, and valves, the placing of the valves before the dams could be removed.

Mr. LAURIER. I was under the impression that the canal was to be opened for navigation last September, 1894.

Mr. CASEY. It was given out that such would be the case. It was also stated that water was let into the canal last fall.

Mr. HAGGART. The water was let in to the canal in October, I believe.

Mr. CASEY. And the gates operated ?

Mr. HAGGART. The gates were hung, for water could not be let into the canal without the gates being in place.

Mr. CASEY. Was it not ready last fall for a vessel to go through ?

Mr. HAGGART. A boat did pass through, but the canal was not open for traffic. It was not intended to be opened until this spring.

Mr. CASEY. Then if Ryan's contract had not been completed when it was, in consideration of this bonus, the canal could not have been opened this spring ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; not until a year afterwards, next fall.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So the reason for giving the bonus of $90,000 was to secure the completion of the canal in December, 1893, because, if it had not been completed then, it could not have been opened until the summer of 1895. What possible object was there gained by having a portion of the contract work completed in December, 1893, and giving a bonus to secure that,

if the lock was not needed to be completed at that time ?

Mr. HAGGART. We had to have the lock completed in order to get the gates, valves, and a lot of other things not included in the lock contract placed in position, ready for the spring. Much of this work could not be done at all in winter without building a shed over the place.

Mr. CASEY. Could these works have been gone on simultaneously with the Ryan's contract ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, by making an arrangement with the contractors ; but the gates could not be hung until the work was completed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the Minister say that the first understanding was to have a lock 660 feet long ?

Mr. HAGGART. Six hundred feet long, and 85 feet wide.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in a speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper, when he was Minister of Railways and Canals, that he stated the lock would be 540 feet long, with 15 feet on the mitre sill.

Mr. HAGGART. The first contract was let on 20th November, 1888, and it was for a lock 600 feet long, and 85 feet wide.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite evident from the statement made by the Minister of Railways at that time that the first intention was to construct a lock 540 feet long. Surely the Minister will not challenge the statement of his predecessor, for I am quoting from "Hansard." So there must have been more changes than the statements of the hon. gentleman opposite would indicate.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the information I have received from the department. I was not at the head of the department at that time, and the information furnished me is that the first contract was for a lock 600 feet long and 85 feet wide. That was subsequently changed to 650 feet long, and 100 wide, with 19 feet on the mitre sill, the width at the gates remaining as before, at 60 feet.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will find Sir Charles Tupper's remarks at page 1440 of the debates of 1888. The question was put by Mr. Choquette : "Can the hon. gentleman state what will be the depth on the mitre sill ?" Sir Charles Tupper replied : "We expect 16 feet, and the lock will be 500 feet long."

Mr. HAGGART. No doubt the hon. gentleman is quoting correctly. All I can tell him is that the contract was made for a lock of a different size, a lock 600 feet long, 85 feet wide, and 16¼ feet on the mitre sill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. CASEY. I understand that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is pointing out to the committee that the changes made by the Government have not even yet been fully explained, that there were changes between the time the statement was made by Sir Charles Tupper in the spring of 1888, and the time the contract was let in September, 1888. But, perhaps the most interesting point is to ascertain what is the actual benefit we have obtained by giving the bonus of $90,000. The Minister does not seem to be positive as to whether the work of finishing up the canal might not have been carried on simultaneously with Ryans' work, whether the canal might not have been opened for last season's navigation, instead of this season's navigation. It was evidently the intention of the Government, under fear of the closing of the American canals, to have had our canal open earlier than it has been opened, and that this bonus was given to push on all the works simultaneously, and get the canal opened a good deal sooner than has proved to be the case. When, however, the difficulty with the United States in regard to the use of their canals passed over, the efforts of the Government were relaxed, and the canal has not been opened sooner than was anticipated, although the Ryans have obtained a bonus of $90,000. That is the outcome of the explanation given ; perhaps if the Minister gave all the particulars, the case might appear otherwise. But the hon. gentleman's brief is not as well prepared as was that of the Finance Minister when he submitted the present tariff.

Mr. HAGGART. The understanding was that Ryan's contract, in so far as the masonry lock walls were concerned, should be finished on 31st December, 1893, in order to enable the Government to open the canal this spring —when navigation commenced, if necessary.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman state that Ryan's contract was originally to be completed for the fall of 1893 ?

Mr. HAGGART. The bonus of $90,000 was given by Order in Council, and it was for the completion of the masonry work one year sooner than was originally intended.

Mr. CASEY. What was the original date ? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that without a bonus, Ryan's contract would have been finished in the fall of 1893.

Mr. HAGGART. No. I will read what the last contract was. All the documents are before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. The Public Accounts Committee meets to-morrow, and if the matter is threshed out there it might save discussion in the House.

Mr. HAGGART. The whole discussion will be in order on the main Estimates.

Mr. CASEY. Would the Minister of Railways give us the date it would have been finished if the bonus had not been paid, and the date it was finished when the bonus was paid ?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that we were enabled by the $90,000 bonus to have the canal completed a year before it otherwise would have been completed. They were obliged by the last contract to complete it on the 31st December, 1893, and I understand they had it completed in November, 1893. This is an amount that has to be available before the 1st of July, and, of course, there are some other items in connection with it in the main Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, this is only the 6th of June. The hon. Minister wants us to vote it without giving any information. Let the item stand.

Mr. HAGGART. All right, let it stand.

To pay salaries and expenses in connection with the commission of inquiry into Lachine Canal expenditure..... $6,700

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it for granted that this item is partially, for the inquiry into the Curran bridge expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We would like to have some particulars into the state of affairs there in reference to what the Minister of Militia described on a recent occasion as "a clear steal." We should like to hear from the Minister of Railways what has been done, or is being done, with respect to the suit instituted in consequence of the report of this commission.

Mr. HAGGART. An action is being brought against Mr. St. Louis to recover $120,000 which it is alleged he got in excess of what he is entitled to. He brought an action against the Government for $65,000, and he did not succeed in it, but I believe it is in appeal. There was a criminal prosecution against Mr. St. Louis for conspiracy to defraud the Government, and that action is now being pressed for the purpose of bringing it before the grand jury in Montreal. That is in the hands of the Justice Department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As I understand it there was an action brought by St. Louis against the Queen, and in the statement of defence put in by the Government they claimed the overpayments to St. Louis as a kind of set-off. Afterwards, on the application of the Crown, the claim of set-off was struck out, so that it should not be considered in the action of St. Louis against the Queen. That action of St. Louis against the Queen was dismissed by the Exchequer Court, and if it is still pending, St. Louis must have appealed.

Mr. HAGGART. I think he has appealed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The set off the Crown put in by way of statement of defence is now brought as a substantive action, and that will be tried before the Exchequer Court in a short time.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The third action is a criminal prosecution pending against St. Louis.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have any proceedings been taken against any other parties in connection with what my hon. friend states was "a clear steal" ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not describe it as such. I said the Minister of Militia said that, but perhaps it was the Minister of Justice. I would not like to misappropriate the statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have any other criminal proceedings been taken against any other parties for this conspiracy ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No steps have been taken at present against other parties.

Mr. MULOCK. It is as much as you can do to handle St. Louis.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At present there is an application pending before the assizes in Montreal to lay before the grand jury the evidence taken before the police magistrate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman able to state to the House whether these proceedings are being pushed ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. The application has been made, and the necessary steps taken under the code, and the whole matter is now under deliberation. The Chief Justice, I believe, is presiding, and he took the case into deliberation to-day and we expect a decision.

Mr. LAURIER. The steps of justice are very slow in this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not the steps of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not hear distinctly the last portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In order to proceed in this case we have to obtain the permission of the court to lay the evidence before the grand jury ; but a question has arisen in this regard, which was argued this afternoon, and I have received

telegraphic information to the effect that after the argument the chief justice took the matter into deliberation, and will decide whether the matter should go to the grand jury or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is a preliminary point taken before the Chief Justice ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. We have contended that it can be laid before the grand jury. Some exception to that was taken by the counsel for Mr. St. Louis and the matter argued, and the case has been taken into deliberation to-day.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is acting for the Crown ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Hall.

Mr. MULOCK. I see it stated in the press that the provincial government have refused to pay some of the expenses of the prosecution that failed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. What effect has that upon the present prosecution ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is a point which the judge has to decide. It was argued that the Crown, as represented by the Attorney General for Canada, was bound to enter into an understanding to pay the expenses of this prosecution in the event of it failing. That was not admitted on the part of the Attorney General for Canada ; and that is the real point in dispute.

Mr. MULOCK. The point is whether the Dominion shall give security or pay costs already incurred ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not already incurred, but which would be incurred by a new trial.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, if the judge decided that the Crown as represented by the Dominion, shall give security, I presume there would be no hesitation on the part of this Government in giving that security.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman presumes that.

Mr. MULOCK. I ask the hon. gentleman, then, whether, in the event of the court requiring security from the Dominion Government, they will be prepared to give it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it would be very unwise and quite extraordinary for me to state at the present juncture what we would be prepared to do in the event of the court deciding in a certain way. It would not be respectful to the court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like the hon. Minister of Railways to give us some general statement of the particulars of this vote of $6,700. Whose salaries is it for, and what are they ?

Mr. HAGGART. The salaries are : H. A. F. Macleod, services and expenses, $2,860 ; J. E. Vanier, $1,920 ; and R. C. Douglas, $1,810. That makes $6,590.

Mr. LAURIER. How is it these men were not paid before ?

Mr. HAGGART. We had not the money ; it lapsed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much did the hon. gentleman pay for the investigation in addition to this ?

Mr. HAGGART. The whole cost amounts to $9,270.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that include this $6,000, or is it outside of this ?

Mr. HAGGART. It includes this.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, it would be $3,000 for the expenses of the commission, and $6,000 for the salaries.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman will find that these figures do not cover the whole cost. There are no claims outside of this pending and unsettled ?

Mr. HAGGART. No, there are none.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that these three commissioners have never received any money for their services up to the present day ?

Mr. HAGGART. $395 is all they received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Railways says this is to pay, among other things, the salary or remuneration allowed to Mr. Douglas. You cannot pay him under this vote, Mr. Douglas being an officer of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. He is not in the Civil Service. He is one of the technical staff attached to the office, but he is not a permanent officer.

Mr. MULOCK. Before we pass from this item, I wish to come back to the point I raised with reference to the Minister of Justice. Let us refer to this prosecution to see how much progress we have made either to cause some person to make restitution or to obtain some satisfaction in some court for the great fraud committed on the country. If I remember the transaction rightly, the country could have got this work done for $160,000 or $170,000, and it was shown that we had paid $390,000, or $230,000 in excess of what the work could have been constructed for by reliable contractors, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I think. A commission inquired into the matter, and made a report in plain Anglo-Saxon language, alleging that the

Crown had been grossly defrauded, and enumerating instance after instance of fraud. That opinion was laid before Parliament a year and a half ago. It was in the possession of the Government as late as September, 1893. Nearly two years have elapsed since an amount of $200,000 was stolen out of the treasury in the most barefaced way, and the only progress made in the meantime is that the accused person has carried the warrant to Africa, and is prosecuting a suit against the Crown for more money. On the eve of a general election, a short time ago, there was a temporary manifestation of energy on the part of the Government, and we saw it stated that they were proceeding criminally against St. Louis. The Government, however, seem to have lost a good deal of their energy of late; and the preliminary attempt having failed before the magistrate, we are now told that there is danger of further criminal proceedings being interrupted by reason of the Dominion Government not having given security, or by reason of the point being disputed as to whether they should give security. The hon. Minister will not say whether the Crown will give the security or not. He thinks it would be ill-advised for the Crown to do this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As we are just contending that we need not.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. Minister pretend to argue that the Chief Justice of Quebec would be influenced in his judgment by a declaration here from the Minister? The Minister ought to assure us that he will do everything necessary in order to bring the case to trial. The public will be content with nothing else. I can see no object in the Government refusing to state what they will do lest that statement should affect the decision of the Chief Justice. If the Chief Justice decides there is to be security—and he will decide that point quite regardless of the attitude of the Dominion Government—the hon. Minister ought to tell us what the Government will in that case do. There has been a good deal of trifling of late by the Government in dealing with matters affecting the administration of justice. I do not wish to re-open old sores, but, speaking of the future, I must say that the public will not stand any more trifling in the administration of justice. It is the duty of the Government to say here, in plain, unmistakable language, that whatever is necessary to vindicate the law, they will do. It is a defiance of public sentiment, it is an outrage, that this great robbery should have taken place, and that there should be no one behind the bars to answer for it. Would the state of affairs which now exists have existed had the accused person not some sort of influence or pull? There can be but one inference. Do you suppose that in any other country under the sun such a transaction, condemned by the Government engineers, resulting in a direct steal from the public treasury of a sum approaching a quarter of a million dollars, would remain unredressed for two years after its discovery? Why, we have contracts for millions of dollars being at all times carried on, and this laxity or carelessness or whatever else you may call it, on the part of the administration, is an inducement to other contractors to do likewise. This state of affairs would not be allowed to prevail among private individuals. The machinery of the law would long since have been put in operation and the accused brought to jail. Why, then, should there be a different rule when the Crown is the injured party? Are we to suppose that there is not enough energy or administrative policy in the whole seventeen members of the Cabinet to bring one accused individual to jail? How long does it take to bring an accused person to jail?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In my judgment the position which the hon. gentleman takes is pitiable. In his desire to serve his political ends, he most utterly failed, by taking up a most extreme position. No more extreme position could possibly be taken. I am sorry for the hon. gentleman. He is always extreme. I have never known the hon. gentleman to be fair and candid in the discussion of any subject connected with politics. If the hon. gentleman thinks he can help his party or influence public opinion by taking the position he has to-night, I believe, knowing something of the people of this country, that he will fail miserably. The Government is proceeding in order and decency. The Government is bound in these matters to observe the procedure of the courts; and while there is no dispute in this Parliament in reference to the frauds that were perpetrated on the Crown, and while the hon. gentleman apparently believes that the accused, with other people, were guilty of crime, we must not be childish in our desire to bring the accused to justice. We must recognize that the Government and this Parliament must bow to the laws which this Parliament has enacted. But the hon. gentleman would hang a man first and try him afterwards. No matter what our opinions may be, from the evidence taken, the only way we can attempt to carry out the opinion of Parliament is by proceeding as other parties proceed. We have taken every step up to this day that we could possibly take. The hon. gentleman refers to the time when these frauds were committed. The hon. gentleman means to state that, after and almost before there had been time to carefully examine the voluminous evidence that had been obtained by a commission issued for the purpose, Parliament undertook, as its right was, to go on with the story, not to leave the Government to discharge its responsibility as it best could. This Parliament exercised its undoubted right and con-

stituted a committee to investigate, de novo and from the beginning everything in connection with this transaction. When an enormous amount of evidence had been accumulated and submitted to the committee, every step that could be taken under the laws of Canada, was taken, and the case was put into the hands of eminent counsel, reputable men, who, in the opinion of the advisers of the Crown, did all that could be done to carry out the desire of the committee and the desire of Parliament. And what was that? To put in due form before the magistrate, the proper authority in the province of Quebec and in the city of Montreal, the evidence on the case. The decision of the magistrate has been given. The hon. gentleman, I take it, thinks—and I agree—that the result was not such as we could have anticipated. What, then, remains for us to do? It remains for us, if we are dissatisfied with the decision of the magistrate, to put that evidence, that cogent evidence, that exceedingly strong evidence, in the opinion of the Government of the day, before the grand jury in the district of Montreal. And, on the first opportunity that we could do that, acting according to the legislation of this Parliament, we have done it. There we meet, as in every case of this kind we must meet, opposition on the part of the accused. And I say that Parliament will not hold its proper position, if we exhibit an undue desire to get the accused into the prisoners' box again. Surely, that is not our desire. We must respect the judges of the land; we must have regard to the regularity of procedure, and, having regard to that procedure, and showing respect for the judges of the land, we have done all that we could do. And now a point is taken as to the regularity of our course in the application that has been made, because opposition has been made to it, and the case is taken into deliberation. I say with confidence and appealing to members on both sides of the House, that it would be an exhibition of gross disrespect to the courts of Quebec, if we should begin to-night to discuss what we should do if the Chief Justice presiding at these assizes did not carry out the desire of the Parliament of Canada. I submit, Mr Chairman, that this discussion—although I do not hesitate to enter into it—is not germane to this vote, and is not strictly in order. The question before the House does not relate to the prosecution of Mr. St. Louis, or to the proceedings that are now being taken; they relate to an investigation that took place some time ago; and this committee is simply asked whether that investigation is one that should be paid for and whether the expenses that were incurred preliminary to the proceedings that are now being taken, were such as the Parliament of this country ought to provide for. I do not think that this is a time to discuss our position before the court or what we will do in the event of the court not agreeing with representations made by the counsel on behalf of the Crown.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice says that he has done all that was possible to do in order to bring this case to justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly.

Mr. MULOCK. I have not got the exact dates in my mind, but, speaking from recollection, a report was made by the commissioner in the fall of 1893. Does the hon. gentleman recollect the exact date?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. It was before the last meeting of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. And many months before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not many; the work was not finished until May, 1893.

Mr. MULOCK. At any rate, in the fall of 1893 the Government had the report of the commissioner. In the fall of 1893 they knew as much as they know now about this robbery. This was months before Parliament met. I want to put two questions to the hon. gentleman in view of his statement that everything has been done that could be done for the administering of justice in this case. Would he explain what was done in order to administer justice in this case between the making of this report and the assembling of Parliament? He pretends that the assembling of Parliament tied the hands of the Government, because Parliament undertook to investigate the matter. Let us, for the instant, concede that point, and let me ask him why his department or his Government was not at work between the handing in of that report and the assembling of Parliament, an interval of months? The accused, according to the information in the hands of the Government, had taken a large sum of money they were not entitled to. The hon. Minister has told us that the Government has done everything that could be done, proceeding in a dignified way, as justice ought to proceed. Let him tell me what was done in the period I have referred to. Perhaps, I should be correct in assuming—though I will not assume it until he has given me an answer—that they had folded their arms during these months, and it was not until Parliament had assembled, and for weeks afterwards, when the House showed activity in the matter, that any manifestation of an intention to do anything was made by the Government. Now, there is another period I want him to bridge over, in view of this statement that everything has been done that could be done. Parliament prorogued, as well as I can remember, about the middle of July, 1894. We are now in June, 1895. I do not know exactly when the information was laid before the magistrate.

Mr. LAURIER. In October.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman tell us if he took from July to October to lay an information? These are two points I

should like to know about, and then we will see how far the Minister's statement is verified.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems to be thoroughly at home. He imagines that we are in a police court, and that he is bullying a witness in the box. The hon. gentleman never seems to be so happy as when he is in a position of that kind. Now, I am not surprised that he has put these questions; he puts them out of the innocence of his heart. If he had ever held a position in the Government, he would not have put these questions.

Mr. MULOCK. Oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. The hon. gentleman will observe that no gentleman on his own side of this House who understands these matters——

Mr. MULOCK. Answer the questions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will answer them in good time.

Mr. MULOCK. Assume that I am guilty, and answer the questions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to give the hon. gentleman more information than he has asked. No hon. gentleman who has held a Cabinet position, either in the Federal Government or a local government, would put his question. If he had listened to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) I am certain he would not have proposed these questions, or spoke of the number of witnesses. The hon. gentleman spoke of the hundreds of witnesses examined. I say there were not 200 witnesses examined; nevertheless we all admit there were a great many, and the case is one that did require an enormous amount of testimony. It was a case in which the fraud practiced was not only gross but ingenious; it was a case in which almost all the employees were involved; it was a case in which a crime was committed through the acts of this enormous body of men. Consequently it was a case exceedingly difficult to consider, and to present in a proper shape to a tribunal. I know, incidentally, something of the difficulty in connection with the massing of the evidence before the police magistrate. Those who have followed the proceedings will easily understand what I mean. There had to be statements tabulated in connection with that vast number of men who were employed, because one of the chief charges was that there had been a resort to fictitious names, as of carters, labourers, and so forth. Then there had to be an investigation into the various and extraordinary means used for defrauding the Government, the misconduct of those representing the contractor and incidentally the misconduct of those representing the Government, who were induced to be false to their trust as it was alleged, by the contractor. I know that the preparation of the evidence, before it was put into the hands of the court, involved a great deal of necessary labour. The case could not be shoved into the courts. Every one in this House knows the way a case is shoved in the Public Accounts Committee; and it is not disrespectful to that committee when I say that evidence is taken there by the ream that would never be admitted by any court in Christendom. Time is consumed there, and witnesses are examined in a manner that would not be tolerated in any court. Therefore, there had to be a careful investigation held before the case could be presented to the court. It is not an unusual thing that when a case of this kind is reported upon, and an enormous amount of evidence is taken, it does not receive such a careful consideration, first, at the hands of the department immediately concerned, and secondly, at the hands of the Government, as a man would give to evidence relating to his own private affairs. I am almost ashamed to give these explanations to the hon. gentleman. He ought to know all I am telling him. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of red tape? Does the hon. gentleman not know that very simple matters that would be dealt with by a private concern instantly consume, and I fear always will consume, a great deal of time in being handled by the Government, either in this country or any other country?

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman cannot say that with a serious face, because it is common knowledge that no matter how perfect we may ultimately become, even in that dim and distant future when hon. gentlemen opposite will sit on this side, we can never hope for the celerity in the conduct of public business that obtains in the conduct of private business. Now, in this case there was not an opportunity within reason to deal with the subject until Parliament was upon us, and Parliament was no sooner upon us than it adopted this inquisitorial proceeding. It would have been highly disrespectful to this House had we ignored its desire for further information before coming to a conclusion. Let me put this point to the hon. gentleman, if there is anything in it—and from the manner in which he has received my remarks it is evident he does not attach much importance to the case——

Mr. LAURIER. What about the answers?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The answers must necessarily be ludicrous, because they are in reply to such absurd questions. If there was evidence existing upon which a direct action could be taken, is it to be believed that we would have spent

weeks, if not months, in taking further testimony ? I put it to the committee whether we ought, on the occasion to which I referred, having received the evidence of the commissioner, to ignore that evidence altogether, and whether we did not go into this question from beginning to end ? Therefore does it lie in the mouth of the hon. member for North York, or any other member, to charge us with not acting before that evidence was taken, when they were not ready to come to any conclusion upon that evidence themselves ? They were not prepared to act, they were not prepared to express an opinion. But they did demand a more thorough investigation, and a more thorough investigation took place. The case of the Government was in no sense prejudiced by waiting until all the evidence that could be accumulated, was obtained. For instance, does the hon. gentleman remember that some of his friends took an extraordinary interest in this case ? Some of his political friends connected with Liberal associations in the city of Montreal, men of good standing, took a great interest in this case Does he not remember that with fear and reward, those men attacked in the investigation which took place under the Government and endeavoured to add to that and to extend the inquiry before the committee. Would it have been respectful, then, to the members of the House, would it have been discrete for the Government to have ignored the fact that this House was not satisfied that all information was in the possession of the Government ? I think the course taken was not only a wise course, but even if there happened to be delay, that delay has by no means defeated justice. We presented from all the information obtainable, the strongest case that could be made out on behalf of the Crown, and, taking the magistrate's decision, and all he said that was proved before him, the Government believed that on that evidence which was before him, a case was made out, and that the accused should have been put on trial. The magistrate came to a different conclusion. No one can say that facts were overlooked or not regarded, because the very facts we wished to prove, and which we thought it essential to prove, the magistrate recounted in his decision. Under the law of this country, the Government believed, notwithstanding an apparent miscarriage of justice, there is another proceeding we can take, and that is to put the case just as it appeared to the magistrate, before the Grand Jury ; and we have lost no time in doing so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) may not know a great deal about red tape, but it is his own fault if he does not know a good deal about circumlocution. As to the appeal which the hon. Minister has made to us who formerly occupied seats in an Administration, I must tell him there was no precedent in a similar case. I do not recollect ever having been called to sit in judgment on the first cousin of a colleague of mine in a predicament.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice has furnished me now with a full explanation of the delay that I asked to have explained. The whole proceeding is in his hands, and he has exhausted a very long period of time in order to offer an explanation, without having furnished the explanation. If that is the method adopted in administering this case, then it furnishes a complete explanation as to why progress has not been made. One point more, and then I have nothing more to say at this stage. The hon. gentleman has told us that, on account of the intricacy of the case, and the voluminous character of the evidence, it was necessary for the Government to proceed safely and cautiously and steadily in order that success should meet them at every stage ; and so they began last October taking steps to get ready, and then took months to put in evidence, and all to have their case thrown out by an ordinary magistrate. That is the result of the deliberation, care and ability with which they brought this case to the courts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have just one remark to make on the lengthy speech which the Minister of Justice has seen fit to deliver on this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It only occupied ten minutes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seemed to occupy more like thirty minutes. The hon. gentleman reflected somewhat on the House for having indulged in the luxury of an invesigation in addition to that which was carried out by the officers of the department. I suppose he understands that the department undertook that investigation for the purpose of discovering who the parties were who committed the frauds on the department. But the investigation which the House ordered, and which took place under its auspices had in view another object, and that was to ascertain to what extent the Government and the department were responsible to the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite agree—that was the object.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was one object of the parliamentary inquiry, and that inquiry did a great deal of good in that direction, at all events, and it did that which the departmental officials could not be expected to do, namely, to ascertain that it was the department which was in fault. The point which I understand to be taken against the Department of Justice, and against the Government as a whole, was this, while the evidence brought out at the investigation before the departmental

officers and also before the Public Accounts Committee showed the existence of a conspiracy in which there were a number of men engaged to defraud the Government out of $200,000, not a single step has been taken, although two years have elapsed, against any man connected with the conspiracy, and sworn to be connected with it, except one. Whether the proceedings against that one have been duly and efficiently prosecuted I will not, at the present stage, express any opinion; but it is written on the face of the proceedings throughout that the Government never have done what they should have done when the sworn testimony given before the departmental officers, and repeated before the Public Accounts Committee, involved a number of men in the conspiracy to defraud the Government, and yet no step has been taken to punish a single one of those men.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a very serious statement to make, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will accept from me, speaking candidly to the House, and directly on that suggestion, that there is not the slightest desire on the part of the Department of Justice to shield a single individual who is connected with the crimes that have occurred. I speak candidly to the hon. gentleman and to the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke from the facts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I ask hon. gentlemen to wait the conclusion of the discharge of this very unpleasant duty before they condemn the proper authorities. If there be responsibility in regard to these proceedings, it rests entirely on the department which I now represent, and I appeal particularly to hon. members versed in the practice of the law, and connected with criminal procedure, in regard to this matter, for our instructions give carte blanche, so far as the department is concerned to the officers to proceed in this case under the evidence, not against one man, but against any or all who are in any way connected with the crime. We have given the most careful consideration to that evidence, because we desire it to be understood that the charge against one man is not taken with a view to victimize him. I am delighted to have an opportunity to correct any such impression that may prevail in the House or in the country; far be it from us to do that, there is no malice, I hope, on the part of any hon. member on either side of the House. All we desire is to thresh this matter out in the proper way before the courts, and whether we proceed against one party or against several parties under a general charge of conspiracy, or against one party after another is, I need not say, to hon. members and particularly those to whom I have referred, a matter involving great discretion and careful consideration. I say we are proceeding now with the bona fide intention of carrying out the ends of justice in the best and most approved manner, and after careful consideration, and acting on the opinion of counsel we have not deemed it in the interest of justice to proceed against all or any at the same time. I hope therefore, that until the end of this unfortunate matter, Parliament will do justice to the low officers, so to speak, of the Crown, and give them their confidence, while they are to the best of their ability endeavouring to bring all to justice. But the mere fact that we happened to proceed against one is no reason at the present time for any hon. gentleman to infer that we may not proceed against others. I say it hoping the hon. gentleman will accept the statement in the spirit in which I make it.

Mr. LAURIER. No, certainly not. The hon. gentleman cannot be serious in the statement which he makes, when we know that this offence took place two years ago, and we have not yet had a single person prosecuted with any effect. It took one year after the offence came to light, before the Department of Justice took any steps against one offender, and after six months of effort it has to be commenced again. Nothing is done. If the prosecution is to go on at this rate, it cannot take effect for one year more. Does the Minister pretend, that if these offences are four or five years old, the time will come to prosecute. He knows that there is such a thing as limitation to these matters, and that these prosecutions cannot be effected unless they are taken within a certain time. If the offence has been committed four or five years before it is tried, the hon. gentleman knows very well, that there is a bar against effective prosecution in such cases. The hon. gentleman has no excuse to say that he is in earnest, as he pretends to be, and as I am quite willing to believe that he is. If he is in earnest that all offenders are to be prosecuted, the prosecution must commence right away, because every day that intervenes makes the chances of conviction less.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will not accept the statement from me in the spirit in which I offered it. I cannot help that, but I regret it exceedingly. I think it is the first time in a British Parliament, that a man—no matter how humble, or even unfit for the high office I for the moment hold—making a statement of that kind, was received in such a manner. I do not remember such a case in this Parliament, and I do not believe that in a British Parliament, or in the local legislatures of Canada, when any one representing the Department of Justice, or acting as Attorney General, having made a similar statement in regard to

criminal proceedings, had his statement in the slightest degree doubted. Now, I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) just why it is that we did not venture pell mell against each and every offender, and all, at the same time. I regret to have to say it, but I must say it because the hon. gentleman has forced me to it. It could not have been anticipated; it was not anticipated by the law officers of the Crown that such an unfortunate miscarriage of justice would take place in the city of Montreal. That was not anticipated, but I do say this: That if under that evidence that we produce, we can neither obtain a committal from a magistrate, nor obtain the presentment of a bill from the grand jury, then I do say, that I will advise my colleagues and the Government, that it is absolutely futile and useless to proceed against the minor and other offenders. That is the course we have adopted. That is the course upon which we proceeded, and on good advice; not only on the advice I have from those immediately associated with me, but, I candidly tell the House the position that the Government takes in that regard. We are not masters of the situation. We must bow in this respect to higher powers. We must submit ourselves to the tribunals of the country even if we are dissatisfied, and meet the obstacles that were not anticipated. There is no law that I know of at present existing on the statute-books, that would put the people of this country or their rights in any better state. When I made my statement to the hon. the leader of the Opposition I had hoped and expected that he would have taken it in a different spirit. I regret that he did not, but of course that does not in the slightest degree affect me, and the confidence that I have that we are proceeding in this matter, not only in the regular way, but under the very best advice.

Mr. LAURIER. That is where I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I do not suspect his motives. He speaks in earnest, and I am quite ready to believe that he means what he says. But, I question the method followed so far by the Department of Justice. The hon. gentleman is a new hand in this department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not lay the blame upon him which I would lay upon the department generally, but I must say, and it is a feeling I believe shared in by every one in this country, that in the prosecution against the chief offender Mr. St. Louis, there has been a want of energy, and a want of determination, which has convinced the great majority of the people that it was a sham prosecution and not a real prosecution. Why, Sir what has been the case? This information was laid before the magistrate in the month of October last, and it took almost four or five months before the preliminary investigation was ended. This showed a want of energy and a want of determination on the part of the prosecuting counsel, whoever he was I do not know. At all events, if the matter had been pushed with the energy which should have been applied to the case, it is not conceivable that the determination of the case, in so far as the preliminary investigation was concerned, should not have been reached in the space of a few weeks at least. I know there was a good deal of technical matter introduced. I followed the prosecution in the newspapers, and for my part I was amazed that so much technical matter was introduced. It seemed to be totally irrelevant to come to the kernel of the matter. It seems to me that if the suit had been prosecuted with vigour and energy there would have been a result at a much earlier day than it came. At least it was said; the hon. gentleman says there was a miscarriage of justice, and I must say for my part, I would not have come to the conclusion that the magistrate came to. The reason which he gave was a reason to convict other parties, but not to let go the man who was before him. That seems to be the reasoning which I would have given to the case. At all events be that as it may, I believe that the Minister of Justice, if he is in earnest, as he appears to be at the present time, must put more vigour and energy into the prosecution than has hitherto been given to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is good enough to shift the charge from the Government to the counsel who have been employed.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not do that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hoped the hon. gentleman had shifted it somewhat. If I heard aright, the hon. gentleman has said that the chief trouble was the delay that occurred, not in the Department of Justice, but before the magistrate. Surely the hon. gentleman knows that the Government has no standing there of a special character. I wish to say in justice to the counsel who represented the department there, that they were interrogated by the Department of Justice from time to time. We placed at their disposal the best assistance that we could and the best men that we had. But there was delay. In one regard it seemed so to myself when I became charged with that responsibility, but on every occasion that inquiry was made, the fault did seem, not to lie—perhaps it is well I should not go further—not to lie with the counsel for the Government. The procedure in Montreal—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) is more familiar with that than I am—but the manner in which the evidence was taken, the adjournments that were not asked for by counsel, and the delays that

occurred, were things over which the Crown had no control. We were subject to the magistrate. I trust that after the additional explanation I have given the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will understand, and the House will believe, that the Government adopted every reasonable means they could to promote expedition in that case.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask one question for my own information. I assume that the Minister of Justice has retained the best available counsel in Montreal, because counsel are generally retained with an eye to the magnitude of a case; and, more than that, it should be insisted on behalf of the Crown that there should be continuous action, and not a day lost. The Government are not in the position of a private individual with a private suit. If all the time mentioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition was taken in that preliminary investigation in Montreal, there is something very curious about it. I used to notice myself that there would be an adjournment for a week or two. This the Department of Justice should have seen to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely, the hon. gentleman knows that the department could not interfere with the presiding officer to prevent an adjournment.

Mr. FRASER. Were those adjournments always made by the court, or were they made on behalf of the prosecution?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman surely does not mean that?

Mr. FRASER. I know that no court in any case in the world arbitrarily says, "I will adjourn for a week or a month."

Mr. GILLIES. The adjournment was asked by the defence.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman seems to know more about the case than the Minister of Justice. If it was asked by the defence, the Crown ought to have seen that there was the best cause shown for it before it was granted.

Mr. GILLIES. It was in the discretion of the court entirely.

Mr. FRASER. Will the hon. Minister of Justice say that it was at the instance of the defendant?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A gentleman belonging to the Montreal bar informs me that during a month at least the magistrate was ill and incapacitated. That would account for part of it.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not most extraordinary that when the Government have a prosecution of this kind the judge gets sick?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman know another case?

Mr. FRASER. I do not, but I think this may have something to do with the hint thrown out by the Minister of Justice a little while ago, namely, that there is not very much justice in Montreal. If we are to meet that issue, that there is not a magistrate in Montreal to send a criminal to trial or a grand jury to find a bill, we had better know it.

Mr. AMYOT. When was the adjournment?

Mr. FRASER. I do not know the dates.

Mr. AMYOT. Was it the fault of the Government?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not profess to know a single thing about any of the adjournments.

Mr. FRASER. Not about the day, but I make the statement that there were three or four adjournments. Does the hon. gentleman deny that those adjournments took place? The statement has been made in this House, and I am bound to assume that it is correct until it is denied. If those adjournments took place on behalf of the defendant, no judge would grant them without the defendant showing good cause, such as the necessity of getting witnesses, and so forth. As I understand, the defendant did not give any evidence to show why the case should be adjourned. Besides any adjournment that took place must have taken place with the consent of the Crown, or else the Crown was not able to make a sufficient case to prevent the adjournment. Now, these adjournments were the very best things that could happen for the defendant, for everybody knows that in any criminal case, if the court adjourns for a week, a very good opportunity is afforded of getting rid of witnesses or of doing a number of things to weaken the case. I do not mean to say that the Minister is responsible for that; but when the case went before the courts, it should have been prosecuted with the greatest possible vigour; because it must not be forgotten that the country was more interested in this prosecution than almost any other Government prosecution that has ever taken place. The Government themselves would not deny that it was about the worst case ever brought before Parliament, not as to the amount, but as to the magnitude and the variety of the stealing. I can understand that the department, after placing the matter in the hands of their counsel, would take it, as a matter of course, that he would proceed vigorously; but I submit that when these repeated adjournments took place, the department should have inquired what the reason was. I am bound to assume that they do not do so, but left the whole matter in the hands of their counsel. I am glad to know that the Minister states that the matter is to be proceeded with. I do not know what the defendant means to do; but know that when a case of this kind is postponed, the evidence cannot be got as well

as at first, public interest abates, and in the end the man gets off. There is nothing like the system prevailing in the motherland, where, when a man commits a crime, almost before he knows he has committed it, he is tried and sent to jail. The evidence is fresh: the community is aroused and insists that justice shall be done; but every day that a case is postponed, the more difficult it becomes to convict. That is the mistake the Government made, either in not appointing the proper person to take charge of the case, or, having made that appointment, in not seeing it properly prosecuted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The fairness of the hon. member for Guysboro' may be understood when he says to the committee that it is bound to assume that the Department of Justice never inquired as to the cause of delay. That is a sample of the manner in which the hon. gentleman approached this subject. The hon. gentleman also said that I had aspersed the administration of criminal justice in Montreal. I did nothing of the kind. I expressed a strong opinion as to what I thought of the evidence we had presented; I referred to the law, and I showed that the Crown was proceeding in this case as in others, and that if a magistrate did not commit, there was still under the Code another procedure by which the views of the Crown could be pressed. If the magistrate does not commit, there is still, under the Act, another procedure by which the views of the Crown may again be pressed. But when Parliament made that provision, it was not with the desire of aspersing the character of the magistracy in any particulars.

Mr. FRASER. I did not say so, but I did say that a hint from the Minister of Justice, namely, that this having failed, and as the case before the grand jury might fail, the Government might, therefore, be in the position of finding itself unable to proceed at all, was very serious.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In that event, what could we say? What did I insinuate? If the Grand Jury refuses to find a bill, it stands unimpeached for that, and it would not be the first occasion in any province in which the Crown thought it had a strong case and the Grand Jury did not think it had a case at all. There is nothing in that, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman made reference to it. One of my colleagues has suggested another feature that I might present to the committee as explaining some of their difficulties. I never anticipated that hon. gentlemen opposite would have been so uncharitable in connection with the prosecution of this case. Hon. gentlemen smile as if they thought I should have anticipated their being uncharitable. There were enormous difficulties in connection with the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman refers to others than I do. The difficulty of dealing with a number of the witnesses was this. We could pretty well trace the men who could give important evidence, but often and often and time and again when we supposed we could obtain a certain witness for the court, he was not available. The means taken by the Crown were the best I could imagine to secure all the evidence, but time and again we were foiled. It was a running fight on a very heavy case. There are innumerable details, but this I will say that be the end what it may, there is nothing that will stand more thorough investigation at the hands of this Parliament than the conduct of that prosecution. I am not making a vain boast, because I had nothing to do with it. I came in at the tail of the hunt, I came in at the end, and so I am not making a vain boast on my own behalf. But I do say that this Parliament may investigate until the very end of its term every step; and I sincerely believe that no gentleman will be able to suggest any step we could have taken in presenting the case for the Crown, which we have not taken. The Commissioner of Police, a most efficient officer in these cases, according to the Crown attorneys of the various districts of Ontario and Quebec—one who has made a reputation in connection particularly with the prosecution of counterfeiters—gave almost his whole time for months to that work, and did excellent work. It has been one of the most trying cases the department has ever had to deal with on account of the great difficulty of obtaining evidence. In the end we succeeded in obtaining what we thought was sufficient evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are somethings the hon. gentleman has overlooked. I remember that the Minister of Public Works, not very long ago, in addressing his constituency upon this very subject, said that, considering the circumstances under which the work was undertaken and executed, considering the speed required by the Government for its completion, he did not think that the amount which the structure had cost was unreasonable, but that on the whole it was most reasonable. It seems that the magistrate, before whom this charge was made, agreed with the Minister of Public Works, and not with the Minister of Justice. He takes the same view of the energy and efficiency exhibited by Mr. St. Louis in the prosecution of his work that the Minister of Public Works does; and until the Government are generally agreed as to the character of the charges brought against Mr. St. Louis, it is not surprising that the magistrate should agree with the Minister of

Public Works, under the circumstances, rather than in the views expressed by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be well if the Minister of Justice would withdraw one statement he made, if it is to be regarded as seriously made. If I understand him correctly, he intimated that if the Grand Jury on this occasion, threw out the bill, he might deem it his duty to advise his colleagues that the prosecution could not be successfully carried on. I think that is an unfortunate statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. God forbid that I should make such a statement. I did not.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman intimated that in the case of failure at this stage, that would be his attitude.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am very glad the hon. gentleman is not a reporter, for I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman intimated, at all events, that he might be compelled to come to that conclusion. If one grand jury throws out that bill, it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to have a new bill presented, and to continue doing this until he can get this case tried before a petty jury and efficiently tried.

Mr. McMULLEN. All the discussion to-night has been upon the prosecution against Mr. St. Louis for the money he is supposed to have stolen under the contract. After the action, the magistrate held, rightly or wrongly, that owing to the looseness of the contract between St. Louis and the Crown, St. Louis was enabled to take advantage of his position and pocket the money, and could not be prosecuted criminally. That contention could not come up in the case of those who must have been guilty of stealing a million feet of timber. There was a large amount of timber stolen. Either it was never delivered, or if delivered it was stolen. Why has no action been taken to reach the criminals? If hon. gentlemen opposite had taken active steps to arrest those men, they would be in jail to-day. How is it that the Government have simply followed one man and that very tardily and allowed the others to go scot free? Allow me to tell the hon. gentleman that the country is looking to the Opposition to discharge their duty in this as in other matters. It is our duty, in the interests of the people, to urge the Government, when money has been stolen, to make every effort to bring the thieves to trial. The people of this country are disposed to look upon the course of the Government with a considerable amount of disgust, after the experience of another case, in which there was a long troublesome prosecution and the parties found guilty and sentenced to twelve months in jail, but let loose at the end of three months, it looked like a friendly proceeding taken with a view of throwing a sop to public opinion. I would like to know how it is that the people who were undoubtedly guilty of stealing a million feet of timber, have not been proceeded against?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is assisting considerably, in my humble judgment, the acquittal of Mr. St. Louis, if he should be committed to trial. The whole tendency of his argument is in the very line of the argument which the counsel for Mr. St. Louis would make if he were endeavouring to obtain sympathy from the jury for him. Now, the hon. gentleman will see on what delicate ground he is treading, and I venture to tell the committee that they must give to the law officers of the Crown some latitude, and accept, at any rate, for the time,—not for all time, but until the affair is through—the statement that they are acting in this matter with care and consideration, and not with the intention of allowing any criminal to escape. And, in the matter of procedure, as to whether they should go at all the accused at once, or separately, that is a matter that I would prefer should be laid before the jury, for, no doubt, the very point will be taken. The hon. gentleman will see that the discussion of this point, if it has any effect at all, has the effect of instilling into the public mind the idea that we are making a victim of Mr. St. Louis. Now, there are some men who believe that, and, in the end, that may be a very formidable criticisim—that we have adopted the wrong method of procedure.

Mr. LAURIER. You escape that by prosecuting the other parties.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has given his opinion. For the time, we must take the responsibility of not acting upon it, and when the matter is finished, we shall be judged on the whole case as it then stands. But why hon. gentlemen should ask us to follow up quickly and hotly all the minor offenders, when this charge, according to their own wish was levelled at one man, is something that I cannot understand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman evidently misses the force of what my hon. friend behind me has said. You are prosecuting Mr. St. Louis for the offence of endeavouring to obtain $170,000 from the Government by false pretenses. That offence stands upon its own merits, and will be supported by the evidence the Government can bring against him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Whom do you wish to have prosecuted?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not saying that this man or that should be prosecuted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is the man whom any one suggests to have stolen the lumber ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not trying to bring that out. I am only repeating, much as I dislike repetitions, at this late hour of the night, what my hon. friend said. Before the committee was appointed, evidence was given that the Government had received and placed in position in Montreal a certain quantity of lumber. That lumber was absolutely stolen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. By whom ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is impossible for me to say. But the point my hon. friend makes is that the fact of that theft has nothing whatever to do directly or indirectly with the question whether Mr. St. Louis was or was not guilty of the offence charged against him. This relates to a simple theft ; and I have yet to learn that the punishment of theft is more difficult in Montreal than any where else in the world. I believe you have nothing to do but to bring forward your evidence before the jury, to show that the theft took place, and that such and such parties were engaged in it, and punishment will follow as quickly in Montreal as anywhere else in the Dominion. I simply rise to point out to the Minister of Justice that there should be no confounding of other offences committed in connection with this lamentable contract with this crime. The stealing of the lumber has nothing to do with Mr. St. Louis. The evidence to prove the guilt of the parties must be easily obtainable, or it must have been easily obtainable at one time. Whether the lapse of time has made it more difficult to obtain or not, the hon. gentleman must decide for himself. I have had sufficient experience in criminal matters to know that while you can easily obtain evidence just after a theft has taken place, after twelve months or two years have passed very often, that evidence will have disappeared. Steps should be taken to punish these parties, who ever they may be.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That shows how much assistance the committee can give the Government when they approach the question in that manner. The hon. gentleman says that after twelve months have passed you cannot find the parties guilty of a theft. And this happened in 1893.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said nothing of the kind. I say it becomes more difficult as years go by to find the guilty parties. And if the hon. gentleman's department has let two years go by without taking the necessary steps, they have only intensified the difficulties in the way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, no : the hon. gentleman cannot get away that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not getting away.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All these offences occurred in 1893. We had the benefit of the hon. gentleman's ability as a lawyer in the Public Accounts Committee, and I challenge him to tell me, closely as he followed the evidence, the name of the man who stole the lumber.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has made a very bold challenge. I do not set up to be a detective. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman earlier in the evening that the object of the investigation held by the Public Accounts Committee was, in a large measure, to ascertain whether there had been departmental negligence. We depend upon the Department of Justice, with its detectives, with its sleuth-hounds of justice, to ascertain who are the parties who stole the lumber belonging to the country. The Public Accounts Committee were examining witnesses to ascertain whether the Government departments had or had not been guilty of gross negligence in a case which, it was alleged, that $200,000 has been stolen. We reported that we had found the same facts in regard to the stealing of the lumber as the committee appointed by the Government had already reported. It then became the duty of the Department of Justice to have the parties punished if they could be found. The charge made by my hon. friend is that there has not even been a pretense of prosecuting any one for that theft.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the bald facts stand out in this form : Two committees of inquiry—whether they were sleuth-hounds on the second, I will not say—went into this subject ; many witnesses were brought up from every point of the compass ; every conceivable question was put, and all that the committee could ascertain was that the lumber had disappeared. I will not make the admission to-night that we can put our hand upon the guilty parties, but what I do submit is that this discussion of the strength or weakness of the case for the Crown is not only entirely irregular, but will, in no sense, assist the administration of justice. I do venture to urge that the tendency of this discussion is to create a sympathy for the man that the committee desired to have prosecuted : that the tendency of the discussion is to create sympathy because we have fastened the fangs of the law upon one man and one man only.

Mr. CASEY. But you have not done it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, that we have attempted to do it. And that will not assist what the hon.

gentlemen have, up to now, pretended was their desire—to have the guilty parties brought to justice.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order to prevent any embarrassment on the part of the Government, I would suggest that we allow this item to stand, and stop the discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no item relating to what we have been discussing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think that the Minister of Justice has quite answered the statement from this side of the House, and I think that we ought to have some further light upon the subject. I am making no further criticism as to the prosecution of Mr. St. Louis. But there was evidence before the committee that there was about a million feet of lumber stolen, that several large boxes were made and ironed off and used, I think, as hoists for taking up and bringing down material, and something like twenty or thirty of these disappeared in one night.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Those are matters about which no information, beyond the fact that they were stolen, was given to the committee; and it seems to me that once the fact is known, it ought not to be very difficult to ascertain who the guilty parties were. Now, the fact that that was stolen has been testified to; the fact that an immense quantity of lumber was purchased and paid for that did not go into the work, was also clearly established, and that it was delivered there and that it was stolen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You could not arrest any one on that evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not saying that, but I am saying that when that fact was made known, it was the duty of the Government to inquire into the matter and to ascertain who the guilty parties were.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not suggest that we did not inquire?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, but I am stating that, so far as we know, no party has been charged or prosecuted up to this moment. It would be a rather extraordinary state of things that, if in a large city you could have a million feet of lumber stolen and some 24 or 25 large boxes made of the kind mentioned, that these should all disappear, and that it should be impossible to ascertain what had become of them.

Mr. HAGGART. There was no evidence in that direction. The evidence reported by the commission was that parties had charged for one million feet of lumber more than was found in the work. Then, there was evidence of one party that he saw pieces of timber, some of them 12 inches square, that were delivered upon the ground, and that had disappeared next day. Then, there was the evidence with reference to these mortar boxes, but there is no evidence at all about a million feet of lumber being stolen.

Mr. LAURIER. We have first of all the offence proved that lumber was paid for which was not delivered; then we have lumber which was paid for by the Government which never went into the work, and, therefore, never was delivered.

Mr. HAGGART. The lumber was charged for, but has not been paid for.

Mr. LAURIER. That makes no difference. It was in evidence that lumber was delivered and taken away, and, as I understand the Minister of Justice, that matter has not been investigated, and we do not know who are the thieves. If that be so, I must say that the investigation has been a farce. Are we to be told that in the large city of Montreal, with judges, detectives and policemen, timber can be stolen and no trace of it can be found and that the thieves cannot be brought to justice?

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Railways is quite mistaken when he says that this lumber might have been charged for but it was not paid for. The evidence was that the lumber was paid for, and that a large part of it, if not all, was delivered.

Mr. HAGGART. It was not paid for, and is not paid for to this day.

Mr. CASEY. The evidence is entirely the other way. The Minister's memory will bear me out that there was no stoppage of payments until the latter stages of the work, when it was pretty well proven that overcharges for labour were being made, and then there were some payments stopped. But this lumber was delivered, and charged for, and paid for, in the early stages of the operation.

Mr. HAGGART. I shall have to correct the hon. gentleman again. The party who delivered the lumber claimed $15,000 more than we paid for.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has admitted just what I said. A certain amount of lumber was delivered and paid for, and the man who delivered it claimed $15,000 more: and that shows that he had been paid for all except the $15,000. So the Minister's correction is an admission of what I said.

Mr. HAGGART. If you take that as an admission, all right.

Mr. CASEY. It is not necessary for him to go out of his seat and consult somebody else about it, because he has admitted the whole case. Then the Minister says: Do

the Opposition want us to be hot-footed after everybody concerned in this? Well, Sir, I should not call it very hot-footed not to proceed with the prosecution for two years from the time the offence was known. It is two years since they knew there was this theft of lumber, and no prosecution was instituted. He says that this discussion will create sympathy for the man on whom they had fixed the fangs of justice. Well, the fangs seem to be in very poor condition. They do not seem to be very good holding fangs. They have not drawn blood so far. The Government have not been able so far, after two years trying, to get them fixed even in Mr. St. Louis. The mouth of justice, seems to be very toothless; and as an hon. friend suggests, it has been only the gums of justice that have been mumbling at Mr. St. Louis. His treatment so far has been more of the nature of a rough caress than of the nature of a bite. It does not seem as if justice wanted to draw blood at all. The blood in Mr. St. Louis' veins was too precious, it was too pure, it was connected with too high a source, to be rashly shed.

I hear a suggestion from somewhere, perhaps it comes from the air, that he has been bled sufficiently already. That was evidently Mr. St. Louis' opinion, for he swore on oath before the Public Accounts Committee that he had been bled very heavily indeed for Government election funds here and there, and to maintain certain prominent politicians, who, he said, were very expensive to keep up. Mr. St. Louis thought perhaps, that he had bled enough already. Perhaps the Department of Justice may be of the same opinion, but the country does not feel that way about it. Now, the Minister of Justice thinks it is quite enough excuse for him that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) cannot put his fingers on the man who stole that lumber. Well, as has been pointed out, we are not a detective agency on this side of the House; it is not our business to put our fingers on the actual thief. If a Minister of Justice and a Solicitor General are for any purpose at all, surely they are for the purpose of ferreting out the man who steals Government stores, and that somebody has stolen here is beyond doubt.

Then there is another point. What has been done in regard to prosecuting Government officials who allowed all this to be stolen? Here was a large staff of engineers, sub-engineers, clerks of works, book-keepers, caretakers, and so on—it is not necessary to go through the whole list. A large staff of Government officials were there to prevent Mr. St. Louis from stealing, and the evidence shows that these men assisted Mr. St. Louis to steal, and not one of them has been prosecuted. It is no trouble for the Minister of Justice to put his fingers on them, and to fasten his fangs into them, if he is inclined to bite in that direction. They are all within reach of his fangs. Let him fix the fangs of justice on those who took public pay and at the same time received money from St. Louis, and knowingly allowed him to steal the public funds. No doubt they have been suspended or dismissed, but it is absurd to dismiss a thief in your employ, and pretend that such is adequate punishment. In the case of an employee who either stole or connived at stealing a hundred thousand dollars from a private party, his employer would put him in the penitentiary. Why have these men not been put in the penitentiary. I will tell the committee why: They know too much and would squeal. Let the fangs of justice be fixed on these men. These are points which the Minister of Justice omitted in the course of his explanation.

Rideau Canal $8,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The committee should have details as to the land damages?

Mr. HAGGART. Unfortunately, these claims arise every year. This is an estimated amount, and may perhaps not be required. Claims, however, have been filed in the department to the amount of over $20,000, covering a number of years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The water was low on the Rideau Canal, I think.

Mr. HAGGART. These claims have been running for a number of years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman's attention has been directed to the Tay Canal, but certainly the water was low on the Rideau. At what point have these damages occurred?

Mr. HAGGART. On the different stretches where dams have been constructed for reservoir purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Details of the claims should be submitted to the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. How does the water come to be allowed to overflow? Cannot it be regulated?

Mr. HAGGART. The engineers make estimates as to the damages that will result from the erection of dams for reservoir purposes. But these sometimes prove erroneous, and when an officer is sent to investigate claims it is found that damages have occurred, and we endeavour to settle the matter for as small an amount as possible, for if the parties go to the Exchequer Court they generally get four times the sum for which it could be settled.

Mr. LAURIER. What do you do with the engineer who misleads you?

Mr. HAGGART. Take the case of a lake ten miles long. Without a topographical survey it is impossible for an engineer to determine what damage may be done by the erection of a dam.

Mr. MULOCK. Were not those dams erected years ago ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, some were erected five, six, ten, and fifteen years ago.

Mr. DEVLIN. When were the claims made ?

Mr. HAGGART. Some were made two, three, or four years ago. I will bring down all the particulars on the main Estimates.

Beauharnois Canal $10,855

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would make explanations as regards the cost of the drain.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimated cost of the drain was $10,000. The contractor failed to complete the work, and the cost, as subsequently carried out was $11,800.

Resolutions reported.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) better to secure the independence of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the principles of the Bill ?

Mr. MULOCK. The object of the Bill is to accomplish what its title indicates—further to secure the independence of Parliament. It has been the constant effort of parliamentists in Canada to secure on the floor of Parliament the free, unbiassed expression of the will of the people ; and from time to time legislators have directed their attention to the removal of all obstacles in the way of the accomplishment of so desirable an end. Our predecessors have from time to time, provided against biassing, influencing, as, for example, the presence of place-men in Parliament. That is recognized now as a condition of affairs which should not be tolerated in a free Parliament. There are a few exceptions to the Act respecting this House, but the general principle has been affirmed long years since, that members of Parliament should not owe any divided allegiance : the member of Parliament should represent freely and fully the will of the people who sent him here and, to speak inoffensively and yet, perhaps, in an apt way to describe my view, he should not accept the shilling from any side of the House to the extent of being in any way hampered in the discharge of his duties or rendered at all otherwise than free to act as his best judgment dictates in dealing with all questions before the House. Now it is impossible for one to shut his eyes to an abuse which has sprung up in the Canadian Parliament, more particularly in the House of Commons, an abuse that is far-reaching and is attended by more evils even than the one to which I particularly allude, but none equal in magnitude to the evil of menacing the independence of Parliament itself. What I refer to is members of Parliament, and members of this House, applying to the Government of the day for positions in the gift of the Crown, positions of emolument, which if they were to accept would at once disqualify them from remaining members of the House. Why ? Because the moment they have entered the public service as civil servants, they would cease to be free, they would be servants of the Government of the day, and, therefore, to that extent, not untrammelled to represent their constituents. Well, Sir, I would like to know if a man is more free who is an applicant for a position, or who has received the promise of a position from the Government of the day as soon as it may suit them to appoint him. How many members are there in this House to-day in that position ? There are a considerable number.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, a very considerable number of members of this House to-day are applicants for public offices from the Government that they are supporting, and several have promises of such positions. A short time ago the Premier of this country wrote a letter to a member of this House stating that ten seats in the Senate had been promised. He did not say they had been promised to members of this House, but I have not the slightest doubt but that a very considerable number of these seats are being kept vacant for some members of this House. We know, and the country knows that public offices have

been kept vacant now for years, which ought to have been filled or abolished long since, in order that when a fitting time arrived, members of this House might be appointed to these positions. It is not very long since a member of this House was appointed to a position, the promise of which, I understand, had been made to him whilst he was a member of this House, and he continued to be a member for a length of time after the promise was made. How can a member of this House, who has the promise from the Government of a position of emolument, be free to vote or take a stand, as a representative of the people, against the will of the Government? However independent he may desire to be, that relation entirely destroys his usefulness as a representative of the constituency which sent him here. Further, Sir, to regard Parliament as primarily a stepping-stone to office is calculated, in my judgment, to lower the dignity of Parliament. I do not deny that members of Parliament, after the lapse of a proper period of time, may have an equal claim with others to public office; but it will be a deplorable state of affairs if the idea comes to prevail that the best way to secure public office is to be a candidate for Parliament or a member of Parliament. Men will come here, not to serve their country generally, but the Government of the day, in order that they themselves may profit, and the interests of their constituents will only take a very secondary position. I think, therefore, considering the magnitude of the evil, that the time has arrived when Parliament must assert itself. I think I am not outside of the mark when I say that from fifteen to twenty per cent of the members now supporting the Administration have promises of situations, and depend upon the Government to carry out these promises. Such an element in Parliament is calculated to lower the influence of public opinion in the House, and entirely defeat the object of our parliamentary system.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 112) to amend the law relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Sproule.)

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers. He said: The House will remember that about three years ago a Bill was passed with reference to the harbour of Three Rivers, the object of which was to give the harbour commissioners power to issue debentures to a certain amount, subject to the condition that none of these debentures should issue until the arrears of interest and sinking fund due to the Dominion Government on the loan to the harbour commissioners, made many years before, were paid. It has been found impossible for the commissioners to issue their debentures and pay the whole of those arrears. Three years have run on and the arrears have been accumulating, of course, to a certain extent. It is found impossible by the commissioners to issue the amount of debentures authorized—$60,000, I think—and pay the arrears, and have sufficient left to make the improvements required, which improvements will result in increased revenue. I may say that the revenues of the harbour of Three Rivers have been appreciating from year to year and business has been increasing. The harbour is managed with a great deal of prudence and economy. It is proposed that the commissioners should pay the Government the amount of arrears due at the time, three years ago, namely, $15,000, but no indebtedness is taken away which the commissioners are under to the Dominion Government. The Bill simply gives the commissioners the power to issue debentures on paying us $15,000 of arrears, and it is expected that increased revenues will result from the improvement of the wharfs, in which case, of course, the Dominion Government may expect a larger return.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course, the petition of the commissioners and all other documents will be brought down?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—PETITION OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I propose bringing the attention of the House to the petition that was submitted to it a day or two ago, with reference to the department of the Auditor General.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman would allow me, before he goes further, I would ask him not to bring this matter up to-day. I have had no notice of it, none of the papers are here, and the petition was only read and printed the other day.

Mr. AMYOT. We received it in French only a few minutes ago.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I thought there was sufficient notice on the subject when

the petition was read at the Table. Of course, when the hon. gentleman asks to have the matter postponed until he has all the papers, I am quite ready to acquiesce in his request. I think that is only proper, under the circumstances. But I would say that I consider this matter of very great importance, because the office and department is one peculiar to our system. And the relation in which the department stands to parliamentary and public expenditure makes the office a unique one in our organization.

Mr. FOSTER. We can have it up on Tuesday, if you like.

Mr. LAURIER. We will let you know.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Chambly Canal—To pay A. Hurteau & Frère for timber, $1,957.15; to pay for lands taken from A. Yule and A. F. Riddell, $1,100; total.....	$3,057 15

Mr. HAGGART. The first item is an old account for timber supplied. The price charged was considered excessive, namely, 38 cents per foot; whereas, 32 cents was considered a liberal price, and was offered him. He refused to accept it for a long time, and has now agreed to take the price. I think the land was taken about four years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you pay him interest on the 32 cents?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there no standard of value fixed by the department that should be paid for timber?

Mr. HAGGART. The officers of the department reported that 32 cents was enough for the timber, and we refused to pay any more. In reference to the other item, the above is the valuation which Col. Yule, until now, has declined to accept. This land was expropriated for the purpose of erecting an electric station upon it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the quantity?

Mr. HAGGART. It was three lots in the town, making in all about 180 by 300 feet. The parties finally agreed to accept the valuation put upon it by arbitration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a large quantity of land for such a purpose.

Mr. HAGGART. It does seem so. The land was expropriated about five years ago, and the parties refused to accept our offer until now.

Sir RICHARD CARWRIGHT. Surely, it must be for some other purpose than merely an electric station. That is rather more than an acre of land, and prima facie that seems quite too large an amount for such a purpose.

Mr. HAGGART. I think there are workshops and other buildings upon it. That is all the information I can give the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better obtain for us a statement of the reason why so much land is required, apparently a great deal more than is wanted for the purpose mentioned.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. I will get a memorandum and make explanations on the main Estimates.

Cornwall Canal—	
To complete Government sewer.....	$4,000
To complete telephone line.....	500
For repairs on lock No. 15.....	3,000
For repairs on lock No. 16.....	3,000
To pay William Tackabury indemnity for injury received whilst on duty....	400

Mr. HAGGART. The first item is for the purpose of paying a contract entered into with a person named Clarkson, at schedule prices for the lowest tender. There was $10,000 voted before, and this is to complete it. At the time of the expropriation of land in Cornwall for the canal, the Government made an agreement with the town, which is embodied in Orders in Council thirty years ago, by which we are obliged to repair this sewer.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister say what is the length of that sewer, and what it is built of?

Mr. HAGGART. It runs along the town of Cornwall right down to the end of the canal, about 5,000 feet. It is built of stone and is of a permanent character.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it for the use of the town of Cornwall alone, or for joint use by the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. For the town of Cornwall alone. On account of the canal cutting them off from the river, this sewer was necessary in order to enable them to dispose of the sewage. There was a commission appointed years ago under old Canada, and an agreement was made with the town of Cornwall by which the province was obliged to build this sewer.

Mr. RIDER. Will the Minister give some explanation in connection with this telephone line?

Mr. HAGGART. That was an appropriation for a telephone line along the canal, which was put up by the lowest tenderer. I think it is about 12 miles long.

Mr. RIDER. How many instruments were there?

Mr. HAGGART. One to every lock, and one for the headquarters of the staff.

Mr. RIDER. Does the line cross under the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. No; it is on the bank of the canal.

Mr. RIDER. I understood that the line did pass under the canal, and instead of the work being done by a cable the wires were put into a lead pipe, which was found to be unsuitable for the purpose. I understand that tenders were called for the construction of the line. Was the lowest tender accepted?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. RIDER. What kind of telephone was to be used? Was it to be a metallic circuit or a single metal wire?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the specification here, but the work was done under specification by the engineer in charge of the canal. If it had been necessary to cross the canal, the wires could have been carried through a subway.

Mr. RIDER. There was a sum voted, and that has been exceeded, I believe.

Mr. HAGGART. There was an application last year for $2,000 for this work. The total cost of it has been $2,500, and that includes everything.

Mr. RIDER. Then this will be the final payment?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, for the whole work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why has the Minister, in regard to this and many other items, placed it under this head, instead of taking the appropriation under the ordinary head of maintenance of canals? It would appear to me prima facie that such items as repairs on locks would come more properly under collection of revenue than in this particular place.

Mr. HAGGART. It has always been done this way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not always. This whole business of "Railways and Canals—Income" was instituted by a Conservative Government, of which the hon. gentleman is now a pillar.

Mr. HAGGART. For a long time it has been done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been done for many years no doubt, but it was not the original practice. What principle governs the hon. gentleman in distributing such items as repairs to locks, and placing them under this heading instead of under the heading of maintenance?

Mr. HAGGART. The Finance Minister is very particular that the amount voted shall be applied to the special object the Minister states when he asks the vote. I suppose that is the real reason—to keep the appropriations solely to the object for which they were voted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister does not want to trust you with the funds, and there is a good deal in that, perhaps.

Mr. HAGGART. The item of $400 indemnity to William Tackabury is asked under these circumstances: One night when Tackabury was sitting on a snubbing-post, a tow approached, struck the post and the man fell off, and has never recovered.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been any doctor's report on his condition, and is it in the hands of the department?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who was the attending physician?

Mr. HAGGART. Dr. Bergin, I think, made the report. I do not know who was the attending physician.

Mr. MULOCK. When did the accident happen?

Mr. HAGGART. Last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is rather a singular proceeding. We have no statement made as to the physician in attendance, but we have a report from Dr. Bergin, in whose constituency the accident happened. The doctor out of the goodness of his heart, perhaps, made a report by which this man was able to obtain an indemnity from the Government. A report should, however, have been obtained from an independent physician, one who did not expect to obtain any favours. I do not say that the country has not been properly treated, but it gives to the whole transaction the complexion of there being an object behind.

Mr. HAGGART. There is also a report by the doctor attending on the party.

Farran's Point Canal—	
To renew superstructure of pier at lower entrance	$8,000
To build lower gates at lock No. 22.....	4,000

Mr. HAGGART. The superstructure of the pier at the lower entrance is very rotten, and requires immediate renewal. The amount of $4,000 is required to build the gates at lock No. 22. These gates are old and rotten and require immediate removal, which is being done. Miller Bros., of St. Catharines, are the contractors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were tenders asked for the work?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. What is the length of the part to be rebuilt?

Mr. HAGGART. About 700 feet.

Mr. GIBSON. On what is it being built?

Mr. HAGGART. Timber, filled in with stone.

Mr. GIBSON. What is the depth at that point ?

Mr. HAGGART. The depth of navigation is 9½ feet, and the least possible depth would be about 11 feet.

Mr. GIBSON. But this is only superstructure, and only above the water will any work be done.

Mr. HAGGART. Of course it is only above water.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to ask the Minister, what rate per thousand feet, board measure, he is paying for timber, and what he is paying per cubic yard for the crib filling ? This is an enormous price.

Mr. HAGGART. The contract is not let yet, but will be to the lowest tender. This is merely an estimate from the engineer.

Mr. GIBSON. As I understand, the gates have been let to Miller Bros., but the pier has not been let yet.

Mr. HAGGART. That is right.

Trent Canal—To assist in building Rosa's bridge over the Otonabee River..... $800

Mr. McMULLEN. Are you getting assistance from the municipality here ?

Mr. HAGGART. We are obliged to build it. Wherever a highway passes over a navigable stream, we contribute towards the building of the bridge, the extra cost, supposing there was no canal there. The cost of the bridge is $10,000, the amount appropriated, $1,700 and the $800 will make $2,500, which the superintending engineer says is what it will cost for the enlargement of the swing.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the municipality pay the remaining $7,500 ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is paid from other sources, either the municipality, or the provincial government.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there many instances of this kind throughout the Dominion ?

Mr. HAGGART. There have hitherto been a good many.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there should be a law applying to all these cases, and it should not be made the subject of an Order in Council. The assistance given is now a discretionary matter with the Cabinet, but I think there should be a law to provide for a certain percentage under certain conditions to structures of this kind.

Mr. MULOCK. That might be desirable, but the question would be if we had power to make a law, which would meet with the approval of the other contracting parties, which, in some cases, is the municipality, and, in some cases, the provincial government.

Mr. HUGHES. The rule is found to work very satisfactorily, so far as it concerns the Trent water. The road crosses the water, and the water becomes navigable after the construction of the bridge, and the Government then pays for the swing.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) misunderstood me. I did not intend that a law should be passed that would affect structures of this kind, so far as other parties are concerned, but simply to grant a percentage of the entire cost.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the Government requires that a bridge should swing so that vessels may pass through where none were required to pass before, the contribution of this Parliament should depend upon the cost of the bridge over a bridge of a different kind from that which was required before. In some cases it would be very much more than in others. I do not think the rule of a percentage could apply to that. Everything would depend upon the extra cost that would arise from the character of the structure required.

Welland Canal—To pay claim of North Cayuga Township for damage to road by floods $567

Mr. GIBSON. Would the Minister be kind enough to explain what damage was done in North Cayuga ?

Mr. HAGGART. The official arbitrators, some time ago, assessed the damage at this amount.

Mr. GIBSON. What led to the damages ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I was the means of asking that this amount be put in the Estimates, I will explain it to the hon. gentleman. Some years ago, the water was raised by the dam at Dunnville, and, in consequence, not only was land drowned, but a number of streams running into the Grand River were made much wider, and more difficult to bridge. All the other townships around applied for certain sums in connection with that damage, and their claims were referred to the official arbitrators. This is the last one of the townships, and the same sum is being asked for here as was paid to a much smaller township.

Mr. GIBSON. Did this occur thirty years ago ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I cannot tell you exactly, it may be. All the townships came here for compensation.

Mr. GIBSON. I suppose it is a case of resurrection to meet the general election ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No. All the townships were dealt with on the same basis.

Mr. GIBSON. The Government are getting very generous to pay for damages that occurred thirty or forty years ago. Is there

nothing else in the township that they could pay for ?

Mr. McNEILL. I must say that if the other townships only got what they were entitled to, and got that thirty years ago, this township should get a little more now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What majority did North Cayuga give on the occasion of the last general election in Haldimand ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. About a hundred, which it has always given against me ; and all the members of the council are Liberals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, this is not much for a hundred majority.

Mr. HAGGART. They have been asking a great deal more, but they finally consented to take this.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very singular that just at the time of an election in a constituency, any old claim that may have been standing since the days of Adam is raked up for settlement. Here is a claim thirty years old which is presented for payment just at a time when Haldimand is called upon to do a favour to the Government by returning a member of the Cabinet. I am quite sure the hon. member who sits for Haldimand would not consider himself bound to pay a debt against himself that was thirty years old. It bears a very suspicious aspect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This claim was never mentioned in connection with the Haldimand election. It was before the arbitrators four or five years ago, and was reported to the department three or four years ago ; it was never mentioned in the election, so far as I know. It is a matter of simple justice to the township ; and, as for the purchase of the Liberals of North Cayuga, though they vote against me, I must resent that.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman's statement will not satisfy the country that there is not a connection between this payment and the election held in Haldimand. The hon. gentleman says that the arbitrators reported on this three or four years ago. Then, why has it been in abeyance so long ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will explain why. The Minister of Railways promised last year to put it in the Estimates, and I think he will admit that he forgot it ; and long before the election he wrote to the reeve of the township informing him that it would be placed in the next Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long before the election ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Away back in the beginning of 1894.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this damage occurred thirty years ago——

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, my hon. friend says fifteen years ago.

Mr. BOYLE. I think the claim grew out of the raising of the canal banks during the administration of the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. MULOCK. They were not in power fifteen years ago.

Mr. BOYLE. Well, probably twenty years ago.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member for Monck probably knows all about canal building, but how the raising of the banks of the canal would cause the country to be flooded, I do not know. Canal banks are raised to prevent flooding.

Mr. DAVIN. I know that when I ran for Haldimand this was one of the things brought before me as a grievance left by the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. BOYLE. With all deference to the knowledge of the hon. member for Lincoln, I may explain that the raising of the banks of the canal necessarily raised the water in the Grand River, and caused it to flow into the creeks and to overflow that part of the country.

Mr. GIBSON. The new canal is not fed by the Grand River.

Mr. BOYLE. The old canal was. These claims were unsettled at the time the Conservative Government came into power, and they have continued ever since. This, I believe, is the final one, and it is a bona fide claim without any political significance.

Mr. GIBSON. There was two-thirds of the Welland Canal built at the time the Mackenzie Government went into power, and they decided to make the canal 14 feet deep from lock 24 to the level of Lake Erie. The Conservative Government that succeeded constructed the remainder of the canal to a depth of 14 feet. Even if this claim arose twenty-five years ago, I cannot see how the hon. member for Monck can throw the responsibility of this flooding upon the shoulders of the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. BOYLE. I am not throwing any responsibility on the Mackenzie Government. I simply say that it was deemed advisable to raise the banks of the canal in order to obtain more water into the Welland Canal feeder and into the old canal, and they recognized the claims of the farmers along the line for damages, and paid some of those claims. I recollect that the village of Dunnville was paid $1,500 during the time of the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was for injuries done years before we came into office at all.

Mr. BOYLE. No matter about that, it was recognized as a public loss, and, there-

fore, paid. My hon. friend from Lincoln is confusing two public works—the old and the new Welland Canal. The old Welland Canal got its supply by water from the Grand River and it was necessary, especially in a season of drought, that the level should be kept as high as possible. The Government, in consequence, encroached on the lands of the settlers and the farmers, injured the roadways to some extent in the townships, made the creeks wider, and consequently claims for damages were made on the Government.

Mr. GIBSON. The old Welland Canal ceased to exist at Thorold. The old and the new canal became joined at Allanburg, so that neither depends on the Grand River.

Mr. EDGAR. It was my good or ill-fortune, a good many years ago, to have some little experience in elections very near this neighbourhood. In the county of Monck, I know that in several elections which I contested there, perpetual abuses were made of the power of the Government to compensate for damages the owners who had votes. That work was built more than twenty years ago, but to my knowledge it was for a number of years the most fertile source of undue influence upon the electors along the Grand River. Men were led to believe that they were going to get damages, from one election to the other. Official arbitrators would be sent down, just before an election, to make some estimate of the damages, and the thing was held back until to-day when we hear that at last the township of North Cayuga is to be paid for some of those old claims. I hope this is the last feather. I hope that the Government have found out that in twenty years, after gerrymandering that part of the country three or four times, they will be able to carry elections there without the assistance of these damages on the Grand River any more. I can only say that the whole system, from 1878 down to the present, has been an unblushing and partially successful effort to unduly influence the electors along the Grand River.

Mr. MONTAGUE. All I know about this, in any shape or form, is the application of the Liberal reeve of North Cayuga, made to me in 1891. I simply transferred it, in the most ordinary way, to the Department of Railways and Canals, and they, without further question, sent the official arbitrators there, and I never heard any more of it until the judgment was given. I then felt it my duty to ask that the amount should be placed on the Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is exceedingly objectionable that claims of this kind should be allowed to lay over from year to year, until twenty years have elapsed, and then have them presented just at the time when an election is about to take place in the constituency. It is unfair. No matter what explanation the hon. gentleman may give, the people may come to the conclusion that this is another "dam" humbug for the purpose of getting money into some constituency.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When were the official arbitrators sent there?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think a couple of years ago.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who were the arbitrators?

Mr. HAGGART. One of them was Mr. Numa. I do not remember the names of the others.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was he the only one?

Mr. MONTAGUE. There were two or three others.

Galops Canal—To pay John Mullen for kitchen to house at lock 26..... $248

Mr. HAGGART. He is a lockman. In enlarging the canal, it was thought necessary to take down the kitchen, which he had built at his own expense.

Beauharnois Canal—To pay the widow of the late bridge-tender, Pierre Leger, a gratuity of two months' salary..... $76

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the item at all, but it seems to me that it should come under unforeseen expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. This had to be voted in order to authorize us to pay it at all. It does not come under the class of Civil Service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the gratuities are usually paid out of unforeseen expenses—a kind of gift, and not as in discharge of a legal obligation.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot pay them without an appropriation of Parliament, except they come within the class of civil servants.

Williamsburg Canals—To pay collector of canal tolls, George Reid, $9 per month for travelling expenses as paymaster..... $108

Mr. McMULLEN. What travelling does he do for this?

Mr. HAGGART. This is an amount that has been paid this man for a number of years. He travels about twelve miles.

Mr. GIBSON. This principle of collecting tolls, and allowing extra pay to an official whose duty it is to go up and down the canal, collecting rents, is a bad one. How much do the rents amount to?

Mr. HAGGART. This is the collector of canal tolls.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, what do they amount to?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know; you will see it in my report.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this man belong to the Civil Service?

Mr. HAGGART. No; he belongs to the outside service.

Mr. McMULLEN. But many of these outside come under the Civil Service rules.

Mr. HAGGART. He is not in the Civil Service in that sense.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary?

Mr. HAGGART. You will find that in my report or in the Auditor General's Report. It is $2 a day, or some small sum like that.

Mr. GIBSON. He is getting about 40 cents a day for travelling expenses.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the amount of $108 which has been given him for a number of years. There is some difficulty, I suppose, with the Auditor General, with reference to the payment of it as salary, and he insists upon having it voted in this way.

Mr. GIBSON. It is wrong to have officials paid in two ways. We had this discussed the other day on an item in relation to the Department of the Interior. A man is employed in certain duties, and is paid so much a year. And then, in order to increase his pay, he is allowed travelling expenses. The Minister says that this has been going on for years, but that does not affect the principle.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand that this is to pay him travelling expenses as paymaster. How often are the men paid?

Mr. HAGGART. Every month.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then he is not travelling every day? He gets $9 a month for going up and down this canal and paying the men?

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose so. He also collects canal tolls. I have not inquired very particularly as to his duties. This salary I found attached to the office when I became head of the department, and it is paid this way this year instead of the manner in which it was paid before.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How many men are to be paid?

Mr. HAGGART. You will see it in the report. If I had a copy of my report here, I would read it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. Here is one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. GIBSON. Don't be discourteous to the Minister; he is going to give us some information.

Mr. HAGGART. You have all read my report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be well for you to read your own report. I have known some of your predecessors who never read their own report—very distinguished individuals, too.

Mr. HAGGART. The particulars are not given here, but the staff of maintenance cost, for the last fiscal year, $10,230. This is for the Rapide Plat Canal, Galops Canal and Farran's Point Canal, which are collectively known as the Williamsburg Canals.

Collection of Revenue—Cornwall Canal—To pay F. Dawson wages from date at which he retired from duty to close of season of 1894, 240 days at $1.25..... $300

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cause of this?

Mr. HAGGART. Two or three months elapsed between the time of his superannuation and the passing of the Order in Council, and he did not get paid in the meantime.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he at work in the meantime?

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose so.

Mr. FOSTER. He would not have been able to draw his pay unless he was.

Mr. MULOCK. But, according to the item, he had retired from duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. There must have been a portion of this time when he was not engaged at all, because the canal would be shut for a certain portion of the season. Was this man getting pay right along?

Mr. HAGGART. He is paid up to the time of his superannuation, and if he did not work, or if there were not a certificate to that effect, the Auditor General would see to it that he was not paid.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But the item shows he did not work; it says: "Wages from date at which he retired from duty."

Mr. HAGGART. The man was superannuated because he was unable to work; and this is to pay him what he is entitled to, pending the passing the Order in Council for his superannuation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What was the amount of his superannuation?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know. It is not in excess of what the law allows him, I think a little over $100. He was reported unfit for work.

Collection of Revenue—Welland Canal—To pay William McClory and Robt. Edgraft from date at which they retired from duty to date at which superannuation took effect, 6 22-25 months each, at $45..... $619 20

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand why the Order in Council did not fix their

superannuation, if they were to be superannuated, from the date they quit work, in place of paying them full wages.

Mr. HAGGART. The Order in Council only takes effect when it is signed by the Governor General, and it may have been passed in Council some months before. It is dated at the time the Governor General signs it.

Mr. RIDER. The result then is that the individual gets two pays, his superannuation allowance, and his wages ?

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose there is an officer engaged in work on the canal. The Minister, for a certain cause, recommends to the Council that he be superannuated on such a date. The Minister's recommendation goes to Council, where action is taken. Council meetings are not frequent. Treasury board meetings are less frequent, and it may be two or three months after that recommendation is signed that he be retired at a certain date, before the Order in Council superannuating him is signed by the Governor General. That becomes an Order in Council only when it is signed by the Governor General ; so that the person is really superannuated three months, we will say, after he was recommended. In the meantime he has been doing work, but has received no salary, and this is to pay him from that date up to the time his superannuation took effect. He does not get two salaries. He is not getting salary as a workingman, and a retiring allowance at the same time.

Mr. GIBSON. In the case of Robert Edgraft I had some communication with the Minister of Railways, and I can bear out what the Minister of Finance said with regard to him. Would the Minister kindly say how much of this $619 Robert Edgraft is getting as his share ?

Mr. DALY. One-half.

Lachine Canal—For maintenance and lighting of Mill Street..... $1,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do we come to be responsible for the maintenance and lighting of that particular street ?

Mr. HAGGART. We own Mill Street ourselves, and the parties on either side, the city and others, have been urging us to have it lighted, as it was otherwise dangerous. We light it from our own electric plant. This sum will not be an annual charge.

Public Buildings, New Brunswick—To complete payments for works of construction, fittings, furniture and other supplies of St. John Custom-house..... $7,600

Mr. OUIMET. The first estimate made of the cost of rebuilding the old custom-house which was burned about three years ago, was $150,000, exclusive of heating and furnishing. As the work progressed it was discovered that the building was not fireproof, that there was a vacant space between the plastering and an inner wall so that a fire could go up from the cellar to the roof without anything to stop it. The architect devised plans in order to make it fireprpoof, by using iron instead of wood, and by providing that the floors should be in cement instead of wood also, along with divers other improvements. The cost of rebuilding was increased by these changes by about $27,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total cost, all told ?

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost all told is $198,560. The building proper is $182,000 ; heating apparatus, $8,953.53 ; furniture, fittings, &c., $7,600. These sums make up the total. As a matter of fact, if the building had been rebuilt according to the first estimate, the cost would only have been $146,000 ; so that the actual cost, except the additional cost incurred by making the building fireproof, is not exceeded. This amount of $7,600 is to pay outstanding accounts. The building was very nearly ready for occupation last spring, and in order to save rent, I preferred to go on with the expenditure, and am now asking for a vote to pay the balance of these accounts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have lost a good deal of money either one way or other by the various fires that have consumed public buildings. I am not at all sure but it would not pay the Government to have a general insurance over all the buildings, if properly constructed, as the rates would be very light. No doubt within the last ten or eleven years we have lost considerable over one million dollars. We had a large fire at Halifax recently ; the St. John buildings have been completely swept away twice, and other fires have occurred.

Mr. OUIMET. Since I have had charge of the department only two fires have occurred, namely, that at St. John and another in the building at Stratford, outside of insignificant fires.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the hon. gentleman consider the new building at St. John fireproof ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I notice in the returns of the Auditor General that in order to make the building fireproof the cost had to be increased about 25 per cent, from $146,000 to $182,000. What is the amount of extras on the building, and what was the original contract price ?

Mr. OUIMET. Everything that could be obtained by contract was contracted for.

after tenders had been obtained, and the list included lumber, iron, furniture, and everything required in large quantities. As to the labour, it was done under the special supervision of Mr. Adams, who was sent from the department here, and everything was carried out in the cheapest manner possible.

Mr. GIBSON. Did Mr. Adams have power from the department to purchase and procure all supplies necessary for the construction of the building ?

Mr. OUIMET. We obtained most of them by tender. The tenders were submitted to the department, and awards made by the chief architect.

Mr. BOWERS. Did the Minister when in St. John last spring notice how the floor of the building was broken up, although it had been only laid down a short time ? Whether the work was done by contract or day labour, it was imperfectly done. I noticed one place 6 or 8 feet square, which was broken up. I also called attention to the fact last year that spruce deals, which generally cost from $6 to $8, cost from $15 to $18 when bought for this building, and there were a good many other things for which similar high prices were paid.

Mr. OUIMET. Spruce deals cost $12.25, and $12.75.

Mr. BOWERS. According to report in St. John, the members for the city and county were worried nearly to death by applications for work. Some of the members could hardly obtain a spare hour in the day—and probably this added much to the cost.

Mr. HAZEN. In regard to what the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) has said with respect to the floor in the building, he has very grossly and greatly exaggerated the matter, unintentionally I believe, but at the same time he has done so. What occurred was this. The floor in the lower hall was set with tiles, and every one knows that if there is any defect in setting, they crowd together and rise up. That is all the defect there was. The cost of remedying the defect was very trifling. I have noticed the same defect in other buildings, and in the large station of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal, where the flooring a few years ago were laid in mosaic, the same crowding process occasioned by expansion occurred, and the flooring was thrown up. In the St. John building the defect was repaired at a very trifling expense and not in any way caused general defect in the building. The building itself, so far as I am able to judge, was very carefully looked after during its construction by Mr. Adams, who acted on behalf of the department ; he is a thoroughly competent man who bought nothing without asking for prices from dealers in the trade, and in every way he safeguarded the interests of the department and the country. It was impossible to repair the building by tender. The original cost of the building, erected under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, was about $500,000. The fire did not totally destroy the building ; it left the walls standing and also the division walls inside, and it was impossible at the outset to have made a specification on which any contractor would have given a tender that would have been at all near the figure for which the repairs could be carried out. It was, therefore, necessary that the greater part of the repairs should be carried out by day work under a superintendent appointed by the department. I think the work was thoroughly done ; from what I understand, Mr. Adams is a competent man, and he did everything in the interest of the department. I noted what the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) said in regard to the prices paid for spruce. I think if the hon. gentleman will look at the returns he will find that the prices paid for spruce were $12.75 and $12.25, and not the figures given by the hon. gentleman to the committee. I also noted what the hon. gentleman said in regard to members of the city and county of St. John being nearly worried to death by applications for work. The men were employed by Mr. Adams, who took every precaution that only first-class men should be employed, men who would give full value for their wages, and the fact that my hon. colleagues and myself are here to-day in good health is a complete refutation of the statement made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OUIMET. The spruce lumber for which $12.75 per thousand, board measure, was paid was seasoned lumber, and tongued and grooved ready to lay on the floors.

Mr. BOWERS. The Auditor General's Report for 1894 shows that spruce lumber was paid for at from $15 to $18 per thousand on that building. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) said I was guilty of exaggeration in my statement. I do not think I exaggerated when I said that 7 or 8 square feet of flooring were broken up. I think probably 10 or 12 feet were damaged. One of the clerks of the department said this was the second time the work had been done and it was scandalous.

Mr. GIBSON. In looking over the Auditor General's Report, I find at page P—33 that no less than $49.75 were paid for pine plank, and for No. 2, $31.50. The spruce lumber, which is worth $8 or $9, is charged at $14 ; and so it is with almost everything else. In my opinion, we paid most extravagant prices for material. For instance, stock brick, which is ordinarily worth $5 or $6 per thousand, was paid for at high prices ; Mooney & Son were paid $9 per thousand for 264,999 brick, or about 50 per cent more than it was worth, or else the bricks are worth

more in New Brunswick than in any other part of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. OUIMET. They are worth $9 in Ottawa now.

Mr. GIBSON. I can buy stock brick anywhere as low as $5.

Mr. HAZEN. You cannot buy them in St. John for any less.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the hon. gentleman know what stock brick means ?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. What do they mean ?

Mr. HAZEN. I am not here to be cross-examined by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. You are defending the price. and I ask you what stock brick means.

Mr. TEMPLE. There is quite a difference in stock brick. There are 9-inch brick, and 8-inch brick, and 3-inch brick, and they all vary in price.

Mr. GIBSON. I was referring to the quality of the brick, and the hon. gentleman refers to the size. He does not know any difference. If all the other articles required for the reconstruction of this public building in St. John were paid for in keeping with the brick and lumber, then the Government paid from 30 to 50 per cent more than they were worth.

Mr. HAZEN. These bricks are made several miles from the city of St. John, and you have to include the cartage in the price.

Mr. OUIMET. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) makes a case against the Government, he should inquire the price of bricks at that period. He had better say nothing, because he does not know.

Mr. GIBSON. Whom do you refer to ?

Mr. OUIMET. I refer to you. If the hon. gentleman does not know what the price of brick was in St. John at that time, he has no reason to say that the building cost more than it should.

Mr. GIBSON. I repeat my statement. I say that throughout the whole Dominion of Canada, bricks, generally speaking, are worth from $5 to $6.50 per thousand.

Mr. ROBILLARD. Stock bricks are worth $9 a thousand in Ottawa now.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) spoke about the cartage being added to the price. Now, the rule of the trade is that the bricks are delivered in all cases, and that is the price mentioned. I admit that if brick has to be brought a long distance, and if the bricks were of an extraordinary character such as terra cotta, they might have to be sent for a long way. But ordinarily speaking, bricks can be had within reasonable distance of every town and village.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see you pay a very high price for lumber ?

Mr. OUIMET. Tenders were asked for the various kinds of lumber, and the lowest tenders were : Hard pine, No. 1, $47.50; white pine, No. 1, $49.75 ; white pine, No. 2, $31.50 ; birch flooring, $40 ; T. & G. spruce No. 2. $12.75 ; 3 by 4 spruce scantling, $12.25. It is possible that for a small lot they had to pay more, but these were the lowest prices by tender.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why was not this building let by tender for the complete work ?

Mr. OUIMET. I have explained that for two sessions, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has explained it just now. The building was burned down, and the walls only remained. The extent of the damage to the walls, and especially to the walls which were part in limestone, and part in sandstone, had to be ascertained. The amount of stone in these walls that had to be taken down could not be ascertained, and, as I am told by my officers, they had to take down larger quantities of the walls than they expected.

Mr. RIDER. Did they make any use of the old walls ?

Mr. OUIMET. Of course they did.

Mr. GIBSON. I understood the Minister to say that the spruce lumber, T. & G. was $12.75. How does it come that the department paid $14 per thousand for some of that lumber ? In the Auditor General's Report, spruce, No. 1, 1,383 feet, cost $19.38, or $14 per thousand. Evidently, they did not stand by the contract.

Mr. OUIMET. My architect tells me that this lot was a different kind of lumber altogether.

Mr. BOWERS. The Minister doubted my word about the lumber a moment ago, but if he will turn to the Auditor General's Report, 177 C, he will find the following entries credited to W. H. Quinn, Lower Cove : —15,284 feet spruce timber, $17.50 ; 1,251 feet, $17 ; 3,184 spruce deals, $14.50 ; 5,682 feet, $18 ; 11,136 spruce planking, $15 ; 22,201 2-inch plank, $15 ; 15,471 feet spruce boards, $13 ; 6,950, $16. The hon. gentleman will see, if he consults the Auditor General, that I was right in my statement.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the hon. member for St. John should withdraw the statement he made a few moments ago to the effect that my hon. friend from Digby had made a grossly untruthful statement.

Mr. HAZEN. I said nothing of the sort. The hon. member for King's is putting words in my mouth that I never used. I said that the injury to the floor of the custom-house had been unintentionally, I hoped, exaggerated by the hon. member for Digby. I said with regard to the price of lumber, that the hon. gentleman was mistaken, as from the return I saw in the hands of the Minister of Public Works, the price was $12.75. I made no such statement as the hon. gentleman attributes to me, and it is his duty to withdraw what he has just said.

Mr. BORDEN. Then, I do withdraw it, for I understood the hon. member to say that the hon. member for Digby had made a misstatement with reference to the price of spruce lumber, whether intentional or not. Since I misunderstood the hon. member, I, of course, withdraw the statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that you paid for doors $6.75 each. What are the doors made of? That is a very high price.

Mr. OUIMET. They are oak doors, veneered.

Mr. BOWERS. Was this lumber, for which $17 or $18 per thousand was paid, purchased by public tender, or by private contract?

Mr. OUIMET. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that instructions were given to ask tenders for everything that was worth asking tenders for. Perhaps a small lot might have been bought here or there as it was the only place where it could be got at the time.

Mr. BORDEN. The quantities were large, aggregating 20,000 or 30,000 feet, and $18 a thousand for spruce deals in the city of St. John is simply absurd. Everybody knows that $9 a thousand on the wharfs at St. John is a fair price.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the department would not buy deals on the wharfs to use them at once. The lumber had to be dry and in condition to go into the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister cannot expect the committee to accept that as an explanation of the difference in price between $9 and $17. He must know that there is not that difference even between lumber that is newly cut and lumber that has been dry for two or three years. There must have been some other reason for paying this high price.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The explanation of the Minister is a very reasonable explanation, and if the hon. gentleman who has just spoken understood anything at all about the price of deals, he would not have made the statement he has just made. The price he refers to, $8 or $9 a thousand, is the price in St. John, of deals by the carload, in which there is a large proportion of very small stuff. But when you have to get lumber of certain dimensions, perhaps sixteen, or eighteen, or twenty feet long, and buy in quantities of perhaps not more than 2,000 feet, you always have to pay from $14 to $20 a thousand. I know that in the town of Moncton the price of ordinary spruce flooring is $14, and it goes up to $18 or $20 a thousand.

Mr. GIBSON. If the hon. gentleman takes the trouble to look at the Auditor General's Report, he will find that there was 47,000 feet of 3 by 6-inch timber, 17,000 feet of 3 by 4-inch, 6,850 of 3 by 2-inch, and 15,000 feet of spruce timber, all at $17.50 per thousand feet, board measure. We are not speaking about lumber, but about timber scantling, which does not require to be so dry as the Minister would have the committee believe. None of this lumber was of any special value. No flooring was required; it was nearly all deals—scantling, timber, plank, and so forth, with the exception of 6,950 feet of clear spruce boards; and the contention of the hon. gentleman that that required to be dry, and that in consequence of its being dry the people of this country had to pay $7 or $8 a thousand more than the timber was worth, has no foundation.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Have you the length of that lumber?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know the height of the ceilings, but if a greater length than fourteen or sixteen feet were required, it would only be necessary to splice two or three scantlings together. Notwithstanding what the Minister has said, when he is asked why he went outside of the contract price, he says he does not know, that he had to take the report of his officer, and the officer gives as a reason that the lumber was of a special character. The Auditor General's Report shows that the lumber was only of ordinary character, and I repeat what I said before, that it was an outrage to pay two prices for ordinary spruce lumber, even to gain support for the Government.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am informed that that lumber was thirty or forty feet long. I doubt if the hon. gentleman had the specification before him and could see the length of that lumber—taking the specification right through, the timber and the narrow stuff with it—that he would say the price of $17 is too high.

Mr. GIBSON. It would require specially cared-for lumber, 40 feet long, 3 by 6, to be worth this price. It would have to be put in a glass case.

Mr. WOOD. I did not say 3 by 6 and 40 feet long. I said that a portion of the lumber in that specification was round timber.

Mr. GIBSON. Three by six, 47,000 feet, board measure.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister say, after the statement we have heard with regard to the large quantity used, whether tenders were called for, and how many were received ?

Mr. OUIMET. The architect tells me that tenders were asked for every time they could be invited for.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not an answer to my question. Were tenders asked for this lumber ? If so, how many were received ? Was the lowest tender accepted ?

Mr. OUIMET. The lowest tenderer who could supply the article required was always accepted.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were tenders invited for this timber ?

Mr. OUIMET. I have just answered the question. I am told by my architect that tenders were asked for.

Mr. McMULLEN. For this particular timber and lumber ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, from the different firms. We do not go to the newspapers every day when lumber is required, but every firm that could supply the stuff was asked to tender.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many tenders came in ?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not say. That is two years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman not find out from his officer ?

Mr. OUIMET. He does not keep these things in his head. Better ask the Auditor General.

Mr. GIBSON. I wish to call attention to the statement of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) regarding long lumber. I notice at the foot of page 177, Auditor General's Report for 1892-93, that the Government took very great care of Mr. Quinn when they ordered any long timber from him. Instead of the long timber being paid for at the rate of $17.50 a thousand feet, I find that 2,233 feet of long pitch pine timber is charged at $40, and 4,965 feet of the same over forty feet long, is charged at $45. So you see that the very long lumber which the hon. gentleman was trying to convince the House was being given to the country by this generous gentleman, Mr. Quinn, at $17.50 per thousand feet, was charged for at $45 per thousand feet. When you scrutinize this gentleman's account, you find that he had as long a head in getting a long price for his lumber as our long-headed member, who wanted to make the House believe that Mr. Quinn was throwing in the long lumber at the same rate as the short stuff. Strange to say, he took care of his own business sufficiently well to prevent the Government getting any advantage over him, because we find that when the lumber was under forty feet in length, he charged $40, and when it exceeded that he was paid at the rate of $45.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has accounted for what he himself must admit to be the unusual price paid for the lumber by the supposition that it was very long. The price certainly was long, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman said, the timber must have been long. I would ask him if he ever heard of timber scantlings 40 feet long 2 by 3, 3 by 4 and 3 by 6 ? That is perfectly absurd. Let me call the attention of the committee to this further fact. In St. John, which is the centre of the deal trade in this Dominion, which exports more deals than any other place in the Dominion, the price of deals below six inches in width is two-thirds the ordinary price of deals, so that when deals are selling in St. John at $9 a thousand feet, seven and eight inches being the narrowest deals, the price of six-inch deals and of scantlings below six inches would be, not $9, but $6, and you would have the price $6 instead of $17 or $18. It seems to me that the hon. Minister must see at once that this demands an explanation. He may say that it is dry lumber. But whoever heard of putting dry scantling into a building. Suppose it was, it would dry in the space of three months by exposure to the air. There is no difference made because a lot of deals or lumber is left over from one year to another. The hon. member for Westmoreland will admit that deals left over from one season to another, which have become dried, do not bring any more for that reason, the following season. I am, however, prepared to admit that an extra price might be paid for a special lot of lumber—what we call dimension stuff, sawed in certain lengths. But whoever heard, in a general way, of the increase in price in such a lot of lumber as that being more than $2 a thousand feet ? Nobody ever heard of its being double the price, but these figures are double, and treble the ordinary market price of deals in St. John at the time the lumber was purchased.

Mr. McMULLEN. There appears to have been a very large amount of lumber supplied to the building. Did all the lumber go into that building, or was any portion of it stolen ?

Mr. OUIMET. The question may be very funny, but I am sure the hon. gentleman does not expect me to rise to the height of his wit, and be able to answer him whenever anything funny passes through his head. But I will just tell him this, that I have

taken every precaution to have that building cost as little as could reasonably be expected. Mr. Fuller, the chief architect, with his assistant, Mr. Ewart, first went and visited every part of the building. They made estimates in detail. These estimates amounted to $150,000. More work had to be done than was foreseen. The building itself was under the supervision of Mr. Fuller, and Mr. Ewart, who paid bi-monthly visits to the work. We sent from here the best man we had. He was a stranger there, without any interest in favouring anybody, and the result was that the building actually cost $6,000 less than the estimate, carefully made by two competent architects of this department, who had no interest in increasing the cost. I should think the House and the public ought to be satisfied that the cost of the building has been reasonable, and nothing has been stolen, and that every cent expended was expended to a good purpose. And I should think that, instead of going back two years to discuss small details, as the hon. gentlemen do, it would be more reasonable to accept the general statement I have just made. The country, at least, will be satisfied that the cost has not been excessive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think, Mr. Chairman, that the country will be quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman should pay $17 for an article that was worth $8 or $9. The only possible way the House can judge whether the Government has been acting economically and with prudence is by comparing with such instances as my hon. friends have brought forward. We have heard from the hon. member from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), who appears to have taken this matter under his charge, or from the Minister of Public Works himself, no reasonable explanation. The suggestion of the hon. member for Westmoreland that this was unusually long stuff appears to be disproved by the note read by my hon. friend. To all appearance, in St. John, which appears to be a specially favoured locality, the price of deals has doubled in value within the last nineteen months or so. If this is the explanation, it is a pity he did not furnish it to the Secretary of State, as that gentleman might have added it to the equally excellent illustration he gave of the increasing value of our products under the National Policy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That will do for next year.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The hon. gentleman is doing what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) did—comparing the price of lumber cut to certain specifications with the cargo prices of general lumber. These are two entirely different things. Even taking the cargo prices, I, for one, certainly never heard of lumber of these dimensions being sold in St. John at $6 per thousand. I know that up in the country where I live, and here, there are some lumber mills, we never sell even small lumber as it comes from the mill, all sizes together, at so low a price as that. The ordinary price for cargo lumber, even of this small description, has been from $7 to $9 per thousand feet. I understand that some cargoes this year have sold for $9. That is a little higher than the ordinary price for the last few years. But when the lumber is cut to specifications the price is always higher. To my own knowledge, the price for a particular bill of lumber to fill the specifications for a small building in the country, is about $10 to $12 per thousand. I have known it to be as high as $15. This is rough lumber right from the mill. Now, the specification for a building the size of the custom-house building in St. John must certainly be much more difficult to fill than that of a small building in the country. Taking the differences in the specifications, and comparing the prices, I should say that the price charged—$17 per thousand feet—is a very reasonable and moderate price; and I do not believe that if we had that specification to fill to-day, and it was placed before any man who has knowledge of the ordinary price of lumber, it could be filled for any less than that.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not much wonder that the Opposition are suspicious with regard to this building. In every case where the Government have undertaken to put up a structure of this kind without asking for tenders or letting the work by competition, the cost has been much higher than the real value of the building. The hon. Minister says they asked for estimates. He asked the engineers of his own department, I assume. These officials, basing their estimates upon past experience, take the outside figures, knowing what is expected of them. In this case, they estimated the cost at $101,000. I cannot see why the Government did not ask for tenders for the whole work, giving those who wanted to perform the work an opportunity of inspecting the building, so as to ascertain what they should repair and what they should build anew. There are always excuses given for not letting the work by tender to one contractor. Take the case of the Langevin Block. They gave the contract for the walls to one man, the contract for the stairs to another, the roof to another, the joisting to another, the iron girders to another. Wherever they can, they reserve the privilege of farming out or dividing the work as much as possible. Now, I am sure, the previous experience of his department should have deterred the Minister of Public Works from letting the contract in this way. But in the face of that experience, they hire men and buy material and the result is that the cost of the building runs up to enormous figures. We had

a similar experience in the Napanee post office. The estimate of the cost of the building was $32,000, but in the end the actual cost to the country was $54,000. And so it runs. Where buildings are not let by public tender they cost the country 50 to 60 per cent more than they ought to cost. It is no wonder we, on this side, investigate these matters closely. Take our experience with the Curran Bridge, for instance. There was a contract in which double the money was spent that should have been spent. Then there was the case of the Harris property, and many others. I hope there has been no St. Louis in connection with this building. The cost has been kept within the estimates, the Minister says.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No ; $40,000 more.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister shakes his head. Is he prepared to deny that ?

Mr. OUIMET. I said that the original estimate was $150,000, and that the actual cost was $144,000.

Mr. GIBSON. I took the figures down as the Minister spoke them. He said that if he had gone on and completed according to the original plans, the building would have cost $146,000 ; but, in order to make it fireproof, there was an additional cost of $36,000, making a total of $182,000. Now, with reference to this lumber that we have heard so much about, I am astonished to hear the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), a business man, and one who claims to look at this matter from an impartial standpoint, speaking as he does. He admitted that the lumber could have been bought in the city of St. John for $9 per thousand feet, board measure, instead of $6 to $7, as stated by my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Bowers). I may say that my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) tells me that, taking the lumber as it is, even a special cargo, it would not be worth more than $9 per thousand feet. Yet the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland, after admitting that it was not worth more than $9, thought the Government was perfectly right in paying $17 for it. The Minister made light of the question by asking my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) whether any of this lumber had been stolen. But when men can carry away in one night 450 sticks of Government timber, from 26 to 30 feet long each, it is a wonder the whole custom-house in St. John was not carried away.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no doubt the people in New Brunswick will appreciate very highly the compliment the gentleman has just paid them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman imagine that because the fact is recognized that a few people steal timber, there is a reflection cast upon the people of a whole province ?

Mr. OUIMET. I did not rise because I expected to satisfy the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I had done the best that could be done in this case. I was pretty sure that if I could show to the House that the work cost less than was estimated, I should be blamed just as much as though I had to admit that it cost much more than the estimate. As to the charge made by the hon. gentleman against me, that the work was not given out by tender, this is another illustration of how the "Hansard" could be shortened without any one losing by it. The work was started two years ago, when the first estimate was asked for to rebuild that custom-house. I then explained to the hon. gentlemen that the intention of the department was to have the work done by days' work, and that plan was approved. Two years afterwards I am blamed for having done what the House authorized me to do. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied with what he agreed to then, but he has to talk about an hour to overload the "Hansard," involving a considerable cost of money, just in order to reverse his course of two years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very much better that the debates should be overloaded than that the people should be overloaded with taxes. We are performing a duty which the country expects of us, in making these criticisms of the hon. Minister's actions. Now, if the hon. gentleman will turn up "Hansard" of July, 1894, he will find that when this item was before the House, the following remarks were made :—

Mr. MULOCK. Does this item finish the construction ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. There will be no more money asked for from us ?

Mr. OUIMET. No more.

Now, how is this ? The Minister now comes down and asks us to add to what has been already voted, the sum of $7,600. Last year he told the committee that that was the last vote, and now he challenges the propriety of the committee interrogating him and the Government because he asks for an additional amount. I think the people in the country will endorse the action of the Opposition in criticising the hon. gentleman with regard to expenditures of this kind, more particularly when he comes this year and asks for an increased vote, after stating last year that he then asked the last amount.

Mr. OUIMET. I am ready to admit that I made a mistake last year, but I do not think I can be blamed for it, as I made that statement on the authority of my officers.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, surely, when the hon. gentleman was a Minister of the Crown, he

had to rely on the 30 or 40 clerks under him. In saying that I cannot be blamed, I do not mean to cast any blame on the shoulders of my officers, for they must have been mistaken, just as any hon. gentleman may be mistaken. The fact is that hon. gentlemen opposite are so often mistaken that they have to change their policy every six months. The architect of my department may have been led astray by some reports made to him, and it is not to be wondered at if he made a mistake of $7,000 in a building that has cost $192,000. If the hon. gentleman has ever built for his own account, he must know that architects frequently err in their estimates. It cannot be expected that public business can be carried on any more accurately than the private business of the best business men.

Mr. GIBSON. The Minister seems to misunderstand the object of the Opposition altogether. There has been no question discussed this afternoon about the propriety of the Government doing this work by days labour. What we object to is that in the matter of giving out contracts to different parties, he gave in some cases twice the price for lumber that the lumber was worth.

Mr. OUIMET. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman. We have not paid twice what lumber was worth, nor even 1 cent more.

Mr. GIBSON. My point is this, that if prudence had been observed on the first item of lumber alone, where nearly 90,000 feet of common rough lumber was supplied for the interior partitions of this building, for which over $10 per thousand was paid, there would be no need for the Minister now to come to this House and ask for a vote of $7,600. He gave this friend of his a contract for 86,000 feet of lumber, for which he paid $10 per thousand more than it was worth.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). What lumber is that you refer to now?

Mr. GIBSON. On page 177 of the Auditor General's Report for 1892-93, we see "spruce scantling at $12 : 3 x 6 inches, 40,039 feet."

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Do you say that $10 per thousand more than it was worth was paid for that lumber?

Mr. GIBSON. I said $10 per thousand for nearly 90,000 feet.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Read the item.

Mr. GIBSON :

Spruce scantling at $12 · 3 x 6 inches, 47,039 feet ; 3 x 4 inches, 17,485 feet ; 3 x 2 inches, 6,850 feet ; spruce timber, 15,284 feet at $17.50.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). You have just read three items making about 70,000 feet, at $12 per thousand. If you say he paid $10 per thousand too much, does the hon. gentleman think that $2 would be a sufficient price?

Mr. GIBSON. I beg your pardon.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Do you say he paid $10 per thousand too much for that?

Mr. GIBSON. I say all that spruce lumber was not worth more than $9 per thousand, and they paid $17.50.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I beg your pardon, they paid $12 per thousand for it, for what you have just read :

Spruce scantling at $12 : 3 x 6 inches, 47,039 feet ; 3 x 4, 17,485 feet ; 3 x 2, 6,850 feet.

In the very line you are reading.

Mr. GIBSON. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. I will read it word for word as it appears here :

Spruce scantling at $12 : 3 x 6, 47,039 feet ; 3 x 4, 17,485 feet ; 3 x 2, 6,850 feet.
Spruce timber : 15,284 feet at $17.50 ; 1,251 feet at $17 ; 1,092 feet at $14.50.

If I made a mistake of $5 per thousand I should be forgiven, especially when the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) declared that the Government were justified in paying $17.50 for that lumber. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. The Minister of Public Works said that all the repairs to the Custom-house in St. John were done on business principles, as a business man would conduct his own affairs. I pointed out that while the Government had received tenders at $12.25 for supplying certain lumber, the officer in charge went out of his way to pay $14. The hon. Minister further contended that every purchase in connection with the building was made at a reasonable price. I remind the hon. gentleman of his speech at Quebec regarding the Curran Bridge, when he declared the expenditure had been reasonable considering the character of the work.

Mr. OUIMET. Order.

Mr. GIBSON. I mention this in refutation of the remark that the hon. gentleman thought the cost of the St. John building was reasonable. I wish to put myself right with the people of New Brunswick. I do not wish to say that the people of that province would have run away with the building, but what I wanted to convey was that if the same kind of people as were connected with the Curran Bridge had done this kind of work in St. John, they would no doubt have run away with the custom-house.

Mr. RIDER. If I understood the Minister correctly, he stated that the large cost of the building was due to the fact that it was fireproof. On looking over the Auditor General's Report for 1894, I find that 250,000 feet of lumber was used during the previous

twelve months, and adding the quantity used previously, no doubt the total would reach 500,000 feet. What method has the Minister adopted to make this immense quantity of lumber fireproof? It must be a large building to have enabled the Minister to use up that quantity of lumber. The building surely cannot be fireproof.

Mr. HASLAM. This discussion is altogether out of place. There is no man in this House or out of it who can tell anything about the value of lumber without seeing it. In the first place the quality of the lumber is to be considered, and then the length of it is an important element. Unless a copy of the specifications is furnished, no one can intelligently discuss the prices of lumber. There is not a length stated in the Auditor General's Report, and I am not aware that hon. gentlemen opposite have a copy of the specifications.

Mr. GIBSON. I doubt if there was any specification. If there was, let the Government bring it down.

Mr. HASLAM. Unless there is a copy of the specification available it is unreasonable to find fault with the price paid for the lumber.

Mr. RIDER. Then, it is absurd to discuss the question under these circumstances, and the item should stand.

Mr. HASLAM. Hon. gentlemen are discussing the question without knowing what they are talking about.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If a practical man finds it difficult, it must of course be much more difficult to ordinary members of the House to consider this question and judge whether there is an overcharge. But there is a peculiar phase of the question, and it is this: the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) always poses as an independent member, a man eminently fair and impartial, and he asks this House in his soft, soothing tones to accept his opinion on every practical point because he is a practical man. I want the hon. gentleman to explain how, when he was equally in error with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), as to the amount charged per thousand, he was equally ready to defend the Government whether they paid $17 per thousand or $12 per thousand?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am sure I very much indebted to the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the committee for the very complimentary manner in which he has referred to my remarks. I do not very often address the House, not nearly so often as does the hon. gentleman, and I certainly do not assert my opinion with any more emphasis than he does. I only make statements when I have some knowledge of the facts. The hon. gentleman has asked me to explain why I challenged the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln when I was equally in error myself. I am not prepared to admit that I was equally in error. I had not before me the figures of the Auditor General. The only statement I made was, that for a mixed specification for lumber, as I understand that to be, large lumber with some small lumber in it, $17 is an average price and is not an exorbitant price. That is the statement I made, and I am prepared to repeat it, and hon. gentlemen possessing a knowledge of the lumber trade of New Brunswick will say it is a correct statement. When I look again at the charges which I find in the Auditor General's Report, they appear to be reasonable. The charge for 3 x 6, 3 x 4, and 3 x 2 spruce scantling is $12. The ordinary price for such lumber, in lots of different lengths as they come from the mill, is from $7 to $9 per thousand. This lumber must have been to fill a certain specification, the lengths must have been uniform, and no doubt, for such a large building, considerably in excess of the length which ordinarily comes from our mills. The spruce for which $17.50 is charged was not scantlings but timber, and some of it is charged at $14.50. When we come to deals, they are also required to be of uniform length, and greater lengths than the average deals which come from our mills, and we find the price for selected deals $14.50; long deals are charged at $18. Spruce plank is charged at $15, 2-inch at $15, and some at $14. Spruce boards are charged at $13, and clear spruce boards at $16. The hon. gentleman spoke about $40 per thousand having been paid for certain lumber. I find that this price was paid for a different description of lumber altogether from that to which he referred; it is for sawn pitch pine timber, some of which is charged at $40 and the balance at $45 per thousand. I can only say that so far as my knowledge of lumber transactions go, and my knowledge of the prices which usually prevail in St. John, that I do not consider that any of these prices are exorbitant.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Haslam) thought a little while ago that I was smiling in derision when the real truth was that I was smiling in approval. I may say that I would not be willing to undertake a discussion on transactions such as this, unless I saw the specifications.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will state the prices as I know them, and I may say that cargo prices always vary from the prices of small quantities which are sold in retail. The value of spruce lumber on the Ottawa River—and I suppose it is about the same in New Brunswick—in cargo lots, of dimensions 9 inches wide and 16 feet long, would

be about $9 a thousand feet. I sell many cargoes at that price.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is in the rough.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, that is the price in the rough. While that is true, scantling sold for division purposes in buildings, if retailed from the yard, and delivered to the buildings, costs $12 to $14 a thousand feet. But these long lengths at $17 a thousand are prices that we have never heard of, except for very special sizes. My candid opinion about this transaction is that the prices for the lumber are high, and I think that the lumber could be obtained at lower prices if tenders were called for.

Mr. CARGILL. But supposing that it was manufactured.

Mr. EDWARDS. Suppose it was kiln-dried and manufactured for flooring purposes, it would be worth $4 a thousand feet more. I say, in all candour, that this is a subject worthy of criticism, but it is also the case that when a man knows all the details of a transaction of this kind, he would be better able to criticise it than if he did not know the details. I am stating exactly what I know, and I am sure that His Honour the Speaker could back up my statement, if he were speaking on the subject. Our cargoes for shipment to New York net us $9 per thousand at the mill. The prices are a ltle higher this year, I admit, but we are not obtaining any increase. Under six feet long, the price is lower, but for joists or scantling for division purposes, delivered at the buildings, the price varies from $12 to $14 per thousand feet.

Mr. CARGILL. I think that this discussion has been protracted to an unusual length, and to an unnecessary length from the fact that it has been taken part in by a number of hon. gentlemen who are probably not familiar with the lumber business. My hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Haslam) and the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) would not have discussed the question at such length, because they know the business. My hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Haslam) put the whole thing in a nutshell. It is quite impossible for men to come to any definite conclusion as to the value of lumber unless they have the specifications before them. No doubt there is some lumber quoted here in the rough, and there is also some quoted which is finished and ready to be put in the building, which materially increases its value. The whole discussion this afternoon is calculated to leave the impression on the country that excessive prices have been paid for lumber in this case; whereas, when the real facts are brought out and understood, it is found that the material purchased and put into the building, has been obtained at the best possible rate. I am very much surprised at the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) a gentleman of wide experience, a contractor, and a man who knows the variations in the price of lumber, should have said what he did in this discussion. Why, lumber varies in price as much as $45 per thousand feet. We sell lumber at from $3 to $4 a thousand, and we sell lumber, also, at $50 per thousand. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) can bear me out in that. Every one knows that the price of lumber materially increases according to the length and quality. If a particular kind of pine is needed for specific purposes, a high price must be paid. It is insinuated by hon. gentlemen opposite that there is an attempt at a job being put up by the Government in order to make a little money out of it for electioneering purposes. Now, I believe that the facts show that to be entirely wrong. The object of some hon. members opposite seems to be to leave an impression throughout the length and breadth of the country that there is jobbery in connection with every contract let by the Government, and that contractors have got to receive more than a fair profit in order that, at the completion of the work they may have a surplus to lay aside, especially for elections. Now, that is not fair, nor is it just. From all that I have heard in connection with this discussion, I believe that this work has been done in the best interests of the country, and at as reasonable prices as it possibly could have been done for.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Denison.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

CANADIAN ORDER OF FORESTERS.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Canadian Orders of Foresters.—(Mr. Taylor.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the superintendent of insurance reported on this Bill ?

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). He did not specially report on it but he was present in the committee, and the changes in the Bill were made at his suggestion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had a good deal of conversation with the superintendent and understood that all his suggestions were accepted. When we left the committee, one or two of the clauses were to be amended in accordance with his suggestions ? I suppose that has been done.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway.—(Mr. Amyot.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Quebec Dominion Public Building—Renewals, improvements, &c.....	$2,000
Montreal post office.....	3,000

Mr. RIDER. I want to make some inquiry in connection with the Montreal post office. I notice, in the Auditor General's Report, an amount of $118.70, in connection with an arbitration with the "Gazette" Printing Company. Will the hon. Minister please explain ?

Mr. OUIMET. The post office is lighted by electricity, the power for which is supplied from the "Gazette" printing office, which is close by. We also take from the "Gazette" building the power to run the two elevators. A difficulty arose as to the price that should be charged for these two services, and the matter was referred to arbitration, each side appointing one arbitrator, and they appointing the third.

Mr. LAURIER. Who were they ?

Mr. OUIMET. The arbitrator appointed by the department was Mr. Ahearn, of Ottawa. I cannot give the names of the other arbitrators, but one was connected with the Royal Electric Light Company, of Montreal.

Mr. RIDER. Has the matter been fully decided ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. RIDER. Is the "Gazette" Printing Company still furnishing power and light ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes ; we made a contract with the "Gazette" for three years.

Mr. RIDER. What is paid to the "Gazette" by the Government in connection with the electric light and furnishing of power ?

Mr. OUIMET. I think it is in the neighbourhood of $1,800, but I am not sure. I inquired very carefully as to whether the electric power would be cheaper than water or steam, and found it cheaper by far.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand that a contract was entered into years ago with the "Gazette" Printing Company, and that that contract has since expired ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the rate under that contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not say. I at first found the price high, and when the time came to make a new arrangement with the "Gazette," the whole question was gone into, and prices such as now obtain were agreed upon as a result of the arbitration.

Mr. McMULLEN. We would like to know what the original contract was so that we could have some idea of the reduction.

Mr. OUIMET. There is an item in the main Estimates for the same building. I will undertake, before that item is discussed, to bring down that contract, and all the information asked for by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. This item is for the present year, and you will have another for next year. I understand that you will present to the House the statement of the amounts paid under the old contract, and under the new ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. You have left over item 33, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Denison.) I had declared it carried ; then it was opened again, and that was the way it stood when we rose at six o'clock.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the discussion on the item was not closed at six o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. When I was in the Chair I declared it carried, and afterwards it was opened and the discussion went on. I had declared it carried, and nobody was on the floor at six o'clock to discuss it.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend to my right (Mr. Rider) was waiting for an opportunity to ask for some information on the subject. When an item is carried, it should be so declared clearly so that we may understand.

The CHAIRMAN. I spoke quite audibly, and it was the hon. member himself called out to wait.

Mr. RIDER. On resuming to-night, Mr. Chairman, you called item 34, and I supposed that item 33 was allowed to stand.

Mr. OUIMET. Items 33, 34, and 35 are carried.

Mr. McMULLEN. The rule has been that when we rise at six o'clock and the item that has been discussed is not passed, the Chairman reads it again on resuming, thus giving an opportunity for discussion. To proceed to the next item is hardly a fair way of doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman did not understand me. When the item was read, when I was in the Chair, about five o'clock, no gentleman arose, and I declared it carried. But the hon. gentleman asked to have it gone into, and the discussion went on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think you are a little mistaken about that, because I cross-questioned the Minister myself about it the moment the item was called.

The CHAIRMAN. There was some discussion after I declared it carried.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we have got to submit to this, all I can say is that we shall watch closely to see that an item is not declared carried until we are done discussing it. The item was not read until after six o'clock; it was read at five o'clock, and pronounced carried by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. After discussion.

Mr. OUIMET. All the discussion which took place after you declared the item carried, was irregular.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must protest against such a doctrine as that. It has not been our custom, and it ought not to be our custom, that the Chairman should take snap votes. If he does that, it will lead to no end of wrangling and recrimination. I do not blame our present chairman (Mr. Denison), but there has been a great deal too much of attempts to snap votes through; and whenever there is suspicion of that, it is sure to prolong discussion. Hon. gentlemen are well aware that if any idea of that prevailed, the only thing the Opposition could do would be to debate at very great length all the other items, which we do not want to do. No doubt, if the Chairman accidentally calls it carried, when there is a desire for further discussion, that ought to be considered as an accident and reversed.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say that I declared the item carried in good faith at the time, and I adhered to that. Of course it is in the power of the committee to appeal to the Speaker against my ruling.

Mr. McMULLEN. There will be no time gained by taking advantage of the committee in that way. Here are two gentlemen who have not been long in Parliament, who wanted to ask a few questions, and it would not have taken fifteen minutes for them to have done so and to have received the information they desired.

Mr. FOSTER. I well recollect what took place. I do not think the Chairman is to be lectured on the ground of his having desired to rush the vote through without fair consideration by the committee. The vote was called and read, and quite a long debate took place, with a series of questions and answers. Then, at a time when no person was on his feet, the Chairman took advantage of the opportunity, as he is always looking for such an opportunity, to declare the item carried. Then, when some other gentleman got up and wished to ask another question, it was allowed, though it was informal, and the discussion went on, question succeeding question, until six o'clock, the Chairman having declared it carried some time previously. There is no disposition to shorten the discussion. If hon. gentlemen are anxious to prolong the discussion, we are willing to sit here until September. But a great deal of discussion that was informal was allowed by the Chairman after he considered the item carried. There will be another opportunity for any gentleman to ask questions on concurrence, when they can get their replies and make their remarks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To talk about discussion on concurrence, is a farce. That cannot be done, and never is done. Nine times out of ten, the whole $40,000,000, or whatever it may be, are put through in little more than an hour or two on concurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. That is because they have been so thoroughly discussed before, and there is nothing left to say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know about that. We prefer to discuss the items fully on the Estimates, and that has always been our rule. As a matter of fact this discussion had been going on to six o'clock, and I am perfectly certain that the Chairman had not the slightest desire to interfere with the discussion.

Brockville Public Building—To pay Tompkins, Crain & Co., contractors, amount due on final estimate.....$2,475 37

Cornwall Public Building—Balance due—the late John James Brown, architect, of Montreal, and to be paid to his legal representatives in full and final settlement of all claims for professional services rendered by the late Mr. Brown in connection with the said building...	131 32
Strathroy Public Building—Balance due contractors on final estimate.....	215 00

Mr. OUIMET. I will explain the first item. That building was completed in the course of 1888. The final estimate was given by the chief architect on the 19th September, 1888, by which it appeared that a balance of $2,475.37 was due on the contract. The contractor filed a claim for extras, which was not allowed, and the claim has been pending since. I ask for this amount to be revoted in order that it may be legally offered to him, and the matter closed, as we anticipate that it will probably be settled for this amount.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this within or outside the contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount of the contract was $37,320. The additional work authorized and carried out, amounted to $3,655.37; making a total of $40,955.37. There has been paid up to, the final estimate, $38,480, leaving a balance of $2,475.37. That was the final estimate, which was refused. This public building at Brockville includes a post office, customs, inland revenue and excise.

Mr. GIBSON. What is the difference in dispute between the Government and the contractor regarding the final estimate ?

Mr. OUIMET. The contractors claim for additional work $11,608.91.

Mr. GIBSON. Was the amount the Government are willing to pay the contractor settled by arbitration ?

Mr. OUIMET. No arbitration has taken place. The amount awarded to the contractors is $40,955, which includes, for additional work, $3,635. Instead of the latter amount, the contractors claimed $11,608.

Mr. GIBSON. Then, this sum of $3,635 is admitted by the Government as the proper amount to be paid to the contractors ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, but it has never been paid because the contractors would not accept it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister please explain this payment to John James Brown.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Brown was the architect in charge of the Cornwall public building. He died some two or three years ago, and his estate was not settled until this year, when his heirs came forward and presented their claim in due form. This balance is admitted due, and is to be paid. With respect to the Peterborough custom-house, that is a balance due the contractor for grading, fencing, &c.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much did the Strathroy building cost ?

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost of the building has been $2,602, and cost of the site $2,400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount of business is done at Strathroy, as shown by the collections of custom-house, post office and inland revenue ?

Mr. OUIMET. I have not the information at hand. The building was completed in 1890.

Brandon Industrial School—To complete payments	$2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this for the benefit of the Indians or the whites ?

Mr. OUIMET. It is an Indian industrial school. The amount is required to pay the balance due to the contractors.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much did the building cost ?

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost is $27,084.

Mr. McMULLEN. This building is not placed, in my opinion, in the most desirable location. I do not know why it was placed at Brandon. We have spent large sums of money in erecting training schools. There are no less than seven in the North-west, on which the Dominion spent last year $165,000. The schools are as follows : Battleford industrial school, $21,011 ; Brandon, $20,091 ; Elkhorn, $14,899 ; High River, $15,427 ; Qu'Appelle, $35,324 ; Red Deer, $11,370 ; Regina, $16,280 ; St. Boniface, $14,375 ; St. Paul's, $16,214. So we have expended no less than $165,000 annually on these schools, and it is an extravagant outlay. How many Indians are there in the Brandon school ?

Mr. DALY. It seems to me a very inconvenient time to discuss the policy respecting the industrial schools. The hon. gentleman in charge of the item cannot possibly give the information. I cannot give it off-hand, but I shall be quite prepared to discuss the question on the proper item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that is the proper way to answer my hon. friend. My hon. friend may, in his discretion, abstain from exercising his undoubted right to discuss this question very fully, but I am bound to say that when the Government come down and ask the committee to vote a sum for industrial schools, the whole subject is properly open for consideration, and while we may not go into a discussion of policy, hon. gentlemen should be prepared to tell the committee, at least, what number of pupils are being instructed at the school at Brandon, and why Brandon was selected for the school. There is a great

deal of force in what my hon. friend has said. Brandon does not appear 'prima facie' to be a very desirable point at which to establish an Indian industrial school; and I am also bound to say that the expenditure of $165,000 on eight or nine Indian industrial schools appears to me to be an extravagant expenditure for the people of Canada to be called upon to pay. The total expenses of the Indians in the North-west have been frequently criticised in this House, and very deservedly criticised. I doubt very much whether we are getting anything like a proportionate return or sufficient value for the expenditure. From what I have heard and seen, I am of the opinion that greater results could be obtained for the expenditure of a very much smaller sum of money, particularly if the work was more centralized than it is now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not desire to press for an answer as to the number of pupils in the training schools. We can let that matter stand until the main Estimates come up. But in connection with the Brandon school, we should know the amount of accommodation furnished and how many pupils are in training. I thought possibly that information might be supplied. I may say that the school is just about to open, and I cannot tell as to the number of pupils.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister may tell us what the building has cost?

Mr. DALY. The Minister of Public Works will know about that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I presume the Indian Department furnished the Public Works Department with a statement as to the number of Indians?

Mr. DALY. We simply furnish a plan as to the accommodation required. I understand this item furnishes the building.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Public Works Department does not take the initiative in this matter without an application from the Interior Department, stating the Indian bands that are to be accommodated, and the reserves the children are to be drawn from.

Mr. DALY. As I stated last year, this school is established at Brandon to be conducted under the auspices of the Methodist Church, and in order that they may draw from the different Indian reserves in Manitoba on which they have missionaries. The department concludes that an industrial school is necessary in a certain locality which they select, and they make a requisition on the Public Works Department for accommodation for a certain number of children. The school will be opened this present month, but I cannot say if any pupils have arrived yet, nor can I say how many they expect, because that will depend upon the efforts of the missionaries. From my knowledge of the building, I presume it will accommodate about 100 pupils.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these institutions wholly supported by the Government?

Mr. DALY. We give a per capita grant, and with that they have to furnish teachers, food and everything of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the per capita grant?

Mr. DALY. The school is not opened here yet, and in this instance we may not adopt the per capita grant. The per capita grant differs in respect of all the industrial schools. For instance, the grant at Battleford is greater than at Red Deer, on account of the distance the school is from the railway, and the greater cost of supplies.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a matter which I do not propose to discuss at any length now, but will have something to say on when the regular Estimates come up for the industrial schools. Last year I pointed out that the reports seemed to show that in a great many instances the pupils died very shortly after leaving the school. I notice that the department has omitted from the report this year any information upon that point, which seems very strange. I hope that some explanation will be ready later on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not suppose that this is the proper time to discuss the general principle of the industrial schools, but I would like to know from the Minister what has been the effect of establishing these schools. The amount expended is large, and unless the results are beneficial we should change our system.

Mr. DALY. I do not think this is the right time to discuss that matter at all. This item is a supplementary vote for a building, and has no more to do with the question the hon. gentleman asks than an item in the fishery estimates. I will give the hon. gentleman all the necessary information at the proper time. I think it is unfair to take up the time of the House discussing matters of this kind on such an item.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think the Minister is fair in putting it in that way. We are asked for a grant for industrial schools, and my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) asks about the schools generally. He does not expect an answer from the Minister of Public Works, but surely the Minister of the Interior has information which would enable him at least to give a courteous reply.

Mr. MULOCK. I think, upon reflection, the Minister will see he is in error in

assuming it would be out of order to discuss the system on an application for funds to build a school. The building of a school is intended for the education of Indian children, and it is germane to the question as to whether we should build the school or not, to see what public benefit would be done by the work. The Minister might be excused from answering on the ground that he did not expect a discussion, but not on the ground he took.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of the Interior ought to be able to tell why he selected Brandon as a site for this school.

Mr. DALY. I stated that last session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that is not answer to a question asked to-night. We are not expected to go over all the hon. gentleman said last session. The question is pertinent now. Now, any member of the House is entitled to know why a site for an Indian industrial school was selected at Brandon, which is the centre of a large and, I believe, a very thrifty white population. I do not think there is any very large number of Indian reserves in the vicinity of Brandon.

Mr. DALY. I am quite prepared to answer that question, which I answered last session and the session before. Brandon was selected partly because of its central position in the province of Manitoba as to railway and other facilities for getting the Indian children there, and also because the city of Brandon donated to the Indian Department the land, 320 acres, or 160 acres, I forget which, on which the building has been erected. As the hon. gentleman has said, there are not many Indian reserves in the vicinity of Brandon, and that is one reason that moved the department to locate the school there. It is considered desirable to have the schools as far away as possible from the reserves from which the children are taken, experience having shown that if industrial and other schools are located near the reserves, the parents of the children delight to go and camp in the neighbourhood in the hope of being fed, and in that way they interfere with the attendance of the children and generally with the working of the school. Another object of locating the schools near the centres of civilization is to accustom the children to the habits and ways of the white people about them. For instance, take the school at Elkhorn. That school is amongst the most successful. Its pupils conduct the only tailoring, shoemaking, harness, and tin-shops in the place, and the young women conduct a dressmaking establishment, all in connection with the school. The pupils are not only taught these civil trades, but they are taught business habits and generally how to deal with white people.

Vancouver, B.C., Public Building—To complete payments to contractors for construction and heating of building, and to superintending architect.....$1,367 94

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the total cost of this building ?

Mr. OUIMET. $102,784.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the original estimate ?

Mr. OUIMET. To give that I would have to refer to the explanations given by the Minister who was in charge of the department at the time. The only extra is $888.63.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—Renewals, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance..... $ 3,000
Lighting public buildings throughout the Dominion 15,000
Heating public buildings, Ottawa, including salaries of engineers, firemen, elevator attendants and caretakers..... 5,000
Telephone service—To pay arrears of rents of instruments used in 1893 and 1894.. 400

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister explain these items ?

Mr. OUIMET. The appropriation for Rideau Hall for 1894-95 was $15,000. Of that sum, up to the 31st of March, $14,980.42 has been expended. The items of expenditure, adding this $3,000, are as follows : Gardeners, contract, $3,000 ; filling ice-house, $70 ; repairs staff, salaries, $6,500 ; lumber, $600 ; hardware, $350 ; glass, putty, shellac, &c., $100 ; dry goods for repairs, $50 ; blacksmith, $60 ; firebrick, cement, fireclay, plaster of Paris, &c., $125 ; furniture, upholstery and carpets, $1,000 ; linen, $800 ; china, crockery and glassware, $1,000 ; repairs to stoves, tinware and utensils, $950 ; shingling roof of ball-room and curling rink, $500 ; paper, painting &c., $1,600 ; incidentals, $1,295. The increase in the vote for lighting public buildings throughout the Dominion is nearly all accounted for by the substitution of electric light for petroleum and gas. There is also an increase in the number of public buildings. The total appropriation was, $71,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no use in the hon. gentleman bringing down estimates which are very largely at variance with what he knows must be expended, and this excess of $15,000 on an aggregate vote of $70,000 is really an extremely large discrepancy. I should think the hon. gentleman's department ought to have been able to make a much closer shot at what would be required. Besides, the hon. gentleman must recollect that in view of all that has been told as to the economy which was to be exercised—we have not seen any of it this year—it is rather discouraging to find items like this cropping up in the supplementaries. It inspires us with very considerable doubts as to what supplementals may be found necessary by the hon. gentleman, or other people, in an en-

suing session. I very much fear we will have a very considerable number of repetitions of similar votes to this.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What amount did the hon. gentleman put in the Estimates for this purpose for the next year ?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not tell.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is worth while looking up. If the department imprudently cut down the Estimates of the hon. gentleman last year and this imprudence be repeated this year, we will be only providing for another supplementary vote next session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman wants $15,000 more on an estimate of $71,500 for 1894-95, and he only asks $70,000 for 1895-96. There is something queer about that surely. He wants $86,000 for the service of 1894-95, and only $70,000 for 1895-96. Does the hon. gentleman expect a reduction in the price of light ?

Mr. OUIMET. My officer tells me that there was a deficit of $13,000 last year, which this supplementary vote is to cover.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has the hon. gentleman tried the system in any of our public buildings of putting in our own electric light ? Business establishments now generally have their own plant. They have dynamos sufficient to furnish the light they require, and that plant is found far cheaper. In the Montreal post office and custom-house, where a great deal of light is required, the cheaper and better way for the Government would be to put in a dynamo of their own.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. Finance Minister is only putting the trouble a year further back. What was the estimate of that year in which the $13,000 deficit occurred ?

Mr. OUIMET. From the information I have, the deficit has been increased from year to year. The vote is only $38,000, and I made a mistake in giving a larger figure.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the same deficit going to occur again ?

Mr. OUIMET. No ; whenever it is paid it will be wiped out.

Mr. MARTIN. If the estimate for next year is not sufficient, the deficit will go on again.

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that the estimate will be sufficient for next year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the hon. Minister give an answer to my question about lighting public buildings ?

Mr. OUIMET. That question has already had the attention of the department. It is only in Toronto and Montreal that plant of our own could be used with advantage. On the other hand we would have to lay down the plant and connect all these different buildings. If all the buildings were together, it would be much cheaper, but we would have to get a franchise from each municipality, and the hon. gentleman knows how the various private companies look after their own privileges, and we should have to meet a great deal of opposition on their part. And after all, we now have the light about as cheap as it can be had. That is the opinion of my architect, Mr. Ewart.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What does it cost to light the buildings in Toronto ?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not say for each building.

Mr. MULOCK. You have a contract for the Montreal post office ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes ; with the "Gazette" Company, to furnish light and power for running the elevators.

Mr. MULOCK. What does that cost a year ?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not give it off-hand. When we are in the main Estimates, I will have all this information ready.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia—
South Ingonish Wharf—To provide for the amount of a judgment rendered in the Exchequer Court in the suit of the Queen vs. Murdoch G. McLeod, for the expropriation of a property required for wharf purposes, together with the costs recovered.....$635 88

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. Minister state what the judgment was about ; also the amount of the judgment, and the amount of the costs ?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount of the debt was $427.68, and the costs $208.20.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Fifty per cent—pretty fair.

Mr. OUIMET. Pretty fair ; any province would be proud of that.

Mr. FORBES. Is that the result of a suit brought in the Exchequer Court by the Crown ?

Mr. OUIMET. No ; expropriation proceedings taken to cheapen the cost of that land. Our engineer reported that the land was worth $240. I think we offered $300, in order to avoid expropriation proceedings. The owners would not accept, and wanted over $500. The matter was referred to the court, and this was the result.

Harbours and Rivers, New Brunswick—
Hopewell Cape—To pay balance due for lumber required for repairs to ballast wharf $317 69

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman tell us what amount of fees the Government received from Hopewell Cape wharf—anything at all ?

Mr. OUIMET. The work was built out of the appropriation of the current year, and was completed, I think, last fall. No fees have been collected. It is a ballast wharf.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know ; I have seen it.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the entire cost ?

Mr. OUIMET. The appropriation was $600. Without the knowledge of the department, this was exceeded by $317.50, which we refused to pay, as it had been incurred without due authority. But, after the party had waited long enough, we thought the officer in charge had been sufficiently punished, and that he would likely remember the lesson that he must not exceed his instructions in future. As the amount was reported by the engineer in charge to have been actually spent, and that as that was confirmed by the engineer here, it would be better to pay it.

Maritime provinces generally—General repairs and improvements to harbour and river works..... $3,000

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if any of this has been spent on the breakwater at Yarmouth ?

Mr. OUIMET. I omitted to bring down the information for the hon. gentleman. I beg his pardon. I will have the information on the main Estimates.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. gentleman please say where this sum has been expended ?

Mr. OUIMET. The regular appropriation for the present year was $10,000, which was all expended on 31st May last. This sum was not sufficient for the enormous requirements of the current year. There were very heavy storms during the winter in Cape Breton and along the Nova Scotia coast, and we had to go into this expenditure. Out of this $3,000, there is an amount of $1,000 to cover a special warrant of the Governor General which we had to get in order to make some absolutely necessary repairs. I have not with me a list of the works done, but that can be given when the main Estimates of the department are before the House.

Mr. FORBES. Several years ago the Minister said he had a plan, or his chief engineer was to devise a plan, with regard to the expenditures on the chief wharfs in Nova Scotia. I understood they were going to arrange so as to keep them in repair without submitting a vote for each to Parliament. There are, however, the smaller wharfs along the shore, to which I would like to call the Minister's attention, if he thinks that this discussion affords a fitting opportunity. I do not want to take up time unnecessarily.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to make a list of the names and requirements of these different harbours, I could submit them to my chief engineer, and have the answer ready for the hon. gentleman when we come to the main Estimates.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. gentleman, then, make an explanation with regard to the new plan of which I have spoken ?

Mr. OUIMET. I think the hon. gentleman refers to the suggestion of a plan for the classification of the harbours of Nova Scotia. It was proposed to divide them into three classes, according to their importance, either as harbours of refuge or as shipping harbours, in order to have a better distribution of the public money voted for keeping them in repair. As we are going now, I am bound to say, the votes we have are too small to enable us to keep up the harbours in the maritime provinces.

Mr. FORBES. That is true.

Mr. OUIMET. I thought I should be, in part, at least, relieved of difficulties I encountered every day if we had that classification, which would be placed before the House, and so would enable me to make a better distribution towards the maintenance of these harbours.

Mr. FORBES. Why does not the hon. Minister give us a larger vote ?

Mr. OUIMET. Better times are coming.

Mr. FLINT. I think the suggestion is a good one. Even if a larger sum is appropriated, it will not follow that there will be an increase in the expenditure on necessary repairs, because any proposeal for new expenditure can be investigated on its merits. I knew of cases in which, the fact that the Government had not an appropriation in hand for small repairs of from $300 to $500, has been either the cause or the excuse for very large subsequent losses. The other day in the county which I have the honour to represent, a large section of an important breakwater collapsed. I suppose we shall have the report in a few days. The collapse was probably due to some weakness not apparent on the face of the work. If the hon. Minister had in hand a little larger sum for special occasions of this kind, repairs could be easily made, under the supervision of the proper authorities, and a large sum would be saved in the long run. We know how a break of that kind goes. One or two storms will so enormously increase the cost of reconstruction as to make the

Government unable to cope with it, except through a vote of Parliament. I believe hon. members on both sides would agree if the Government would lay any scheme before the House under which this appropriation could be laid out, and that care would be taken that no improper use was made of it by local persons, that the real interests of economy would be served.

Mr. FORBES. I wish to call the Minister's attention to one or two places right in line with the remarks made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). In the county of Queen's there are two breakwaters in particular to which I wish to call his attention, those at Port Joli, and Port Mouton. One of these works is absolutely going to decay and destruction for want of proper repairs. That at Port Joli was sadly injured by a storm some years ago, and that wharf is now in absolute want of a small apppropriation. If nothing is done to it, in a few years it will require many times the amount to put it in repair that it now requires. It is necessary to use it for a wharf for a passenger and freight steamer about to run to that town from Liverpool, and it needs an outlay of $200 or $300 at once. I called attention to this before, and urged it on the Government, and was put off with the reply that the Government was making a classification of the breakwaters, and hoped to include those named. For Port Mouton I got a sum of money voted to build a new pier, but it does not serve the purposes of the citizens to the extent that it was intended, as vessels cannot use it for want of dredging. Indeed, I may add also that the caretakers of all these public wharfs, to a great extent, neglect their duty in not reporting to the Government the damages which they sustain from time to time from storms and accidents, and the condition they are in. Then, coming further east, to the harbour of Liverpool, there is another breakwater at Coffin's Island Harbour, which needs repair. These are wharfs which are works of necessity. I had the pleasure of writing to the Minister about them, and I will do so again to urge on his classification, and I trust he will be able to give a favourable answer showing that they are included in the Government's list and among the class for permanent repairs. Although I am obliged to the Minister for at least recognizing the rights of the citizens of Queen's County in the appropriation he made last year, I must say that the sum asked for in this vote is altogether inadequate to the necessities of the works. Both as harbours of refuge, and for shipping purposes, they require larger expenditures than they are getting, and the policy of the Government in neglecting even the urgent necessities of keeping established works in order, because the people send members opposed to the Government on their trade and other policy, is a vicious one, and fraught with danger to the country and loss to the people, and our citizens repudiate the action of the Government in so doing, and I am glad to hear the Minister say he does accept it as the policy of his department.

Mr. BORDEN. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say a year or two ago that he was having a report made with reference to the condition of the breakwaters in the maritime provinces, with a view to collecting certain of the most fitting to receive public grants, and to be taken under the special care of his department. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has completed that report.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Perley is now working at it, and my chief engineer says that he does not expect it to be ready before the end of the season. It will be put in the next report of the department.

Mr. BORDEN. Then, to a certain extent, the department is going very much on the lines they have followed in the past, without any special principle governing these grants, except that utter want of principle which, I am sorry to say, has governed the department, that of selecting places for expenditure on the lines of politics, merely selecting counties in which the Government happen to have, for the time being, a representative, without having special reference, as they should do, to the requirements of the work itself.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not think the hon. gentleman can establish that charge to the satisfaction of the House. I think the department can very well defend itself against such a charge. We have done for the best in every place, and even we have spent sometimes the larger amounts of money in counties that were opposed to us. We are certainly not open to that charge.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not desire to make unpleasant charges, or to misrepresent the hon. gentleman. But, speaking from my own experience, I am compelled to say that I can account for the utter neglect which he has shown towards the public works in the constituency I have the honour to represent, on no other grounds than that the county happens to be represented by a man opposed to him. If there is a county in the Dominion of Canada which has a right to a fair share of public expenditure, it is that county. I will venture to say that there is not the same number of people anywhere else in the Dominion who pay more money per head into the treasury of this country, than the people of my county. I have, over and over again, brought to the notice of the Minister certain works which demanded immediate attention, works constructed by public money, at a time, perhaps, when that county happened to be represented by a gentleman in sympathy with the Government, but which are now being allowed to get into

disrepair, and that money is allowed to be absolutely wasted. I have before pointed out to the hon. gentleman, and to this House, both in the House and privately, one particular work among a dozen, and I am sure he will not mind me reminding him once more of the work known as Pickett's Pier. That hon. gentleman considered it necessary, in 1892, a few weeks before the date of a by-election, to send one of his engineers into that county to look at that breakwater, although I believe it was covered with several feet of snow and ice. The engineer recommended that $200 be expended to save that work from destruction. It so happened that the election did not turn out as that hon. gentleman expected, and that $200 grant was cancelled. However, by dint of persuasion, by calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the importance of the work, I was able to get him to place in the Estimates, subsequently, the sum of $800 to repair that important work. He assured me that the work was to be done. Time went on, and the vote was allowed to lapse. Then when I came here and asked for this expenditure, what do you suppose I was told. I was coolly told that the work had become so out of repair that $800 was not sufficient to repair it, and that, therefore, it could not be repaired. Is not that a nice state of things? In 1892, $200, according to the report of the hon. gentleman's own engineer, was sufficient to have repaired that work. In 1893, the engineer recommends a vote of $800; but in 1894, when the grant has been allowed to lapse, the Minister comes down and says: No, we cannot do it, because it will take so much money. If the hon. gentleman pursued a policy of looking after the interests of this country and attending to the public works when they demanded attention, $200 or perhaps less would have repaired that work; but he dilly-dallied, because the county was represented by a man who was opposed to him, until the time arrived when the work is so greatly out of repair that the amount voted will not cover the expenditure and the whole undertaking is allowed to go by the board. That is a case which is patent to every member of this House. Every word I have said is susceptible of proof, and the hon. gentleman knows it. So it is with regard to scores of other works. It is about time a halt was called in this kind of business; it is about time public money was spent in the interest of the people and not in the interest of a particular party. I will tell the hon. gentleman what happened, only a year ago when Pickett's pier was being examined by one of his engineers at Halifax, Mr. Greenwood. He went down to look at the breakwater, and one of the gentlemen living in the neighbourhood, whose name I am prepared to give, went down with him. When he had looked over the work, Mr. Greenwood said: "Well, it is too bad, that this was allowed to get into this condition; but you people in King's are making a mistake—you do not know how to get grants for public breakwaters?" "What do you mean," asked the gentleman. "I mean this," replied Mr. Greenwood, "that if you will send a representative from King's to Ottawa to support the present Government, you will get all the grants you want for your breakwater." That gentleman is Mr. James B. Dickey. If the hon. Minister wishes to verify the statement let him write to Mr. Dickey, who is one of the most responsible gentlemen living in King's. There is a statement made by his own engineer direct to the people; he made no secret of it—if you want money for breakwaters send a representative to support the Government.

Mr. KAULBACH. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. "Hear, hear," says an hon. gentleman opposite, the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). Such is his policy. It is about time, however, to put an end to such a state of things. I do not mean to say that the Minister would instruct his engineer to make such a statement but that statement has been made, and it is in line with the manner in which the public money in this country is being expended, on breakwaters at any rate. I do not pretend to say that it is possible for the Government to maintain all the breakwaters. I have sympathy with the statement made by the Minister on a former occasion in this House, that the most worthy public works should be selected and maintained. I believe it is utterly impossible for the Dominion Government to maintain all these breakwaters; but the Minister has left too much time before making his selection, and thereby he has allowed valuable public works to get entirely into disrepair when a very small sum would have saved them from destruction.

Mr. OUIMET. As to the information given by the hon. gentleman in regard to Mr. Greenwood, I think there must be a mistake, I think the engineer was only chaffing. Or another construction may be put upon it: If he was not chaffing, he might have made that statement in order to hurt the Government, and he must therefore be an opponent. He certainly should not have said it, as I do not think he was correct in making the statement. If he said so, it was no doubt with a desire to hurt the Government and the department, and he will have to answer for it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then dismiss him.

Mr. OUIMET. I will see that the case is inquired into. If the inquiry shows that this was done to injure our party or your party, we will see that he is properly dealt with.

Mr. FRASER. I do not expect to get anything for my county—long ago I arrived at

that conclusion. This engineer must have been trying to hurt the Government, for he acted in almost an identical manner in my own county. The principle laid down is something like that of dividing an estate, the friends must get there first. Of course, as the old cock crows the young cocks cry. These officers have learned to repeat the cries of the Ministers. When such acts are done publicly, as a matter of course, what else can be expected? In my own county there are 150 miles of coast line, and no railway except the Eastern Extension goes there, and that road touches it only at one point. For the last three Parliaments the county has seen fit to send to this House an opponent of the Government. The Minister, after a good deal of begging, last year gave us $1,500. Two years ago, I obtained an order of the House for a return showing the money expended in Nova Scotia by counties, and up to this day I have not been able to obtain it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It will take two or three years to prepare such a return for all the counties, outside of Guysboro'.

Mr. FRASER. It would take only five minutes so far as Guysboro' is concerned. I suppose nothing else could be expected. I call attention to the fact that at a meeting at which the Ministers were present in my county the candidate who opposed me rose and said, "I have brought down these Ministers here to show them what is required, and I tell them in your presence that they will find me a man who will ask for a good deal."

Mr. OUIMET. I think if my hon. friend opposite had accepted our invitation to attend the meeting, he would not have had so much to complain of now.

Mr. FRASER. I was only asked five minutes before the meeting opened. I sent a written request to be allowed to speak at the meeting, but I was refused in a written reply. I asked a week beforehand. I have not a word to say about the courtesy not being given, for the committee had a perfect right to refuse. I was not going to go there five minutes before the meeting, because I had made a request and been refused, and of course none of my friends would have been there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There were some of your friends there.

Mr. FRASER. My opponent made the statement that the Ministers were brought down specially for the purpose and in that bland manner for which the Minister of Public Works is noted he spoke, but he did not say anything in regard to carrying out this or that work. Nevertheless the people went away delighted. It was said: Well, the Ministers have never been here before, we have seen and heard them and now we are going to have everything, the days of happiness have come. One gentleman of a religious frame of mind said, "I feel as if I was a new Moses sent to deliver the people of Guysboro'"—and all the Ministers cheered. This Moses at the first opportunity he got wanted to get on the bench. He had led the Conservatives into the wilderness, and he left them there. They were trying to get a Joshua. This was all said before the Ministers, and there was something very funny about it. One of the men, not being a biblical scholar, asked, "To whom does he refer—who is Moses. I never heard of him.

An hon. MEMBER. Was it the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. FRASER. No; it was not the Minister of Public Works, and I am certain it was not the Minister of Justice, because I think he has been better brought up than that.

Mr. OUIMET. Was not there a Jonas there?

Mr. FRASER. Oh, no: there is no Jonas in the Bible. You mean Jonah. The Minister is really as far behind in his biblical knowledge as the gentleman whom I won't name.

An hon. MEMBER. Perhaps it was Joncas?

Mr. FRASER. The county I represent has 150 miles of coast line, but the county of Antigonish, next to me, has not more than 40 or 50 miles.

Mr. CAMERON. If you go around the county of Antigonish you will get 150 miles.

Mr. FRASER. Nothing like it. Perhaps with the indentation of the bay you might get 70 or 80 miles, but from Pictou to Mulgrave it is only 60 miles.

Mr. CAMERON. It is 80 miles in a "B" line.

Mr. FRASER. Why there is no "B" line there at all. In Antigonish, within the last six or seven years, $60,000 has been spent. Now, is that justice? The Minister sent an engineer down there after I had made out a very strong case as I thought, and the engineer reported on the work, but year after year when I ask about it, the answer is: it is under consideration. That is the most dangerous thing that could have happened, because the more he considered it the further we are away from getting it. I am not going to be ungenerous, and with a falling revenue and a large deficit, it cannot be expected that any heavy expediture will be made. But in the days of our prosperity we did not apply the correct rule. There are men who have to toil with their boats five or six miles to seek safety from a storm in my county. They have to land far away from their homes, and yet no

accommodation is provided for them. The Government has been expending money on the idea that they would apply it where they could get the most political assistance from it. A Government is not for this purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This one is.

Mr. FRASER. The proper function of Government is to see that those who need help, and cannot help themselves, should receive help.

Mr. McALISTER. Does your local government in Nova Scotia do that?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, they do. They spend the Government money in every county whether it supports them or not. Why, they borrowed money for bridges and roads, and every county pro rata got its share whether it supported the Government or not. The road grant is given to each county every year. I would not lay it down as a rule that the Government should give a like amount to each county, but I do say that in the interests of the people of this country, the prime idea should be to spend the public money where it is most needed. For twelve years, the county I represent has only received $1,500, and let me ask the Minister of Public Works now how much of that has been expended?

Mr. OUIMET. It has been all expended.

Mr. FRASER. I am thankful for that at least, and I hope that the work will prove of some benefit. When one of the Ministers spoke about that very little sum of money in my county, the man who was opposing me said to the people: The Minister can tell you how much he did towards it. Well, I brought the matter year after year before Parliament. I did nothing except what was my duty in the matter, and certainly it is a prostitution of proper representation to say that a man who is not in Parliament should get a grant of money for the county. If a proper representation is made by the member representing the people of a county, it is that representation should be acted upon, and not the representation of a man who is seeking to get into Parliament, and who has failed to secure the confidence of the people. I feel that my county has not been treated as it ought, and because I feel that, I have pressed its claims upon the Government. Every day I hear it said: It is no use to send this man to Parliament for he will get nothing. Well, I do not fear to meet that accusation, but when a Minister is appealed to in proof of that, I say that a very bad and improper system prevails in this country. I was sorry that the Minister of Public Works did not come down to my county as he was billed to, because I think that his well-known fairness would have prompted him to do something for our public works there when he saw the condition they were in. I cannot help mentioning a rather amusing thing that occurred in connection with that visit of some hon. gentlemen opposite to my county. On the bill announcing the meeting, among other members of the Government it was promised that the Hon. Mr. Costigan and the Controller of Customs (Mr. Clarke Wallace) should appear. I was glad to see the cordial relations existing between the various members of the Government, and I was glad to see that Mr. Costigan and Mr. Wallace were travelling in harmony together. But they did not appear, and curiously enough just a few days afterwards, and then I understood it all, the Conservative press announced that the Hon. John Costigan had been out in the woods, and that he had not seen the face of a white man for weeks, so that he would not appear with Mr. Clarke Wallace in my county. I regret that very much, because I enjoyed the visit of the others. I say that the Minister himself is to blame for the mistakes made by Mr. Greenwood and others. Many of these officers think that they are serving the Government and not the country, and parrot-like, because they want to stand well with the Government, they repeat the expressions of the Minister. What business is it of a public official who are in or who are out? What has he to do with what party has control of the Government? He likes to do that sort of thing, because he thinks it will result in his shortcomings being overlooked. Even now the hon. Minister is attempting to set up a plea for Mr. Greenwood, and what is the plea? That he was only in fun—that he was trying to hurt the Government? Does the hon. Minister believe that? The hon. Minister knows that he was carrying out the well-understood wish of the Government in representing that if any county expends anything it must support the Government. But now that the statement is made, I shall wait with a good deal of interest to see whether Mr. Greenwood is asked to explain, and whether he will show that what he said was high-flown wit or will make an apology for an attempt to hurt the Government. I cannot understand the mental construction of the Minister when he calls it wit. Now, the principle I want to be bound by myself, now and always, is this; that the need of a locality is the only rule that should guide the Government in making expenditures. There was more money thrown away in the county of Antigonish than would build two or three breakwaters. I do not say that has been generally done elsewhere, but universally the idea in the province of Nova Scotia, and the supporters of the Government have learned parrot-like to repeat it, is that only those counties that support the Government will get anything—as if we were all standing here over a big trough, with pails in our hands, waiting to get them filled. That is not the purpose of the Gov-

ernment at all, and the sooner they understand that the business of the country is to be conducted according to the wants of the country the better. As to the hon. gentleman's visit to the county, I was glad to see him. He saw a county that was worth seeing. He saw a county, which despite its lack of the means of communication which most counties have, and despite the fact that its inhabitants find that every-day life is a struggle, has, with the exception of one occasion when the party were divided, clung, the hon. gentleman may say ignorantly, to the principles which its people have thought to be right. I can assure the hon. gentleman that not even the fascinating presence of the chairman of this committee, whose wit enlivened the scene, and who let the people understand that he was very near a Minister, was sufficient to induce them to leave their old love and take up with the new. Nor could the Ministers accomplish that object by attempting to strengthen themselves by ensconcing a man in a judge's chair which he found was the safest retreat he could have. I trust when the Ministers come again to that county they will come into the very place they did before, or, at least, that the Minister of Public Works will be less skilful in that deceptive style of oratory which, while not staying much, injects into the minds of the innocent Conservatives of that county that after all, back of it, they may depend upon him in the day of need.

Mr. CAMERON. I was very much pleased with the very amusing address delivered by my hon. friend from Guysboro'; but when he states that Guysboro' should be looked after with regard to its public works before Antigonish——

Mr. FRASER. I did not say that. I said that if so much money was expended in Antigonish, a little should be given to this county with twice the coast line.

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend said the money should be expended where public works are most required, and that part of the money expended in Antigonish should have been expended in Guysboro'. I am fairly well acquainted with both of these counties. I know that the sea coast of Guysboro' is about 150 miles in extent; but if my hon. friend will start from Auld's Cove on the Strait of Canso and follow the coast line of Antigonish by Cape George, thence to Merigonish he will find that the coast line of that county is nearly as long as that of Guysboro' itself; and I tell my hon. friend that when Antigonish shall be provided by art with harbours and piers as fully as nature has provided Guysboro' with them, it will be a long time before the Public Works Department of Canada will expend public money in Guysboro'. I do not know any county in the province of Nova Scotia that is so well served with harbours as Guysboro'. From the time you leave Auld's Cove at one end, until you reach the county line of Halifax at the other, it is indented with harbours from one end to the other. In fact, unless he goes far into the interior of harbours, I fail to see where the Minister of Public Works could profitably expend public money in that county. The opposite is the case with the county of Antigonish. Along its entire coast line of nearly 150 miles you cannot find a single harbour of refuge in which vessels could get shelter. That being the case, if the principle laid down by my hon. friend from Guysboro' is to be adopted by this Government, not a dollar of public money will be expended in Guysboro' until the interests of Antigonish are as well served as are those of Guysboro'. There is another county which requires a large amount of public expenditure, and that is the county of Inverness. I am satisfied that my hon. friend from Guysboro' will agree with me in that. From Hawkesbury on the Strait of Canso to Cape St. Lawrence at the northern part of the island there was not a single harbour of refuge on the coast of more than 150 miles in extent until the Public Works Department of this Dominion undertook to construct a few in the interest of the people there. I was amused to hear my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) complain of the manner in which public works were treated in his county, which he attributed to the fact of that county not being represented by a supporter of the Government. I do not believe there is a county in the province of Nova Scotia which does not fare in a similar manner, simply for the want of sufficient public money being placed at the disposal of the Minister of Public Works, and it is unfair to attribute to the Minister political motives in looking after the public works of any county of the Dominion. Very much as Guysboro' is served by public harbours, so is King's served by railways. The county is intersected by railways. It is a very important county, but a large amount of public money has been expended on public works for the distribution of the products of that fine county. I was equally amused by the funny manner in which the hon. gentleman described the visit of the Ministers to his county. I had the great luck myself of having the county of Inverness visited by prominent political gentlemen from other parts of the Dominion, who, although they were not ministers of the day, I am satisfied were ministers in prospect. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick," and no doubt it will be deferred in their case for a long time. It appears that a committee in Guysboro' refused my hon. friend from Guysboro' a hearing. I may say that I was not aware there was any committee in my county to whom I would have to apply in order to obtain a hearing; but

I was aware of the fact that these prominent gentlemen, who visited the county of Inverness during the month of December, advertised a public meeting in the district in which I resided. Although not invited, I determined to have the pleasure of meeting them there, but, to my utter astonishment, I found that some wire-pullers from the district, when they learned that we were prepared to meet them, changed the place of meeting from the agricultural building, where all the people of the county could be well accommodated, and gave out notice that the Liberal leaders would address the electors of Inverness at Port Hood, on Wednesday, the 12th December, at 11 o'clock a.m., and in the hall at Whycocomah on Tuesday evening, 11th December. When I first observed this notice, I could hardly believe my eyes, and pointed out to my friends that this could not have been the intention of the committee when they invited the Liberal leaders to address public meetings in Inverness. The only way I could find out their original intention was by placing the advertisement between me and the light, when I found that the original notice read in the exhibition building.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What date?

Mr. CAMERON. The date was not given. The intention was to hold a meeting in the exhibition building on the 12th December, and it was announced all through the county that the meeting would take place there. Early in November we were notified to that effect, but it was found very inconvenient to have a big meeting in a central part of the county, and so they changed their course and held three small meetings in places where, of course, they have performed great work, as no doubt the next elections will show.

Mr. YEO. I would like to ask the Minister if any part of this amount is to be spent in Prince County? That county has fared very badly. The few grants we have had there have been very small, indeed. The hon. Minister will recollect that I have frequently drawn his intention to the necessity of an outlay on several wharfs and breakwaters in that county, and I think, in the session of 1893, the Minister promised that he would complete the breakwater at Brae, Prince County, and the following year pay some attention to a breakwater at West Point. Since that time I believe $100 has been expended at Brae, and that is all that has been done. I have, at every session since 1891, drawn the attention of the hon. Minister, both in the House and the department, to the necessity of these works, but without much success so far. At Brae the inhabitants, in the year 1890, constructed a work themselves of about 350 feet in length. That shows the great necessity which they consider exists for a shipping place there. The Government the following year made a small outlay, and extended the work some 200 feet. The portion which was constructed by the people is falling into decay, and likely, if not attended to, soon to be carried away. I find it stated in the Minister's report that:

> The inner portion of the work, which was constructed by the inhabitants, is in a bad condition, as it has not had any repairs for some time, and should be put in order.

My colleague and I have frequently drawn the Minister's attention to the necessity of something being done to protect this work, but so far our efforts have been unsuccessful. If this work is not attended to during the present season, this portion of it, at any rate, will be destroyed. We have also drawn the hon. Minister's attention to the necessity of a wharf or pier being constructed at West Point. Before confederation there was a wharf there which afforded great facilities to the inhabitants. Since this pier was handed over to the Dominion by the local government, nothing has been done to keep it in repair, and it has nearly all disappeared. This is a very important place, one of the best portions of Prince Edward Island for fish and agricultural produce of all kinds, and lumber. I hope when the Minister considers the appropriations he will decide to do something both at Brae and West Point. I may also refer him to the necessity of an extension to the Miminegash breakwater. This is also a very important place. Some money has been expended there at different times; but to make the work at all a success, a further extension is needed. I am aware that at present repairs are being done to the pier or wharf at Moss shore, Malpeque, as promised last year. The work now going on there is very necessary, and will, when completed, give the people a very good shipping place, if the Minister will carry out his intentions of sending a dredge to that harbour. This is absolutely necessary. I would also call the Minister's attention to Summerside Harbour, which is perhaps the most important shipping place in Prince Edward Island. Some few years ago an engineer was sent there, who surveyed the harbour and made a report. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to do anything towards improving the navigation of Summerside Harbour. I believe the proposition was that two piers or breakwaters should be built near the entrance—one running from Indian Head on the south side to the lighthouse, and one from Welland Point to the north side of the channel. I know these works will cost more money than is provided in the present Estimates, or the main Estimates, but as they are very important, I hope they will be favourably considered. While speaking on this matter, I may say that the Government supporters make no secret in saying to our people: If you want anything from the Government, you must

return members to support it. They would like the people to believe that is the only way of getting anything like fair play. It is a very immoral doctrine, and with our people it does not go down. They consider public works should be dealt with on their merits. If they are entitled to public grants, these grants should be made whether they elect supporters of the Government or not. There are other important wharfs and breakwaters in Prince County which have been asked for; but when the main Estimates come up I may then draw the hon. gentleman's attention to them. In the meantime, I would like him to say whether it is the intention to do anything with the wharfs or piers I have referred to.

Mr. PERRY. I think I have the right to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a very solemn promise he made last session that during the recess he would send his engineer to Tignish to make a report on the requirements of the harbour. I had drawn his attention to the fact that Tignish was not sufficiently large to give accommodation to the many large fishing boats that come across from Caraquet, Shippegan and other places. The result of these boats coming into the harbour as it is at present is that our own fishing boats sometimes in the mornings cannot be got out. I indicated a plan to the hon. Minister which would remedy that. He seemed to feel sympathy for the people of Tignish, Caraquet and Shippegan, and said that he would send his engineer down as I have stated. I saw his engineer at St. John when I had the pleasure of attending a great Reform meeting there. I thought that really the lion and the lamb were going to lie down together at last. I made no doubt but that he had come there clothed with orders from the Ministers to surevy the harbour of Tignish. But he told me that he had no such instructions. I had not thought that the Minister of Public Works would break his promise in that way; I thought that when he made a promise it would be carried out. I am sorry to say that I was disappointed, that I was deceived. The hon. gentleman will not deny that promise he made, because it is in "Hansard." That promise, however, has not been fulfilled. How am I going to tell the people of Tignish that the Minister of Public Works, one of the highest men in the land, broke his word. I know his Government does not get much support from Tignish; but if they expect to get votes from the people of Tignish they should treat them with justice. It will not do to say that the Government have no money. The people of Prince Edward Island believe that the Government have lots of money. We find that they squander not by thousands but by hundreds of thousands. Every one in Prince Edward Island is not so happy as the sugar barons who, acting upon what they tried to learn, laid in enough sugar, before the present tariff came into operation to last them for a year, and thus made $300,000, which the people of Canada will have to pay. The people know that there is the money here and that they have a right to a share of that money. They know that they pay $1,000,000 a year into the exchequer of Canada and that they get back very little over $600,000. My colleague (Mr. Yeo) has stated the shameful and glaring case of West Point. There was a wharf there for which this Government allowed the local government of Prince Edward Island about $6,000 or $7,000. And they have not spent a dollar on it since then. And the result is that the wharf has gone adrift; it is buried in the sand. There may be two or three sticks there but the wharf is not there. It is a monument to the Government's neglect. And we have been asking for protection to this work ever since. The only time they ever pretended to do anything, I believe, was that they made some kind of promise on the eve of the election of 1891. They were ready then to make any promise, but their promises have not been fulfilled. In this case the wharf has gone adrift, some of the planks, I believe, drifted over to the main shore in the county of Kent and were used for fire wood. They have steadily neglected the public works of Prince Edward Island. They are doing some work at Rustico, I believe, and some at Souris, but, Sir, these are not the only places that require to be attended to. It would require an expenditure of $20,000 to make Tignish the harbour of refuge it ought to be. We have not now a harbour of refuge from Alberton all the way around to Summerside. And even at Summerside they are not willing to spend money, though they have been asked to do so, not only by members of the Opposition but by supporters of the Government as well. Sir Richard Hunt, when he attended as a delegate, urged this very strongly upon the Government. But nothing has been done, and they have no intention of doing anything. I asked the Goverment last year if they intended to dredge the rocks and stones that they had blasted in Cascumpeque harbour. They spent $18,000 there in blasting the rock, and then never removed what they had blasted, so that it has actually made the harbour worse than it was before. That is another monument to the gross neglect of the Government, and particularly to the Department of Public Works. When is this going to stop? When may the people expect justice and fair-play? I can tell when—when the people can get an opportunity to speak in the next general election. My hon. colleague (Mr. Yeo) has brought out very well the case of the Brae. The Public Works department did not vote a dollar until the people, began the work, and then they only put up an amount equal to what the people had taxed themselves for. That work, as the hon. Minister knows was wasting away. His

report shows that he has not one dollar, either in the main Estimates or supplementaries showing that he is going to repair it. He will let that go to waste as well as the wharf at West Point. There is to be another monument of the injustice done to the people of Prince Edward Island, more particularly the people of West Prince, the county that I have the honour to represent. And I tell the Minister of Public Works that I do not misrepresent the interests and wishes of the people. I talked to the Minister for them, and I might as well talk to the wind. Promises are made and promises are broken. I thought that no honourable man would ever break his promise. As humble as I am, if I made a solemn promise on the floor of this House, I would try to keep it. If I promised here that I would support the Government, bad as they may be, I would do it. I make no doubt that the Minister intends to bring down another Supplementary Estimate. Perhaps there will be an item for $5,000 or $10,000 to build a wharf at West Point, which is very much needed. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the West Point people live 20 or 25 miles from railway accommodation. It is only a short distance across from West Point to Richibucto or Shediac, where they could carry their canned fish or dried fish and their herring, to market if they had this accommodation. Now they have to travel 25 miles, and pay three times the price in freight which it would cost them to run across with their little schooners if they had shipping accommodation. But the Government will not give them such accommodation. What encouragement have the people to live on the island at all under such an Administration as this? Who can wonder at the continual exodus from Prince Edward Island to the United States? I say that the Government ought to accommodate these people with their own money. The money does not belong to the Government, but it belongs to the people who paid it. And let me tell the Minister of Public Works that the people of Prince Edward Island are not squandering their money the same as a gentleman squandered money two years ago at Chicago. Sir, we do not pay $146 per week for board. We live economically. When we are lucky enough to catch a few fish, we eat them. It is very seldom that we have fat meat. We have to use potatoes and fish, but fish makes brains, and the more that is used the more brains the people will have. If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would only resign his seat and go to Tignish, and ask the people to elect him, and make them promises, I have no doubt they would elect him, but what good would that do them? Well, Sir, I think the Minister is going to put a sufficient amount in the Estimates to commence and finish the breakwater at West Point, and he is going to come down with $2,000 or $3,000 to extend the breakwater at Miminegash. Why, I had the promise of the late member for Gloucester, two years ago, that he would help me to get these public works. I spoke to his successor, the present member (Mr. Blanchard), last year, and he said he would help me. But I do not see him in his place, he is not here to represent his county. I have to speak for the people of Caraquet, Shippegan, Pokmouche, and these other places, for he is not here to speak for them. I am sorry to say that, old as I am and weak as I am, I have to represent both the counties of Gloucester and West Prince. However, I hope that the Minister, after he takes a sound sleep, will conclude to render us the justice that we deserve.

Mr. KAULBACH. I was rather amused by the expressions of the senior and junior members for the county of Prince (Mr. Perry and Mr. Yeo) who have just spoken regarding discrimination shown by the Government toward certain counties in the distribution of patronage. I may say that there are several public works in the county I have the honour to represent which require a deal of attention. Appeals have been made to the Government from time to time in their interest, but without avail. I cannot complain that all my requests were not heeded, because a number of them were acceeded to, and much appreciated. With regard to the hon. gentlemen I have mentioned, as well as the hon. gentleman for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), that if it were not for the twinkle of their eye and the curl of their lip, you would imagine that they were really serious in the remarks they have made. They charge the Government with dealing unfairly, in recognizing the interests of their political friends, while turning their backs upon their opponents. Now, that charge comes with bad grace from the hon. member for Guysboro' for if he is correctly reported, when he went up west a few months ago, he and his friends were making pledges from time to time at every stopping place all the way to the Pacific coast. I am not going to say that he was correctly reported, but if he was, I think his charges against the Government are most unfair. Now, the hon. member for the county of King's (Mr. Borden), a few minutes ago referred to me as having ejaculated during the course of his remarks. He was wholly in error in using my name. I made no expression such as he mentioned. Perhaps it may have come from a neighbour of the hon. gentleman on the other side. However, I may say I fully justify the remark that was made, and consider it perfectly fair on the part of the Government to deal with their friends as well as they possibly can. When hon. gentlemen opposite reflect upon the manner in which the local government have dealt with their friends in various constituencies, I think they will feel satisfied that this Government have only been following their example in looking after their friends instead of their foes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have felt a little disgusted and humiliated at the description given by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) of the pusillanimous conduct of certain Liberal leaders who were advertised to appear in the hon. gentleman's county last fall, and whom, it seems, showed the white feather. I gather from the hon. gentleman's remarks that in some way or other those Liberal leaders had discovered——

Mr. CAMERON. No; I said the political heelers who invited them there discovered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—I think the hon. gentleman read a placard setting forth that certain Liberal leaders were advertised to speak at a large agricultural gathering; but although the hon. gentleman, the doughty champion of the Conservative faith, had determined to meet them there in mortal combat, he ran away, and hon. gentlemen could not catch him. I am sorry for the disappointment.

An hon. MEMBER. They are still running.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I remember a curious commentary. Some not very distinguished members of the Liberal party went down to the hon. gentleman's county—I happened to be one of them myself—and held two or three meetings, and all the king's horses, and all the king's men could not find the hon. gentleman. We had a meeting at Hawkesbury, and hoped to see the hon. gentleman, but failed to do so. Then we had a meeting at Whycocomagh, a large and enthusiastic meeting, at which the hon. gentleman was expected; some of his lieutenants were there, but the hon. gentleman himself did not appear. Then we travelled up to Port Hood, and held a meeting in the court-house, and the hon. gentleman discovered on the morning of that day that he had an important engagement thirty miles away, and he could not be found, to the regret of the people. The report had been circulated there that the hon. member was going to meet Liberal leaders and challenge them to mortal combat before his own constituents. But I am sorry the hon. gentleman thought discretion the better part of valour, and took to the woods. I should have been delighted to have met him and to have discussed public questions as we do here. I hope, if I have the opportunity of going down to Inverness again that he will not have an engagement in another part of the county. The hon. gentleman knew when the Liberal representatives were going to be there, because he has carried round the placard in his pocket from that day to this, for some particular reason. I hope when we go there again the hon. gentleman will treat us more generously, and meet us in open discussion; but as to the leaders who went and advertised a public meeting, and when they heard it was the hon. gentleman's intention to be present, ran away, I hope he will not disgrace them by naming them.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., was one of them—the prospective Minister of Justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am very sorry I was not aware that I had been advertised. How was it, however, that when the hon. member for Queen's was duly advertised, my hon. friend did not make it convenient to be present.

Mr. CAMERON. He was not invited to attend, and the notice shows that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We had men scouring the county to try and find him. I passed his house and his office, I went through the surrounding district, and all we could hear was that in the early morning at day light he was seen making a bee line for a distant part of the county, pleading that he had an engagement. I now want to call attention to a speech which the Minister of Public Works is reported to have made in the town of Guysboro', when there last fall, in which he laid down a doctrine that is politically immoral, and a doctrine which is contrary to that laid down by him from time to time in this House, when he meets his opponents and to which he subscribes his vote. The hon. gentleman went down to Guysboro', and we have it in evidence that the candidate carried him round on exhibition like a bear. This was done by Mr. Forbes, the Conservative candidate. The Minister went there, and declared not that he would give a special grant for special purposes which Mr. Forbes demanded on the platform, but he pledged that they would receive due consideration. But what doctrine did the hon. gentleman lay down? He said that if any of his hearers had a trust to administer and a large sum of money to be divided among certain parties, they would certainly select first their friends, and pay the money to them. I venture to remark that if the hon. gentleman lived in my province and so administered a trust he would be apt to find himself behind the bars for malfeasance and breach of trust. And the hon. gentleman was himself correct in saying that he was administering a public trust when he was advising the paying out of public money. But in stating that he would appropriate public funds to his friends, he made a statement and enunciated a doctrine which was repudiated by this House as a whole. Hon. gentlemen will remember public works and other departments became so disgraceful that public attention had to be called to it in the most marked manner, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) moved a resolution set-

ting out that "in the expenditure of public money, public interest and not party favouritism should control." That motion was supported by such ample illustration and argument that the leader of the House, the anniversary of whose death was commemorated yesterday, announced that he could not oppose the principle of the resolution, and acceptd it, and all the members of the party voted in favour of the principle on which public money should be expended. That was supposed to embody the governing and guiding principle in all the spending departments hereafter; and yet the Minister of Public Works went down to this county, just before the time when an election was supposed to be about to be held, and announced a policy directly at variance to the policy to which the House agreed; and this is something which should be most severely condemned. The hon. Minister should have an opportunity either of disallowing the report of his speech or defending it in this House. It was published in every newspaper in Nova Scotia; I go further and say that it was published in every paper in the maritime provinces, and it remains to-day uncontradicted, so far as I have been able to see, by the hon. gentleman, and that speech contains, politically immoral doctrines, doctrines calculated to destroy the efficiency of the public service, unjust and unfair doctrines, and doctrines directly contrary to the declaration of principles proposed by this side of the House, and adopted unanimously by the whole House.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Queen's has referred to his tour through Inverness. That placard speaks for itself. No Conservative was invited to speak at either public meeting. "Liberal leaders will address the electors of Inverness in the court-house at Port Hood on Wednesday, 12th inst., at 11 a.m., and in the hall at Whycocomagh, the 11th," was visible on the placard. But the intention of the tourists are easy seen throughout the advertisement if we read between the lines. I will tell the hon. gentleman one thing so that he may not forget it. I shall hold some public meetings in Inverness before the next general elections. I shall be most happy to meet the tourists at such public meetings, as I shall convene. I invite the senior member for Queen's, the Premier of Nova Scotia, and the hon. member for Guysboro', and such other Liberal leaders as they desire to bring into the county; and I shall do a little better with them, and give them as much time to discuss public questions as the Conservatives will get on those occasions. I think that is fairer treatment to them than I receive at their hands. If they give me any such invitations as that, they will find I would meet them at the places at which they are pleased to meet their friends, and where they hope to have a majority.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman has been kind enough to pay me a compliment before he read me that dreadful lecture on what he calls the immoral principles I proclaimed to the electors of Guysboro'. He had to admit that I never made any promises to them, and he says that when we are before him we do him justice. Probably he means that I have been doing justice towards his electors and his county. All I said in Guysboro', and it is a very important thing to remember, was this: I said that every year my department was given a certain sum of money which the country can afford for public works, and mentioning especially the public works and harbour improvements in the maritime provinces. I said: Unfortunately, I must admit that the amount I have at my disposal is quite insufficient to do justice to every part of the country. Being in that position, I said plainly, that after all, things being equal, that they should not be surprised if our friends were served first. I said "things being equal."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the rule, is it?

Mr. OUIMET. My hon. friends on the other side may say, that, things being equal, they ought to be served first. But what would be the use for us to be generous to that foolish extent, as the only compliment from them would be that we did it through cowardice, and that we did not dare to do justice to our own friends, and that we gave them favours, and spent every dollar of money to appease our opponents, in order, I suppose, to keep their mouths closed. Well, we won't do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You never have.

Mr. OUIMET. At least, I am not one of those who will do that. If I cannot provide for every harbour in the lower provinces, I shall take first the most important harbours, and when the main Estimates come before the House, I shall prove that all important places in the maritime provinces, whether they be represented by Liberals or Conservatives, were first provided for.

Mr. CAMERON. Look at Yarmouth.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, look at Yarmouth. $10,000 were spent in the improvement of Yarmouth Harbour during this present year. As all cannot be served at the same time our friends shall be served first, all things being equal, and our opponents shall come next.

Mr. FRASER. That is all we want.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, we will do that, and I think the Government——

Mr. FRASER. I mean that all we want is to have that statement on record.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they were very careful never to serve us.

Mr. CAMERON. That is correct.

Mr. OUIMET. If there is any immorality in what I have said, I would like to know it. I know very well that hon. gentlemen opposite would always find some way of blaming us. Sometimes they say we spend too much money, and sometimes they say we do not spend enough. They will always find fault, but we have gone on, and the country has gone on, without consulting them very much for the last fifteen years, and, if they continue preaching morality as they do, I think the country will go on for twenty-five years more without taking much stock in their professions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ouimet) has spoken with a very great deal of frankness, and his speech is in perfect accord with the practice of his department, but that speech is directly in the teeth of the resolution for which the hon. gentleman voted. That resolution says:

> That in the expenditure of public money the public interest, and not party favouritism should control.

The hon. gentleman says to-night that party interests shall control.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said to-night, that he will serve his friends first.

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, "things being equal."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the position which the hon. gentleman has taken. And he has never enough money voted for the necessary public works over the country, therefore, the time will never come, so long as the hon. gentleman is in office, when the constituencies represented by hon. members of the Opposition can be served at all. The hon. gentleman talked about things being equal. Has the hon. gentleman acted upon the assumption that the expenditures are made in constituencies represented on this side of the House, only in cases where things are equal. Has not the hon. gentleman asked for an appropriation for public buildings in Petrolea, but has he asked for an appropriation for public buildings in Sarnia? He has not done so, although the Government collect twice the amount of revenue in Sarnia that it does in Petrolea. Have you preferred Petrolea to Sarnia because the public interests are superior in Petrolea? No, but it is because the constituency in which Sarnia is situated is represented by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, while the constituency in which Petrolea is situated is represented by a supporter of the Government. That is what the hon. gentleman calls equality. Why, the hon. gentleman has appropriated money for post offices in villages in which there are not a thousand people, and in which there are not a thousand dollars collected, and he has failed to erect a public building in the city of Woodstock, where the Government collects nearly $50,000 revenue, and where a public building would be in the public interest. The hon. gentleman calls that equality. Laprairie, with a population of 400, and a contribution of $400 a year to the post office, gets a public building, but the town of Woodstock does not. Is that in the public interest? I could go all over the country and I could show that the hon. gentleman in his conduct has not taken into consideration the question of equality at all. The year before last, I brought under the hon. gentleman's attention that the navigation of the river in my constituency had been destroyed, and the hon. gentleman said: Yes, I will see to removing those obstructions, I will have the matter attended to at once. I so wrote to my constituents, and I communicated the letter which the hon. gentleman had sent me. I supposed the hon. gentleman would keep his engagements, and that he meant what he had said. But the twelve months went by and nothing was done. I mentioned it to the hon. gentleman last year, and he said that he was in doubt whether the matter was in his department or under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, then the present Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I spoke to both gentlemen, and the promise was given by both. But I do not happen to be on that side of the House; and, although I called their attention to the fact that the port of Wallaceburg was one of the most important in the whole Dominion, considering the amount of tonnage that arrived and departed, up to this hour nothing has been done, although the promise was repeated last year. The hon. gentleman says that is keeping faith with this side of the House and acting in the public interest. Do the facts which I have mentioned correspond with that statement? Now, Sir, in my opinion the Government are trustees for the public, the money they are expending is not the money of the Government or the money of the Tory party; it is the money of the people of Canada, and by their oaths of office and by every principle of honour which should govern the conduct of public men, the Government are bound to consider and to consider only the public interests in its expenditure. Does the hon. gentleman act upon that assumption? I say, Sir, from first to last he has wholly disregarded that consideration. At this moment he has boasted that he intends to act upon a different principle. He says: The House did not give me money enough to expend in every portion of the Dominion where public money is required

to be spent, and, therefore, I must look after my own friends first, and spend money in constituencies represented on this side of the House. That is the doctrine the hon. gentleman laid down.

Mr. OUIMET. As they must be served in turn.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whose turn? The hon. gentleman says that according to the appropriations he receives the turn of members on this side of the House shall never come. While the Government have a right to appoint officials from their own party for administrative work—and so far as these appointments are concerned, I have no fault to find—yet the fact that the public have entrusted them with the administration of public affairs makes them trustees, not for a party, but for the whole people, and that trust I say has not been discharged. If a return is brought down, every member of this House will see how representatives on this side have been treated. Why, Sir, the negroes in the South in the days of slavery were dealt with as fairly as the Government have dealt with us. There is nothing to ostracise men, to humiliate them, if possible to crush out and destroy an independent public sentiment, that the hon. gentleman's department could do with the expenditure of public money that has not been done; and when you go upon the public platform you are prepared to say to the people: If you want a man who will obtain for you the expenditure of money for necessary public works in your constituency, why, just send a man who will support the Administration. The Government assume to be the masters of the people of this country instead of their trustees, their servants; they are not Ministers, but masters; that is the position they take. It is a position to which the people of this country might submit when a man of large experience and great ability was at the head of the Conservative party; but hon. gentlemen will find that they cannot play the role of Sir John Macdonald in this matter. What people would submit to at his hands they will not submit to at the hands of the Minister of Public Works; and when he undertakes to deal in the unfair way he has, and which he has scarcely concealed in the statement he has made——

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman cannot substantiate his statement, that I have dealt unfairly with any constituency, because it was Liberal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You admitted it.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not admit it. I said that in point of fact I could prove that every constituency has been fairly dealt with, and that some Liberal constituencies have been perhaps more liberally dealt with than some Conservative constituencies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I put this question to the hon. gentleman again. How is it you are undertaking to erect public buildings in East Lambton and none in West Lambton? You collect more revenues in West Lambton, and yet you erect a post office at Fairfield in East Lambton, with 800 inhabitants, and none in Woodstock with 10,000?

Mr. OUIMET. That is ancient history.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is modern history; it is the state of things at this hour. The hon. gentleman knows that he has not dealt fairly with the constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) One would imagine, to hear the hon. gentleman, that the Government did nothing at all for hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends. I can instance a case in my own province to show the reverse. In my own county I wanted some money expended by the Government, and I could not get it because, forsooth, my neighbour from Queen's had to get an expenditure in his county; so I had to wait my turn, and I trust that the Minister of Public Works will not overlook that very extensive work in Prince Edward Island—the Souris breakwater, which will require a large expenditure this year, not only as a harbour for the people of that locality, but as a harbour of refuge for the fishermen of Prince Edward Island and those of Nova Scotia. It is the only harbour on very many miles of coast and within easy reach of the fishing grounds. I think the hon. member for Bothwell has altogether misrepresented the intentions of the Minister of Public Works and the expression he used. Of course, it is well known that the public money granted from year to year is not sufficient for all the public works of the country, and he must take them in turn as they come.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I speak of pledges and promises made.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). What he cannot accomplish in one year will come in its turn the next. That has been the case with us in Prince Edward Island, and no difference has been made between the counties represented by Conservatives and those represented by Liberals. In this connection I trust that the Minister, when he comes to the regular vote for the coming year, will see that provision is made for keeping up the breakwater at Souris.

Mr. FOSTER. It is amusing to listen for a little while to the high-flown morality and eloquence of the hon. member for Bothwell, and then to cite a fact which is under his own nose, and which might have been patent to himself while he was engaged in delivering his lecture. Here in harbours and rivers

we have a vote of less than $10,000, of which $5,000 is to go to a county represented by a Grit member.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to correct the hon. member for Bothwell, who took a very unfair liberty with me, and I am surprised that he would make such a statement on the floor of this House. He stated, if I understood aright, that he had brought to my attention the condition of a river in Ontario, and I had made a promise to him which I had never carried out. The reference that I remember last year on the subject was made across the floor. The first thing I did after that discussion was to refer to the discussion and the date to the hon. chief engineer of Marine and Fisheries and ask him to do what he could to remove these snags and floating timber. I subsequently informed the hon. gentleman personally of the difficulties, as shown by the reports of the officers of the department. The want of success in connection with entering into arrangements, after inviting tenders for doing the work in a certain way, retarded the carrying out of the plan as first suggested by the chief engineer. At this moment I cannot recollect the exact stage which the transaction has reached when I left the department, but I think if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to move for the papers in the matter, he will find I followed up the work as well as I possibly could. I do not think the hon. gentleman, after hearing my explanation, should allow this statement to stand.

Rivière du Sud—Protection works at Montmagny $5,000

Mr. OUIMET. Montmagny cannot complain of any want of favour.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not consider the Government are doing a favour to Montmagny but simply paying a debt.

Mr. OUIMET. A great many people do not pay their debts. I think it is a very good thing to pay one's debts.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the Government of Canada is not reduced to the position of claiming great credit when it pays a debt.

To complete payment for steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, during the season of 1894, as per terms of contract..... $500

Mr. FOSTER. This is part of the subsidy voted for a line of communication in Prince Edward Island, between the island and the mainland. The steamer "Electra" went to quite a number of places and a vote was passed in Parliament, but a difficulty arose regarding the wording of the vote and the subsidy as earned. The Attorney General refused to pay because the wording did not carry out the intention we had in passing the vote.

Mr. FOSTER.

To pay the Bay of Fundy Steamship Company for services performed in the month of June, 1893, between St. John, Digby and Annapolis.....$910 42

Mr. FOSTER. This is a vote of the same nature as the former one. A vote for the service was made upon a certain schedule, involving a certain number of trips. After the vote had passed, the schedule was changed with my own knowledge, allowing the boat, instead of making a certain number of trips for five months, to make less in the first month and a half and more during the succeeding two and a half months. There was the same number of trips but the distribution was different.

To pay the Furness Line for services between St. John, Halifax and London, in January, 1892..... $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. That arose in this way. The Furness line was under a contract to give us a certain number of trips. The number of trips was given, in fact more than the number of trips, but in this one case the vessel came to Halifax but did not make her trip to the city of St. John. She loaded at Halifax instead and went back to London. I refused to pay because the company did not make the full trip. Correspondence ensued. They pleaded certain reasons why they did not go to St. John, and pretended that their neglect ought not to prejudice their claim to the subsidy. Finally I said I would give them $1,000 to end the matter. They refused at first, but afterwards concluded to take the money, and this amount is asked to carry out my promise.

To pay the Yarmouth Steamship Company for steam communication between St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth, during the season of 1894..... $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly the amount voted in the main Estimate for the current year. A contract was entered into between the department and the Yarmouth Steamship Company, and the terms of the contract were different from the terms upon which the service had been carried on for years, and upon which the company proposed to carry it out. They had no idea of carrying out the service on any different terms. They received a local subsidy from the Nova Scotia Government, I think, for a number of years. The contract, however, as it was signed, prevented the Auditor General from paying a single dollar of the subsidy, and this is to re-word the appropriation and bring it into harmony with the service actually performed, and exactly on the same lines as those on which it has been performed for the last eight or ten years. It is practically $7,000 voted and not paid.

Mr. BOWERS. What places has the boat to call at?

Mr. FOSTER. St. John, Yarmouth and Halifax are the objective points, besides

Shelburne and Lunenburg, and I am not sure what others on the south coast.

Mr. BOWERS. Is Westport included ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. BOWERS. Two years ago ?

Mr. FOSTER. There were a great many difficulties in connection with that. It was found impossible to call at Westport and do the service. Westport has not been a port of call for the last two or three years.

Mr. BOWERS. A boat stops there right along for which the local government pays a subsidy. The hon. members for St. John Lunenburg, Queen's and Yarmouth waited on the then Minister of Trade and Commerce, now First Minister, and stated the case, showing how Westport was situated, and $2,000 was granted, making the vote $7,000.

Mr. BOWERS. It was reduced to $5,000 and then increased to $7,000. I hope the hon. gentleman will see the necessity of making Westport one of the ports of call.

To pay Roderick McDonald balance on account of steamship service between Port Mulgrave, Arichat, and Canso, Guysboro' and Port Hood, from 1893 to 1895.. $3,000

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Macdonald was paid for several years at the rate of $5,000 per annum under a vote for that service. That was eventually reduced to $4,000, together with an additional $1,000 paid by the Post Office Department out of its general appropriation. From 1893 the Post Office Department ceased to pay the sum, and this is to recoup Macdonald for the three years during which the Post Office Department has not paid him.

Mr. FRASER. Were the mails carried ? Did the Minister say that this carried the mails from Port Mulgrave to Guysboro' ?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say whether he does or not. I am rather inclined to think that the reason the Post Office Department refused to pay the $1,000 was that the mails were sent another way. But as the contract was that he was to receive $5,000, we are bound to pay it.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to urge in connection with this——

Mr. FOSTER. We will have another item in the main Estimates for this service. Let any discussion take place then.

Mr. FRASER. All right.

Additional amount required for Winter Mail Service $1,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is the winter mail service ?

Mr. FOSTER. By ice boats.

To provide a gratuity to the widow of the late Wm. Smith, who lost his life in the attempt to save the Government buoy adrift from Portuguese shoals during the storm of the 15th April, 1895..... $500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it customary to give these gratuities ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Always.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This man leaves eleven dependent children. He lost his life in attempting to save Government property.

Mr. FRASER. The vote is too small.

To provide the widow of the late J. R. Spencer, the amount of one year's salary due that officer while employed as an observer in Fort Churchill in 1885.. $120

To provide for the refund of fines imposed on the owner of the "Golden City." 200

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did Mr. Spencer lose his life while at Fort Churchill ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was not until after his death that a claim was put in by his widow, that one year's salary had not been paid to him, and, on reference to the accounts of the department, this was found to be the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of this refund of fines imposed on the "Golden City" ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Charges were brought against these parties and fines imposed. Representations were made to the department that the offences were not at all serious. The fines were paid. In view of the fact that the offences were not serious, and that the parties pleaded guilty, it was thought that $200 might be refunded.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not state the offence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They were offences under the Steamboat Inspections Act. Sometimes these offences are considered serious, but in this case they were only minor breaches of the law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What were the offences—I do not remember the case.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I could not say.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This was at Peterborough. This is the return of one fine inflicted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It says "fines." You had better take out the "s."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is all right as it is.

Mr. FRASER. There may be a distribution of this $200 over all. It might involve an important question if there were ten of

them and this $200 were spread over them shortly before election time.

To provide additional amount for legal expenses, including prosecutions re Fishing Bounty frauds..... $4,000

Mr. FLINT. This is a large amount, and I think the House ought to have some information now. Or, if there is an appropriation in the main Estimates——

Mr. FOSTER. There is. Discussion can be had then.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman had better let this item for fishing bounties stand.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole question can come up on the main Estimate and full discussion take place then.

Mr. BOWERS. I may not be here then. Is this for legal expenses that have been incurred?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BOWERS. In the Municipal Council of Digby, I notice an item of $88.35, paid in connection with the prosecution of some of these bounty cases. Will that be refunded to the council?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, not necessarily. This is for taxed costs. I may just take a moment to say that it was in my time as Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a vigorous prosecution, which resulted, on the whole, successfully, was inaugurated. The most gigantic frauds were being perpetrated on the department. We sent several of the offenders to jail.

Mr. FORBES. Some escaped.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some escaped, as the hon. gentleman says. Still, the results have been most encouraging. In the prosecutions in Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the expenses were beyond the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Were any practical results obtained to offset the expenditure?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Indeed there were, in one case we were just in time to prevent $5,000 from being misappropriated.

Mr. BOWERS. Will this amount be repaid to the council?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, why should it be?

Mr. BOWERS. My attention has been called to this matter by letter. They say it was not right that this should be thrown on the county of Digby, particularly as the trial turned out a farce. One or two of the accused were sent to jail for 24 hours, but the principal malefactors escaped altogether.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is the judge?

Mr. BOWERS. I do not know.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You do not know much about the case.

Mr. BOWERS. The fishery officer called my attention to a case which I brought before the department one or two years ago. A customs officer was getting a bounty for fishing, in a ten foot boat, and yet nothing was done against him. It is not fair that the county should have to pay these taxes in such a case as this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That case is familiar to me. The judge gave him sentence of 12 hours, I think.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand from my hon. friend that the sentence was not carried out, that while the judge inflicted the sentence, the prosecutor did not see that it was carried out, and the sentence remains unfulfilled to this day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What have we to do with it? He is not in our charge after that. We prosecute a man, and he is convicted. We can do nothing after that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the prosecutor applies to the mgaistrate to have the necessary warrant issued, it must be issued, but the magistrate won't issue it of his own motion. I quite agree in what the hon. gentleman has said, that the administration of these fishing bounties has been marked by disgraceful frauds.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman used stronger language than that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not that the administration had been marked by fraud. I said that gigantic frauds had been perpetrated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The fact of the matter is that connected with the administration of this fund, there has grown up a huge system of fraud and wrong-doing that has been known to the department, and known to everybody throughout the maritime provinces, and it has been so stated in this House for the last eight or ten years. Now, I commended the hon. gentleman when, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he took vigorous steps to put that down. There was a time when we were laughed at from this side of the House for making the statement that enormous sums were paid to the people who were no more entitled to them than the babe in the cradle; that false and forged certificates were put in; that men who were connected with the Conservative party almost made a trade of

obtaining public money fraudently out of this fund. It became a matter of notorious disgrace. I was glad when the department took it up, and I believe a large amount of energy was shown by the head of the department, and was sought to be infused into his subordinate officers in carrying out those prosecutions. But they were frustrated at every step. The hon. gentleman found the local members were too strong for him, and he found, from one reason or another, that the prosecutions became a farce. Now, I would like to have submitted to this House a statement of the number of prosecutions that were brought, the number of convictions that were obtained, and above all the number of convictions that were carried out, after they were obtained, and how many men were really punished. Very few men were really punished. I heard it talked about last year when I took a trip through the maritime provinces, laughed at all over the coast—the manner in which the public officials were imposed upon, and the manner in which those who ought to have known better, winked at it. I am sorry to say that the fishery officers and inspectors themselves have been criminally lax in this matter, and have allowed public money to be paid to men when they ought to have known if they did not know, and the means was within their knowledge to lead them to the conclusion, that these men were not entitled to the money. But they winked at it, they kept the department hoodwinked, and nothing that could be said would open the eyes of the department until a year or two ago, when the representations became so strong that the department had to take action. I commended the department for the action they took. I was glad to see the prosecutions. I say that every honest fisherman who earns this grant or bounty, looks with disgust upon the dishonest men who obtain it by political favouritism, but who are not entitled to it; and they will join in the effort to punish these fraudulent wrong-doers. I believe myself the secret spring of the wrong lies in the fishery officers who wink at this wrong-doing, and make use of the money for political purposes. It is known and talked about everywhere that such is the fact. But my main object now is to obtain, either to-night or before this vote passes, a statement showing the number of prosecutions, the number of convictions obtained, and the sentences that were carried out, together with the names of the parties. It will have a most salutary effect all over the maritime provinces where this fund is distributed, if these names are published. It will have an excellent effect if it becomes known that a man who is guilty of obtaining money fraudulently from this bounty fund, will be punished, no matter whether he votes Liberal or Conservative. I do not mean to say that the fishermen as a class are parties to this fraud, but there is an inside class among them of fraudulent, wrong-doing men, who take advantage of their votes to obtain money illegally, and then perhaps try to curry favour with the inspectors or other fishery officers to save themselves from prosecution and punishment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. While I anticipate this subject will bear discussion, it is only fair for me to say with reference to the fishery officers, that they do not deserve anything like the extravagant denunciatory language of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I was in that department from 1888 until this year, I went through the whole of this business, I saw all the complaints, I investigated every statement that was made of alleged fraud, and the frauds were not traced to the fishery officers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say the frauds could be traced to the fishery officers; I said to the laxity of the administration of the officers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no recollection now of a single instance that would justify the language that was used, that the fishery officers, inspectors and others, as the hon. gentleman said, had connived at this fraud, and had used this fund for political purposes.

Mr. FORBES. Why is it that George Bishop, the present collector at Digby, under conviction for fraudulent practices under this Fishery Act, has not been committed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not remember the sentence at the moment, and I do not think the hon. gentleman does. But all these cases are to be brought down, every case the hon. gentleman wants will be included in the fisheries report. Speaking from memory, the case of Bishop was tried in the county court of Digby, and, I think, there has never been a sentence imposed upon him. It is an extraordinary case. The facts are laid before Parliament, and that is as far as we can go. We prosecuted that man, and the whole incidents of the trial were laid bare. I rose, however, to defend the fishery officers and the inspectors as a class from the aspersions cast upon them by the hon. gentleman. If he refers to Nova Scotia, I can tell him he is wholly wrong. If he refers to Prince Edward Island, I believe him to be wrong, because there is nothing that has come within reach of the department that would justify such a wholesale charge as that these men were guilty of misconduct, if not of fraud. These charges used to be made across the floor of this House in the days of Mr. McIntyre, but every case that he brought to my notice was thoroughly in-

vestigated, and the reputation of the fishery officers stood the investigation, and I believe will stand it. In Nova Scotia there is no such opinion as the hon. gentleman speaks of—that every one talks about the fishery officers using the bounty fund for political purposes, and conniving at fraud. A more serious statement could hardly be made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to finish my remarks? He can speak when I get through.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has made a charge against me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to direct the hon. gentleman to take his seat.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise to a point of order. It is not usual, when a member rises and asks to be allowed to make an explanation, for a Minister to get into a tantrum in the way the hon. gentleman did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order. I will not submit to this sort of language.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Queen's may state his point of order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My point of order is this. The hon. gentleman has charged me with having said that which I did not say.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no point of order in that. The hon. gentleman did charge the fishery inspectors and fishery officers, in some part of this country, I assume—he did not name the province—with being so notoriously connected with these bounty frauds, and so notoriously using this bounty system for political purposes, that it was the common talk, wherever he went in the provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say that if the hon. gentleman has information of that kind, it is his duty to make a specific statement in this House, so that action can be taken upon it, particularly when I say that the files of the Fisheries Department will show that every charge of that kind has been thoroughly investigated, and the character of the fishery officers has been proved to be as good as could be expected or desired. There have been officers guilty of wrong-doing, but they have been punished, and some of them have been dismissed. But I say that as a class, the fishery officers, particularly those concerned in the administration of the bounty, gave, in my time, every possible satisfaction to me as the head of the department. Every case reported to me that had the smell of fraud, was investigated, and every case where we could obtain evidence of crime, was put into the hands of the Justice Department for prosecution. I gave directions before I left the department, to see that these cases which had not met with conviction and punishment, should be mentioned in the report. I call on the hon. gentleman either to withdraw these charges against respectable men, many of whom I know, and who have been engaged in the fishery service in Nova Scotia, and against others in other provinces whom I know not to the same extent, or to name the men who are tainted with fraud who have been guilty of misconduct, and place the committee of the Government in possession of that information. These men are not in the House, but they are entitled to fair-play, and their characters are as dear to them as the character of hon. members are dear to them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman must not get into tantrums; I made no specific charge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I ask it to be made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The administration of this department has been such that huge frauds have been committed during several years in the payment of these moneys.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the part of the officers?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do not interrupt me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do not get into tantrums.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said that huge frauds were proved to exist, amounting to thousands of dollars. Does the hon. Minister mean to say that, if the fishery overseers had discharged their duty, these frauds would have existed year after year?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Those frauds have been notorious for years. They were brought to the attention of Parliament by Mr. McIntyre some five or six years ago, when he showed that hundreds of cases of fraud existed in King's County, and he read 25 or 30 cases in this House. And who was to blame? Was it not well known, and was it not charged that the men themselves were not so much to blame as were the fishery officers, that many of the fishermen were induced to put in their claims by officers of the Government, who knew at the time that the claims were not valid?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Name one single officer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not going to name one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then why asperse the officers?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman knows that these frauds amounted to thousands of dollars.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not in the case of the fishery officers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To what extent the fishery officers may have been concerned or been parties, I cannot say, nor can the Government. I speak of the general impression prevailing all through the province that bounties have been paid in years gone by. I believe the system has been improved since the Government has compelled the declaration to be made in a different way; but the fact remains that thousands of dollars have been defrauded out of the public in this manner, and this sum must have been defrauded either by the crass negligence or the willing connivance of the officers. The hon. gentleman said that effective measures were taken. I want to know the names of parties against whom action has been taken.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Every information of that kind will be supplied.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, tell me to wait until the fishery report is brought down; he knows that necessarily it is brought down at about the end of the session. Before we vote this money the returns should be brought down, so that hon. members may be able to see not only how many men were convicted and how many prosecutions proved abortive, but also how many convictions were carried out, and then we will be able to judge how far there is effective administration of the department, designed not to punish offenders, but to vindicate the law.

Mr. FORBES. I have listened to the remarks made by the Minister of Justice in regard to this question. His memory must be short, if he does not recollect that specific charges have been made against fishery officers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not my statement.

Mr. FORBES. The Minister stated that the charge made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., was that a great many of the frauds charged against the Government were due either to the shirking of duty on the part of the fishery officers or to direct connivance by the officers in the commission of the frauds. The Minister attempts to justify the acts of his officers. Surely, the Minister must have forgotten the case of A. C. Hockin, fishery inspector on the south shore of Nova Scotia, in which the Minister refused to pay the bounty in a certain case of J. J. Hubley, and prosecuted and subsequently persecuted this man, and brought a charge of perjury against him. The whole defence was contained in an affidavit which was filed, written in the handwriting of the fishery officer; but the officer would not come forward and give evidence. I could not get him there. However, the grand jury discharged the defendants. It was proved that he swore he made a sworn statement on the advice of the officer. Another case was that of Kenney. He misappropriated money, and was discharged for negligence of duty and otherwise neglecting his office. Further, I can make special reference to the fishery officers in the county of Queen's. Between 1st January and 17th May, there was but one inspection made at the lobster factories. The charge was made that men favourable to the Government were curing lobsters that were under size, as small as 5½ and 6 inches, two of them being put together to make a full-sized lobster. This complaint was brought to the notice of the officers, and they deliberately overlooked it, and only made one visit between the dates I have mentioned. The matter was again brought to their attention, and it was mentioned that this packing of undersized lobsters was constantly going on. The answer of the officer was; If men make a specific charge in writing, we will have it investigated. There is one packer who is anxious to conform to the law, and he has made reports to the department that the law was being violated in this respect by other rival packers, but he cannot get the officer to inquire into these violations. He says he cannot attempt to compete with these packers who are allowed to catch undersized fish of five or six inches.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has that to do with the bounty. This is only an ex-parte statement.

Mr. FORBES. Every man in Nova Scotia is anxious to conform to and observe the law. If I understand the inspector's duties aright, it is to watch that the laws are not violated. If they are to draw their salaries and do nothing, the sooner we know it the better. While I believe that some officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries do all that is required of them under the law, yet there are others who do not. I must say that when an honest citizen is endeavouring to conform to the laws of the country, and lays a complaint before the officers of the department, it should be looked into, and he should not be told to lay the information in writing and to enter a prosecution himself. I have cited those instances to justify the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Davies).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is only one remark of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes) that I will notice. He referred to Mr. Hockin. I know Mr. Hockin as well as I know the hon. gentleman, and I believe

him to be as honourable a man as is to be found in the Dominion of Canada. I venture to make this prophecy: That the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Forbes) will not put over his signature in a paper in this country, the statement that will be found reported in "Hansard," and which he is privileged to make; with regard to Mr. Hockin's conduct in connection with that prosecution. I never heard of this before, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes) never made that charge officially to me. The hon. member from Guysboro (Mr. Fraser) knows Mr. Hockin, and he can speak as to his character. Every one in the county in which he lives, on either side of political life, will join me in the statement that I make as to the integrity of Mr. Hockin's character. And for whom is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forbes) pleading? For two miscreants, or one of them I forget which, against whom the grand jury would not fill a bill it is true, but who are black listed in the Department of Fisheries on account of their known frauds, and who under the general rule are debarred from it. This is the case the hon. gentleman brings up here, and for the first time he mentions Mr. Hockin in the connection in which he has mentioned him, and then he runs off to tell us in regard to some who are violating the law with regard to lobsters. I have no doubt the Minister of Marine will act upon that information. I have no doubt that he will inquire fully into the matter and see that those people are prosecuted if they are violating the law. But what has that to do with the very serious statement made in regard to these fishery officers as a class?

Mr. FORBES. Pardon me for one moment. I did not want to reflect in any way upon the conduct of Mr. Hockin.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Your language did, seriously.

Mr. FORBES. I know Mr. Hockin as well as the Minister of Justice does. I will put over my signature and lay it before the hon. Minister too, the fact that Mr. Hockin drew, in his own handwriting, a form of affidavit for this fisherman to write out, and swear to, and that the fisherman did it word for word as Mr. Hockin drew the draft. That affidavit was sent to the Minister and upon it an information was laid for perjury against that fisherman. The indictment was before the grand jury of the county of Halifax, and as the Minister himself says, the grand jury refused to find a bill against him. Subsequently when the next grand jury was empannelled the Minister again made the charge, and without calling all the witnesses that were necessary they found a bill. The trial took place and the petty jury acquitted that man of the charge which the Minister has now black-listed him for.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. FORBES. I wonder who is the better judge of the character of the fishermen: twenty-four grand jurors and twelve petty jurors of the county of Halifax, or a few officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. What right has the Minister to blacken the character of that fisherman by putting him on the black list, when thirty-six of his fellow countrymen say he was not guilty of the charge. I have in my office now, or I have returned it to the fisherman I do not know which, the pencil draft of Mr. Hockin on that affidavit.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a very different statement from the first one you made.

Mr. FORBES. That is the statement I made, and if I did not I intended to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not object to that statement, but I do object to the other.

Mr. FORBES. That is the statement I made word for word. As regards the case of the canners in my own county of Queen's, I intended to refer to it later on. I do not think that any fishermen in the province or in the Dominion, is bound to come to Ottawa, or is bound to lay before the member for the county, information in regard to infractions of the law. His duty is to go to the officers of the Government, and in this case that was done, but they have taken no notice of it. I want fair minded men to draw the inference. There are only one or two reasons why it has not been taken notice of. Either the officer of the department does not believe the man making the charge, or else he knows the man against whom the charge is preferred and he decides to leave that man alone. It is the duty of the officer to investigate the charge, and if he has not done so, he cannot be carrying out the law. As regards Mr. Hockin again. I made no charge against him that the Minister says I did, but I believe he acted as he did to aid and help a good Tory who was opposed to Mr. J. J. Hubley and bound to hurt him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Your last statement I do not object to. It was Mr. Hockin's duty to draw the affidavit for an illiterate man.

Mr. KAULBACH. I must object to the reflection so generally made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., upon the fishery officers charged with the distribution of the fish bounty money. The officers in my county, I may say, distribute more bounty than is distributed in any other county of the Dominion, and I must speak in the highest terms of their reputation. They have in every possible way discharged their duties faithfully and well, and without a particle of blemish upon their character, of any kind. I, therefore, rise for the

purpose of exonerating the fishery officers of the county I have the honour to represent—Lunenburg—from any aspersions which have been attempted to be made upon them by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to know from the Minister, if he will bring down the items of those expenses?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, I think they are ready.

Mr. FRASER. As the Minister has referred to me, I may say that perhaps I am not the best judge to give Mr. Hockin a character as to the discharge of his official duty. He was all over the county to try and get up a case, and he did work up a case against me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What case had he against you?

Mr. FRASER. He was trying to get evidence to enter a case to void my election. He was the man who went over the county, together with the local member, to do that, and I might therefore not be the best judge in his case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He was inspecting.

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

An hon. MEMBER. Was his salary going on?

Mr. FRASER. Oh, certainly, and all his expense. I will say, however, that I do not believe that Mr. Hockin would wilfully, either tell a lie or write a paper for the purpose of fradulently getting a bounty. I will say that. I will say also, that perhaps his ignorance of the fishing law would enable him to do a number of things that would not be thought of by any officer who understood his business. I say that, because Mr. Hockin has not the advantages of understanding all the fishery laws that another man would have. As I had occasion to say to my own electors in Guysboro', he was taken out of a dry goods shop and sent there, and I do not think, if he was called upon some fine morning and taken down to one of the fishing stations where various kinds of fish were caught, and without knowing that he would be asked, he was asked what were the names of six different kinds of fish; I do not think he could tell them. I have said that openly in the county, and I believe it is true. Of course he is learning. When officials become ardent partisans, they will wink at irregularities, and, just for the purpose of not hurting their party, they will see that the law is not carried into full effect. A fishery officer in the eastern part of my county was at a meeting——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much did he receive? About $150 a year.

Mr. FRASER. That is quite a consideration to him; and he not only got up and spoke, but interrupted, and when I told him this was unseemly on the part of an officer like himself, he said, "I will take my office in my hands, and go around canvassing for the candidate I want to see elected." I can give the Minister the name. What I want to point out is that an officer like that is not likely to correct the wrongs which are perpetrated on the department. He is a politician more than an officer, and if a man whom he knows to have perpetrated a fraud happens to be a Conservative, he is sure not to suffer for it. Why, just before the election, men who had been fined went to this officer, and made arrangements with him by which the fines were not collected, and nothing has been said about it to this day, because they were Conservatives.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would take it as a great favour if the hon. gentleman would give me the particulars of those cases.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman will remember that I told him about the frauds in my own county, and he was frank enough to tell me that he knew there were wrongs; and he will remember the statement I made that I did not wish to add to his difficulties, and I did not want that fishing bounties, small as they were, should be made to appear before the representatives of the people of the Dominion to be so distributed as to be in danger of being abolished; and I did not make these statements in public until the hon. gentleman arose to-night and had to say that huge frauds has existed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Had existed—because it is my firm conviction that we have stamped out the main part of them, and a great many of the perpetrators have been punished and several are now in jail.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I think the hon. gentleman will not deny that if there is a county in the lower provinces where an attempt has been made to get $5,000 improperly from the Government, the officers under him in that county could not help knowing it, as they are the men who know the fishermen, and whose duty it is to find out who the parties are. As I was going round last summer I saw notices notifying the fishermen to go to such a place and put in their claims.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not the practice formerly. The hon. gentleman is now referring to the new system, one of the advantages of which is that an officer having superior knowledge and education goes to a certain district and holds a little court where the fishermen are convened, and he examines their proofs of claim. Under the old system, recourse was had to the ordinary fishery officers in the

various districts, who were paid a nominal salary, and who had only ordinary qualifications. In that system there were found to be opportunities for fraud, as the claims were not so thoroughly examined.

Mr. FRASER. I know this is a better system, but if attempts were made to get $5,000 for one county more than it was entitled to, the hon. gentleman's officials must have winked at them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. I am satisfied that they did not.

Mr. FRASER. Of course, I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman would pounce upon an officer whom he saw going astray; but I say it is impossible for these officers not to know. In one county, a man actually put down the name of his dog, and got the bounty. I do not say the application came before one of the officials, but he got the bounty. While I am ready to commend the hon. gentleman for the improvement made in the manner in which these applications are now presented, and while I do not say that corrupt bargains are made with the officials, yet I do say that with their knowledge claims were put in that should not have been put in. There is an idea that it is not as much harm to steal from the Government as from any one else, an idea which has been encouraged in the last fifteen years by the Government neglecting to punish men who steal from them under cover of contracts. Therefore, the idea goes abroad that the Government are good game and should pay more than private parties, and these men make the best of their chances. I do not know the name of the county where this $5,000 grab was stopped. I trust it was not a county represented by a Liberal. I am not going to name the county, because I do not know it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has got to be so delicate a matter that I do not want to name it now.

Mr. FRASER. I would suggest to the Minister in this connection a great mistake that is made in connection with the payment of the bounty.

Mr. COCHRANE. Shut it off altogether.

Mr. FRASER. I am not going to say that I would not do that, although I come from a fishing county. I do not say it would not be a good thing to abolish it, provided the money were put to other uses, such as the building of breakwaters and harbours. I do not say I would do it. Here is $4,000 for example, in costs. That would be quite a substantial sum to expend even in the distribution of bounties. I object to the manner in which the bounties are distributed. I think the officials could, without any risk whatever, send cheques to the fishermen in the various counties. I notice that it costs, in the county I represent, pretty well on to $200 or more to distribute bounty cheques, and the fishermen have to walk quite a distance—in some cases several miles—to get these cheques. Let me suggest to the hon. Minister a plan, which I wonder was not adopted long ago. Let a cheque be issued to every man entitled to a fishing bounty. On the back of that cheque let a form be printed, which the payee must sign in the presence of a justice of the peace, and on signing which he can cash the cheque. That cheque will then go back to the department and be the best receipt the department could have. This would be a great saving to the fishermen, and be a perfect safeguard to the department. I would ask the Minister whether this $4,000 for costs comes out of the bounty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; $160,000 is divided among the fishermen, and nothing comes out of it. The cost of distribution and other costs are paid out of the general exchequer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The statement has been made on the floor of the House that a Collector of Customs, who has been convicted of fraud, continues to hold his position. The same statement was made to the Government last session, and it seems strange to any one from the other provinces that an officer of the Government who has been found guilty of fraud, and the prosecution of whom has cost the Government this ridiculously large amount of $4,000 in law costs, should be still continued in his position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do you know that he is Collector of Customs?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The statement was made by a member on the floor of this House, and I take it for granted that the statement was correct, and the hon. Minister did not dispute the statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say that in the case of Bishop, who was one of the fishery officers, and who was convicted of fraud, he was dismissed after conviction. I do not know that he is a Collector of Customs.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the hon. gentleman dispute the statement? It was made on the floor of Parliament by a member of this House a year ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It could not have been made and could not have been true, because he was not convicted a year ago.

Mr. BOWERS. The hon. gentleman will find it in "Hansard."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not that he was convicted.

Mr. BOWERS. No, but that I made a charge against him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly, and he was dismissed as a fishery officer The prosecution was pending, but there was no conviction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He is Collector of Customs to-day at Sandy Cove.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have nothing to do with the Department of Customs, and this is all news to me. I had not the slightest idea that he was collector of customs. I had to deal with him as fishery officer. In some of these little petty offices, a man may hold two of them. He was dealt with as a fishery officer, prosecuted, convicted, and dismissed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As one listening to the discussion, it struck me as a very strange state of affairs that this man should still be in the employ of the Government. I tried to bring this to the notice of the House and the Ministers, in a very respectful manner, and I do not think it is quite proper for an hon. gentleman, who is a member of the Government, and who has his colleagues beside him from whom he can get information, to deny a statement which was made across the House, and which we were bound to assume was true, unless he was in possession of facts to warrant the contradiction.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not deny it because I had not the opportunity to investigate it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You apparently tried to insinuate that I was making a statement which was not correct.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said the hon. gentleman could not be correct in saying that all this had been brought to the attention of the Government last year, because, as the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) knows, the prosecution was pending then, and there was no conviction. There was a conviction during recess.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The charges were brought.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly, and action was taken.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It certainly does seem strange that a state of affairs should exist under which, after information has been given to the Minister of Justice, who has taken some pride in declaring to us that he was exceedingly anxious to put down fraud, and even severe in the administration of justice—it is certainly strange that after he had obtained information of the fraudulent conduct of this man, he still retained him in the service of the Government as collector of customs. What answer has the hon. gentleman to make? It is not by bandying words that he can give a satisfactory reply. What is the opinion of the Government? Should this man be allowed to occupy this position? Are the people to be told that a man who has been found guilty of obtaining money by fraud is to be retained in the service of the Government, his fine to be remitted, and the Government called on to pay this large amount of costs for the securing of his conviction?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not know at the time that the Controller of Customs was not present, but it goes without saying that this information will, of course, reach his ears, and that very speedily, and that immediate steps will be taken.

Mr. BOWERS. I laid the matter before the Controller of Customs in writing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was that before the conviction or after?

Mr. BOWERS. Before the conviction. I stated in my place in the House, I think, and if not, then in a letter to him, how this gentleman sent for articles to Boston and brought them into Sandy Cove in a vessel, and told the captain he need not enter them, as the Government allowed him to bring them in without entry, as they were for his own family. If the Minister of Justice remembers, when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I told him of the case in his office. He sent out for the papers and called in one of his officers. He had been away to France and knew nothing of the case until I called his attention to it. He asked his deputy why this case had not been attended to before. He said: Take these papers at once and send them to the Minister of Justice, and we will have this man's head off—or something to that effect. I called attention to the matter in the House, I think, and the Minister told me to make a charge in writing. I did so, and sent the man's letter who made the charge from Sandy Cove to him. I fully exonerate the past Minister of Marine and Fisheries for and connivance in these bounty frauds.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Thank you.

Mr. BOWERS. I think the hon. gentleman has done his duty in that respect. I believe in giving honour where honour is due. I have called his attention to two or three cases in Digby County that should have bounties that have not. Now, as to this $4,000, I would like some Minister to state to me what it is for. If the county of Digby pays the expenses of its suits and other counties do the same, what is this amount for?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is to pay counsel, no doubt, employed in these cases.

Mr. BOWERS. I think that when the department brings charges against these parties, they ought to pay the expenses, and not saddle them on the county. This is a Dominion, and not a county affair, and I do not want the county of Digby to pay $88.35 more than they should fairly be called upon to pay. I do not want to have these expenses charged to the county in some cases, and paid for by the Dominion in another.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Government ought to say whether an officer who has been prosecuted and convicted in such a case is to be employed in some other branch of the service.

Mr. FOSTER. He ought not to be retained; I have no hesitation in saying that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is sufficiently satisfactory. I think we ought not to be retained, either. We have been here for five hours.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 114) to further amend the Indian Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Daly.)

VOTERS' LISTS FOR WRIGHT.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that the voters' lists for the electoral division of Wright have evidently not yet been prepared. I have received lists for the electoral division of Labelle, one portion of the county of Ottawa, but I have not heard one word yet with regard to the lists for the other portion, the electoral division of Wright. I would like to know from the Government when I may expect to receive them?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand the corrections have not yet been received from the revising officer. Some days ago I made inquiry, and was informed that this was the cause of the delay. I have no doubt the lists will be ready in a short time.

LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McDONALD (Assiniboia) moved third reading of Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Langenburg and Southern Railway Co.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that some objection has been raised to proceeding with this Bill, and I think it was the Minister of Railways himself who suggested that it should stand over. I understand that the bondholders interested in the southern sections of the road were not aware until very recently that such legislation as this was to be sought. Have any representations been made to the Minister of Railways respecting the Bill, or has any requests been received on behalf of the bondholders for time to consider the position this Bill, if passed, will place them in? Although, no doubt, notice has been given in the "Gazette," in accordance with the requirements of the law, yet, it seems to me that if the bondholders were unaware that such legislation was to come before the House it would be well to allow this Bill to stand over.

Mr. HAGGART. The only communication I received on the subject was a telegram which reached me on Saturday, asking that the third reading of the Bill should stand over until Monday, to afford Mr. Ewart, who represented the bondholders, time to secure some individual to make a statement regarding the position of the bondholders.

Mr. LAURIER. Under such circumstances, will not the hon. gentleman afford Mr. Ewart the opportunity to make the statement contemplated? If the Bill is now read the third time, he will not have that opportunity.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not catch what he said.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he received a telegram on Saturday asking that an opportunity be afforded for Mr. Ewart to be heard on this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. All I received was a telegram—I think the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) handed me a telegram, also that I received one from Mr. Ewart—asking that the third reading be adjourned until to-day. I saw Mr. Ewart in town to-day. If he had wished to make any explanation, the Bill might be sent

to committee. I am waiting to hear if there are any reasons adduced by any one why the Bill should be reconsidered.

Mr. LAURIER. Under such circumstances, I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the third reading of the Bill, for if that is done there will be no opportunity for Mr. Ewart to make a statement.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the Senate they have a Railway Committee, also, and Mr. Ewart can be heard before that committee.

Mr. LAURIER. But he asked to be heard before this House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Heard—on what ground ?

Mr. LAURIER. On the ground, as I understand, that he has a statement to make on behalf of the bondholders, whose interests, it is claimed, are jeopardized by this Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. This Bill came up first on Friday, the 31st ult., and was talked out. On Monday, 3rd June, it passed through Committee of the Whole, and was objected to being then read the third time. On Friday, the 7th instant, it stood over upon an understanding between Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Kingsmill, who arranged, by consent between them, as the solicitors of the parties, that it should stand until to-day, in order that there might be plenty of time if it were necessary to raise any objection. Mr. Ewart arrived in town this morning, and saw Mr. Ferguson. I had sent Mr. Ferguson to Mr. Kingsmill, and they arranged that it should stand until to-day.

Mr. McMULLEN. There cannot possibly be any harm in allowing it to stand over.

Motion agreed to (on division), and Bill read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) (for Mr. Stairs) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.

Mr. HAGGART. I will ask the promoter of this Bill to allow it to stand. The Government are preparing an amendment to the Bill for the purpose of relieving the Government from the provisions of the Bill in relation to the customs duties.

Motion allowed to stand.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate Gilmour and Hughson (Limited).—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Grand Falls Water-Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. McAlister.)

ROYAL STANDARD.

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to correct a mistake that was made in my answer on 5th June to the question of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) who asked, "What persons in Canada have the right to hoist the royal standard, and on what occasions ?" That subject has been dealt with in more than one place in the General Orders, and the officer who made up the answer missed one of the General Orders referring to it. I wish therefore to supplement the answer I made, by saying that the Royal Standard may also be hoisted upon the citadel in Quebec, and the Government House, on the anniversary of the birth, accession and coronation of Her Majesty. I understand that the expression "Government House," in the order, is stated by the Imperial authorities to mean the house occupied by the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN CAPE BRETON.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The cash receipts for freight and passengers at the several stations and ticket offices in Cape Breton for freight and passenger service over Cape Breton and other Government railways, for each year since the commencement of the operation of the line to the close of last fiscal year ? The number of miles of Government railways in Cape Breton, and the cost, per mile, for the operation of Government railways during the last fiscal year ?

Mr. HAGGART. The earnings at each station of the Cape Breton Railway for freight and passenger service over the Cape Breton and other Government railways for each year is as follows :—

FROM NOVEMBER, 1890, TO JUNE 30, 1891.

Stations.	Pass'g'rs.	Freight.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Point Tupper	2,748 05	605 44	3,353 49
Hawkesbury	187 95	269 34	457 29
McIntyre's Lake....	93 65	12 88	106 53
West Bay Road.....	303 47	85 41	388 88
River Denys	199 40	130 44	329 84
Orangedale	1,640 89	495 63	2,136 52
Iona	296 03	182 68	478 71
Grand Narrows	740 44	300 81	1,041 25
Boisdale	.....	.....	.....
North Sydney Junc.	309 65	13 84	323 69
North Sydney	3,695 11	787 74	4,482 85
Leitche's Creek	202 19	77 14	279 33
Sydney	3,915 21	2,053 33	5,968 54
Total.....	14,332 24	5,014 68	19,346 92

FOR YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1892.

Stations.	Pass'g'rs.	Freight.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Pt. Tupper	3,256 40	647 49	3,903 89
McIntyre's Lake	301 33	169 76	471 59
West Bay Road	1,147 65	535 06	1,682 71
River Denys	734 28	604 74	1,339 02
Orangedale	4,861 57	1,955 96	6,817 53
Iona	618 66	393 87	1,012 53
Grand Narrows	3,119 61	489 31	3,608 92
Boisdale	216 72	49 34	266 06
North Sydney Junc.	445 57	43 46	489 03
North Sydney	13,605 59	2,558 77	16,164 36
Leitche's	413 29	176 00	589 29
Sydney	14,292 63	4,812 77	19,105 40
Total	43,013 80	12,436 53	55,450 33

FOR YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1893.

Sydney	15,450 36	6,030 72	21,481 08
Leitche's Creek	324 42	113 28	437 70
North Sydney	9,998 57	2,865 37	12,863 94
North Sydney Junc.	77 45	24 90	102 35
Boisdale	336 30	86 57	422 87
Grand Narrows	4,801 55	564 99	5,336 54
Iona	1,269 88	600 57	1,870 45
Orangedale	5,143 26	3,253 58	8,396 84
River Denys	777 85	577 19	1,355 04
West Bay Road	1,205 61	947 51	2,153 12
McIntyre Lake	940 73	180 00	1,120 73
Point Tupper	3,228 69	589 83	3,818 52

FOR YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1894.

Sydney	12,981 61	5,981 68	18,963 29
Leitche's Creek	468 03	67 37	535 40
North Sydney	9,343 70	3,786 62	13,130 32
North Sydney Junc.	55 40	45 42	100 82
Boisdale	184 10	142 61	326 71
Grand Narrows	3,870 16	299 62	4,169 78
Iona	1,003 27	387 31	1,390 58
Orangedale	4,721 71	2,829 66	7,551 37
River Denys	731 81	866 62	1,598 43
West Bay Road	1,196 74	613 95	1,810 69
McIntyre's Lake	908 30	263 20	1,171 50
Point Tupper	3,355 38	652 65	4,008 03

There are 96 miles of Government railway in Cape Breton. Working expenses per mile of Government railways for year ended 30th June, 1894, $2,610.92, equal to 70·94 cents per train mile.

BINDER TWINE IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. MARTIN asked, How much binding twine was manufactured last season at Kingston penitentiary? How much was sold? How much remained on hand after close of season? How much was realized from sale of twine? Was collection made in full for all twine sold? If not, how much is still owing and names of parties indebted and amounts? Was any twine sold on credit, and to whom? When was twine sold on credit, paid for and names of parties to whom so sold?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The amount of twine manufactured during the season, was 331,366 pounds; amount sold during the season, 241,016 pounds; amount sent as samples, 200,000 pounds; amount remaining on hand at the close of the season, 90,050 pounds; sum realized from the sale of twine, $15.515.62. Collection was not made in full for all the twine sold. Mr. R. Rogers, of Manitou, Manitoba, owes a balance of $652.75. In reference to the two last questions, I would prefer not to give that information to the House to-day, although it is available, in order that the hon. gentleman might consider, before pressing it further, whether it is in the interest of the business itself that those two questions should be answered. The names of the parties who are in debt are covered by the answer I have given, but in reference to the lines of credit, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to consider whether it would be in the interest of the business if we gave that information on every occasion where default was made, and if these particulars should be laid before the House of Commons, whether we might not be to some extent embarrassed. There might be good parties willing to deal with us if we treated them in the ordinary way, but unwilling to have their names published as buying on credit. I would prefer to leave those questions unanswered in order that the hon. gentleman may consider the suggestion I have thrown out. If, however, he wishes to renew those two last questions, we have the information of course, and it is available.

FISHING IN DETROIT AND ST. CLAIR RIVERS, AND LAKES ST. CLAIR AND ERIE.

Mr. McGREGOR asked, What are the present regulations as to close seasons in Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and Lakes St. Clair and Erie? Is seine net fishing permitted in any and all of the above waters? If so, what is the regulation size of mesh? Was seine net fishing prohibited in any or all of the above waters during the season of 1894? Has the order prohibiting seine fishing been rescinded? If so, what is the date? Has there been any change as regards the fishing with pound-nets? If so, what?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The present regulations as to close seasons in Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and Lakes St. Clair and Erie are as follows: Bass, 15th April to 15th June; maskinongé, 15th April to 15th June; pickerel (doré), 15th April to 15th May; salmon trout, 1st to 30th November; whitefish, 1st to 30th November. (2.) Seine-net fishing is permitted in the above waters. (3.) There

is no regulation of size of mesh employed. (4.) Seine-net fishing was prohibited in all the above waters in 1894. (5.) The order prohibiting seine-net fishing so far as relates to Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and Lake St. Clair has been suspended for the present. (6.) The date of suspension was 22nd May, 1895. There has been no change with regard to pound-nets.

POST OFFICE AT ST. THOMAS, ONT.

Mr. FLINT (for Mr. Casey) asked, What additions have been made to the salaries of the postmaster and of each of the employees in the post office at St. Thomas, Ont., within a year, and when ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No changes have been made in the salaries of the postmaster and employees in the post office at St. Thomas, Ont., during the past year.

BONDED WAREHOUSE IN CARLETON, N. B.

Mr. COLTER asked. Is it the intention of the Government to close the bonded warehouses on the international boundary between Carleton and the state of Maine ? If so, when, and for what reasons ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The question of abolishing the bonded warehouse in the county of Carleton on the international boundary between Carleton and the state of Maine, is now under the consideration of the Government.

HAY EXPORTATIONS.

Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains) asked, What was the quantity of hay exported from Canada to the United States and to England, respectively, in each of the years 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894 ?

Mr. WALLACE. The quantity of hay exported to Great Britain and the United States, respectively, during the years in question, was as follows :—

Years.	Great Britain.		United States.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Tons.	$	Tons.	$
1891	11,852	150,291	50,070	375,813
1892	14,969	167,604	67,067	598,567
1893	50,892	515,461	94,282	854,958
1894	175,559	1,700,409	87,847	753,575

DRILL SHED, HALIFAX.

Mr. FRASER asked, How many tenders have been received for the construction of the drill shed at Halifax ? What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender, and which tender has been accepted ?

Mr. OUIMET. Two sets of plans and specifications, one for a stone and brick building and the other for a stone building, were prepared, and tenders were advertised for both. Six tenders were received for both the stone and brick and stone buildings, as follows :—

Tenderer.	Stone and brick building.	Stone building.
	$	$
M. E. Keefe.....	187,000	196,000
J. E. Askwith.....	190,000	195,000
Rhodes Curry Co.....	213,000	225,000
James McInnes & Co.....	229,994	249,994
T. Brookfield.....	235,390	252,570
F. Tomkin.....	252,757	267,775

The lowest tender for a stone building, that of J. E. Askwith, has been accepted.

HAY SHED AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. Langelier) (Translation) asked, 1. Is the Government aware that a large hay shed has been built on the Harbour Commissioners' wharf at Three Rivers by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company ? 2. Has the said shed been built with the knowledge and consent of the Government ? 3. Has any arrangement been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an annual rental of the ground thus occupied by the said hay shed, and, if so, what is that rental ? 4. Has any arrangement been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the removal of the said shed when the ground occupied by the same shall be required for the piling of lumber awaiting shipment ?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to inform the House that the wharf referred to is under the exclusive control of the Harbour Commission of Three Rivers, and that the Government has no knowledge whatever of the facts mentioned in the question.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Who has the contract for placing and keeping up the buoys at Cascumpec Harbour ? What is the amount of the contract ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. John Brennan is contractor. The amount of the contract is $194 per annum.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the wharfinger at Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I., made a return of the amount collected for wharfage fees for the year 1894 ? If so, what is the amount paid in ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes ; $49.81. The total collection was $66.42.

POST OFFICE SERVICE, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has a postmaster been appointed at St. Louis, P.E.I., in the place of Avit Perry, deceased? If so, who is he? If no appointment has been made, who is the acting postmaster? Has he given security? If so, who are the securities?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no post office called St. Louis in Prince Edward Island.

MAIL SERVICE TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) (for Mr. Stairs) asked, Whether arrangements could not be made by the Post Office Department by which a mail for the maritime provinces could be forwarded by the Canadian Pacific Railway train leaving Ottawa at 6.30 p.m. every week-day, and by the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial trains leaving Montreal every morning at 8 o'clock?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. At present all correspondence, registered and unregistered, for the maritime provinces is despatched from Ottawa post office at 4.10 p.m. A supplementary mail is made up for despatch by the Grand Trunk Railway, which leaves the Ottawa station at 6.10 p.m. and reaches Montreal at 7.35 a.m. This latter mail, which is forwarded from Montreal by the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railway at 8 a.m., contains unregistered matter for all places in the maritime provinces east of Moncton. As there would only be a gain of about twenty minutes in the time of arrival at Moncton, if the mails were forwarded from Ottawa at 6.30 p.m., as suggested, it is not thought that the gain in time is sufficient to offset the expense, more especially as the postmaster at Ottawa reports that the quantity of mail despatched by the supplementary mail is very small, and it may therefore be inferred that what is posted between 5.40 p.m. and 6 p.m., when the mail for the train leaving at 6.30 p.m. is closed, would be very trifling.

DAM AND LOCK ON YAMASKA RIVER.

Mr. MIGNAULT (Translation) asked, 1. When were the dam and lock on the River Yamaska commenced? 2. When were they finished? 3. What is the total cost of the lock and dam? 4. How much has the Government paid for the total cost of dredging the River Yamaska?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The construction of the lock on the Yamaska River was commenced in 1881 and completed in 1890. The total cost of the lock and dam, including the indemnity paid to the neighbouring land-owners, was $127,360.39. The total cost of dredging the river was $5,082.01.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

PILOTAGE—ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. BOWERS asked, 1. Has the report of the Commission appointed to make inquiries regarding pilotage matters in St. John, N.B., been made to the Government? 2. If not, when is such report expected? 3. If so, is it the intention of the Government to publish such report?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The report of the Commission has not yet been received. 2. It is expected in the course of a few days. 3. It is not the intention of the Government to publish the report.

AUSTRALIAN IMPORTS.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What agricultural products, and in what quantities and values, have been imported into Canada from Australasia since the 30th June, 1894?

Mr. WALLACE. Statement of agricultural products imported into Canada from Australasia, from the 30th June, 1894, to the 31st March, 1895, as follows:—

—		Imported for consumption.	
		Quantity.	Value.
FREE.			$
Fowls		.....	10
Bananas and pine-apples		.....	1,346
Hides and skins		.....	1,458
Wool	Lbs.	249,183	32,460
DUTIABLE.			
Eggs	Doz.	24	4
Oranges, lemons and limes		.....	2,874
Butter	Lbs.	36,907	5,925
Lard	do	2,146	187
Beef, salted	do	3,712	161
Canned meats	do	84,350	7,413
Mutton and lamb	do	16,052	576
Poultry		.....	96
Sausage casings		.....	366
Tallow		.....	43
Honey	Lbs.	1,492	93
Total		.....	$53,012

PORT ROWAN WHARF.

Mr. ALLAN asked, 1. How much was voted by Parliament for the construction of a wharf at Port Rowan? 2. When was such wharf completed? 3. What has been the total cost of it, and what is the greatest depth of water at the said wharf? 4. What tonnage has reported inwards and outwards at Port Rowan during the year 1894?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. $18,600. 2. May, 1895. 3. Total cost of wharf to date, $11,819.81. Greatest depth of water, 8 feet.

GENERAL BOOTH'S COLONY.

Mr. MARTIN asked, Whether there is any understanding between the Government and General Booth as to giving or selling him land for the purposes of his proposed colony, and whether they are in favour of encouraging the kind of immigrants which General Booth purposes to send to Canada ?

Mr. DALY. There is no understanding between the Government and General Booth as to giving him or selling him land for the purposes of his proposed colony, and the Government has no information as to the kind of immigrants General Booth proposes to send to Canada, and are therefore not in a position to say whether they are in favour of encouraging such immigration or not.

LAKE SHIPPING REGULATIONS.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact that the Congress of the United States has recently passed certain rules regulating the meeting and passing of vessels on the lakes different from those in force in Canada ? Is it the intention of the Government to pass rules uniform with those above referred to ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The attention of the Government has been called to the United States Act to regulate navigation on the great lakes and their connecting and tributary waters. 2. It is not the intention of the Government at present to pass rules uniform with those established by the United States Act, as it is not considered expedient to have one set of rules for ocean traffic and another for the commerce of the great lakes.

TROOPS IN QUEBEC.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Is it true that the Royal Canadian Regiment of Artillery and "B" Battery, stationed at Quebec, are to be reduced in strength by two hundred men? If so, when, and why will this reduction take place ? Is it true that the Minister of Militia threatened to withdraw all the troops from Quebec, if the city corporation declined to reduce the price of the water supplied to the citadel and other military property in Quebec ?

Mr. DICKEY. In answer to the first question, no. On the 31st ult. the strength of the Royal Canadian Artillery at Quebec, ("B" Battery and Companies Nos. 1 and 2) was 297 officers, non-commissioned officers and men. On the 30th June instant it is proposed to reduce this number to 214 officers, non-commissioneed officers and men, and no further. This reduction is made in the interests of economy. The city corporation of Quebec required the Militia Department to pay for water rates in the coming year an amount very largely in excess of the sum paid in previous years. This amount, in the opinion of the Minister of Militia, was more than was fairly exigible for the services performed and more than in the public interest should have been paid. The Minister notified the mayor of Quebec that if the additional demand was adhered to the department would make other provision for the force, and intimated that possibly this provision might include the removal from Quebec of the force or a part of it.

STRENGTH OF PERMANENT CORPS.

Mr. GIBSON asked, What is the total strength (officers, non-commissioned officers and men) of each of the following corps :— "A" Battery, Kingston ; "B" Battery, Quebec ; No. 2 Company, Quebec ; "C" Battery, Victoria ; "A" Dragoons, Quebec ; "B" Dragoons, Winnipeg ; No. 1 Infantry, London ; No. 2 Infantry, Toronto ; No. 3 Infantry, St. Johns ; No. 4 Infantry, Fredericton ?

Mr. DICKEY. The following is the total strength (officers, non-commissioned officers and men) of the permanent corps on the 31st May, 1895 :—

Kingston, "A" Field Battery	130
Quebec, "B" Field Battery	61
do No. 1 Company and No. 2 Company	236
Royal Canadian Dragoons—	
Toronto, "A" Squadron	58
Winnipeg, "B" Squadron	91
Royal Regiment of Canadian Infantry—	
London, No. 1 Company	116
Toronto, No. 2 Company	110
St. Johns, P.Q., No. 3 Company	96
Fredericton, No. 4 Company	105
Total	1,003

HILTON WHARF, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Lister) asked, 1. What amount has been expended by the Government on the wharf at Hilton, St. Joseph's Island ? 2. Was there a wharf in the place when the Government built the wharf at Hilton ? 3. Who claimed to own such wharf ? 4. Was any agreement entered into with the Government whereby the pretended owners assigned their interest in the land upon which the wharf stands ? 5. If not, why not ? 6. Were wharfage fees to be collected and returned to the Government ? 7. Have fees been collected ? 8. Has any return been made to the Government of fees collected ? 9. Has any demand been made for such fees ? 10. Is the Government aware that the pretended owners deny that the Government have any claim to the wharf ? 11. Is the Government aware that the pretended owners have mortgaged the wharf ?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. $10,460.30. 2. Yes. 3. Messrs. Bowker & Co. 4. No. 5. No, the

reason being that the construction was not to improve the wharf already existing, but to provide an extension to the same which would give a place of refuge to vessels going up the Sault Ste. Marie before attempting the navigation in the River Ste. Marie, which was dangerous at night. The owner who was not in a position to and did not require to make the extension for his own business, having agreed to maintain light, and keep a man to take the lines of vessels, allowing them to lie at the wharf free of charge. As to the rest of the questions, the answer is, no.

PLUMMER'S WHARF, SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. LISTER asked, 1. Is the title of the Government wharf known as "Plummer's Wharf" at Sault Ste. Marie in the Government? 2. What is the total amount expended by the Government in the construction and repair of such wharf to this date? 3. Who has charge of the wharf? 4. What fees have been collected, and what is the date of the last return? 5. Was a commissioner, Mr. Gourdeau, appointed to make inquiries regarding the wharf? 6. Did his report charge that Mr. Plummer or any one else owed for fees or otherwise a sum of money in connection with such wharf? 7. If so, what was the amount, and has it been paid? 8. Does the Government intend to keep the wharf, or has the same been given back, or any negotiations taken place with regard to giving the same back to Mr. Plummer? 9. If so, what are the particulars of such agreement or arrangement?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. Yes. 2. $15,080.61. 3. Alfred Carney. 4. $3,147.04; January, 1895. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. 7. The report showed that side wharfage for about $300 had not been collected, as well as the tariff on his own shipments, amounting to $44.36. These amounts were not paid in, as Mr. Plummer has a counter claim, not having received salary, pending settlement of his case. 8. Yes, but the question of future management of the wharf is under consideration. 9. The same answer.

LUMBER FOR WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LOWELL moved for:

Return giving copies of all lumber and timber supplied, under contract or otherwise, upon the Welland Canal from 1st January, 1885, to 1st January, 1895; the names of the contractors, the quantities supplied and the prices paid either under contract with the Government or by purchase.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to this return, but the hon. gentleman must know that it will be a very long and expensive return. If there is any particular information he wants, perhaps he had better move for it separately.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. OUIMET.

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS—CASE OF WILLIAM FLEMING.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence with regard to the homestead entry of William Fleming for the north-east quarter of section 16 in township 9, range 14, west of the first principal meridian, and also of all correspondence with Nathaniel Boyd, M.P., as to said quarter-section, and of Mr. Boyd's lease of said land, and also of the regulations as to leasing land and as to homesteading leased lands.

He said: I desire to say a few words in regard to this motion, in order to throw a little light upon the administration of the Department of the Interior. It appears that Mr. Fleming has obtained from the department a homestead entry for the north-east quarter of section 16, township 9, range 14, west of the first principal meridian. Now, Fleming was a person desirous of becoming a settler, and, learning that there were homestead lands open for settlement in this particular neighbourhood, went to the Dominion lands office, and obtained from the agent a list of the lands in the neighbourhood which were open for settlement. Among other lands, this particular quarter-section was mentioned in the neighbourhood given to him by the land agent. The agent made a memorandum upon the paper which he handed Mr. Fleming, stating that a number of these sections were under lease, but that would not interfere with homesteading, that the leases were subject to the right of homestead. Mr. Fleming went and examined some of the lands, and put in an application for this particular quarter-section. It now appears that he made a mistake in locating this land. In the affidavit on the printed form supplied to applicants by the officers of the Dominion lands office, he swore that there were no improvements upon this particular quarter-section. It turns out that there were improvements upon it. The department, having been apprised by the gentleman who held the lease for this and other lands in the neighbourhood—that gentleman being the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd)—that this land had been taken up by this particular homesteader, opened a correspondence with him with a view to getting him to cancel his homestead entry. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw particularly the attention of the House to the manner in which the department attempted to get that done. So far, the homesteader had proceeded quite regularly. He had gone to the lands office; he had obtained from the agent a list of lands open to homestead and had been notified that, while some of these were under lease, that was no bar to his obtaining and having a homestead entry for them. But with respect to the improvements he made a mistake. At this time, the department was not aware that it was a mistake, but they were aware that

he had put in affidavits that there were no improvements on this particular quarter-section. Now, under these circumstances, the department wrote a letter to Mr. Fleming, in which they charged him with having been guilty of perjury, and informed him that unless he withdrew his claim under homestead entry to this particular quarter-section, he would be prosecuted for making a false affidavit. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that this is most reprehensible conduct on the part of a department of Government. If this man had been guilty of swearing to a false affidavit, if he had been guilty of perjury, and the department had learned that fact in the course of the administration of the department's affairs, it was their duty to prosecute him for perjury. They had no right to attempt to rectify a mistake of their agent or of the department by writing a blackmailing letter—and I have no hesitation at all, Mr. Speaker, in describing this communication as a most bare-faced blackmailing letter, holding over the head of this man the threat of prosecution for perjury unless he would consent to a proposition made to him. It is the same as though a private individual, learning of the criminal conduct of another individual, should write a letter, saying: Unless you give me $100 I will prosecute you for this crime. The department were not in need of $100, but they were in need of having the mistake which their agent, or themselves, had made of allowing this quarter-section to be homesteaded, corrected, and they took the course, which would be so reprehensible in an individual, of writing this blackmailing letter to William Fleming, telling him that he would be prosecuted for perjury unless he gave them an equivalent to prevent them bringing this criminal action. I have just a word or two more to say with regard to the rather peculiar circumstances under which this quarter-section appears to have had improvements upon it. It was, as I have said, included in a lease obtained for grazing purposes, by the hon. member for Marquette. Of course, the House is well aware that a grazing lease gives the holder of it no right whatever to make improvements upon the land in the way of breaking up the soil or anything of that kind. It appears, however, that, in violation of the lease, the hon. member for Marquette had broken up this land and had raised large quantities of wheat upon it. So it was a fact that, at the time it was homesteaded, there were improvements of that kind—that is, the land had been broken up and crops of wheat grown upon it. As a matter of fact, I claim, as between the department and Wm. Fleming, that even if the department had, in the affidavit of Fleming, notification of this fact, that should constitute no reason why he should not obtain a homestead entry for that land. If a man has a lease of Government lands for the purpose of pasturing stock, and in violation of that lease, breaks up the land and grows wheat upon it, that surely gives him no right as against a homesteader, who had obeyed the provisions of his lease and not broken up the land and grown wheat upon it. So I claim that the only wrong in connection with the matter was the mistake made by Mr. William Fleming in locating the land and making his application. If all the facts had been before the department, they would have had no right to take any steps to cancel the homestead entry, because the land had been improved in violation of the contract between the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd) and the department. It appears now from correspondence with the department, that the hon. member for Marquette had applied some time previously for the purchase of this particular land, and they had intended to grant him the right to the land under the regulations for leasing land. That clause is a provision by which it is intended to give to ranchers in the west the right to purchase a quarter-section of land on which to place their buildings, a provision which could not possibly be intended to apply to a case of this kind, where the gentleman who holds the lease has land of his own upon which he has his buildings, therefore he had no need, for the purpose of carrying out his lease, and of making available the land which he has under his lease, of buying from the Government and taking out of the hands of homestead settlers, a quarter-section for that purpose. I say, therefore, that even if he had made the application, and there appears to be no written record of any such application, and even if the application had been agreed to by the Government, that would have been done in violation of law. I may say, Sir, that we have had to complain in Manitoba all along of the manner in which the Department of the Interior has administered its affairs. I have brought that complaint to the attention of the House on one or two occasions, and the answer of the Minister of the Interior to all my suggestions has been that the administration of the department speaks for itself. Well, this is one instance in which it does speak very loudly for itself, an instance in which we find a large department of the Government using its power and its right to institute prosecutions against individuals who, to its knowledge, have been guilty of crime, as a threat and as a means of blackmail, in order to get set right what it considered at the time to be a mistake of its own. It is the view of the department, I understand, that the land should be given to the hon. member for Marquette, and that he should be allowed to purchase it, as he had requested to do. But this settler has told the depart-

ment that he is quite willing for them to prosecute him for perjury, that he is prepared to stand his trial for perjury, but that he declines to submit to be blackmailed by the Government, and that he does not propose to give up his right, which he claims he is legally entitled to, and which he claims the Government have no right to cancel, and which he defies them to cancel. He claims that if there is a charge against him for perjury, if he has made a false affidavit, it is the duty of the Government, not to threaten him with criminal action, but to take a criminal action against him, and allow him to substantiate his good name in court. That, however, they decline to do, although months ago they were challenged by this poor and persecuted individual to take the only honourable course they could take under the circumstances. They have declined to do that, but they have left the imputation upon him, and they have endeavoured, as I say, to use their power as a Government to threaten this poor settler into doing something which would be very much against his interests, and which he does not propose to do.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman was not content to move for the return of the papers, to which there is no objection, but he takes occasion to make one of his characteristic attacks upon the Department of the Interior. He tries to make out that this man Fleming is an unfortunate settler whom the department have attempted to bulldoze and to blackmail by writing him the letter to which he refers. Now, Sir, what are the facts? It appears that a lease was made of the township referred to, township 9, range 14, west of the 1st principal meridian, Manitoba, for grazing purposes, to Messrs, Boyd & Crowe, in July, 1885; that those gentlemen have occupied that lease under the regulations ever since; that subsequently, some years after the lease was granted, Mr. Crowe, the partner of the hon. member for Marquette, assigned that lease to Mr. Boyd, who has been the holder of it for some years, and included in that leasehold is the land in question mentioned in the motion. From the statement made by the hon. gentleman it would appear that this man Fleming went to the land office at Brandon, and made application there for the lands that were open for entry. I presume he was given a township map, as men in the usual course of business are given, and upon that map, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, the officer marked the quarter-sections that were open for settlement. At the same time, the hon. gentleman says, the agent notified this Mr. Fleming that these lands were covered by a grazing lease, and that consequently Mr. Fleming had due notice of this grazing lease to Boyd & Crowe. It appeared that when the notice of the department here was called to the fact that the agent had given the entry to this man Fleming and another for lands included in this lease, these men were notified that the entries would not be granted, that the lands had been applied for by Mr. Boyd for his home farm or corral, under the regulations, and that consequently the entries would have to be cancelled. Upon this, one of these men, without further ado, gave up the land, the money was returned to him, and nothing more was heard of it. But Mr. Fleming said he would not give up the land and wrote to the hon. gentleman, and I presume if he had not been a supporter of the hon. gentleman and had not written to the hon. gentleman, we would not have heard about this matter.

Mr. MARTIN. He did not write to me. I do not know whether he is a supporter of mine or not.

Mr. DALY. Some friend of the hon. gentleman must have written to him, I presume. The facts as to Mr. Fleming's claim to the land are as follows:—On 23rd November, he appeared before the Dominion lands agent, at Brandon, and made the usual application for homestead entry, which runs as follows:—

I, William Fleming, of Carberry, Manitoba, do hereby apply for a homestead entry under the provisions of clause 38 of the Dominion Lands Act, for the north-east quarter of section No. 16, of the 9th township, in the 14th range, west of the first meridian.

WILLIAM FLEMING.

Souris district, 23rd November, 1894.

Number of family, including entrant, four; nationality, Canadian (Ont.); where from, Manitoba; previous occupation, farmer.

As provided by the Dominion Lands Act, at the time of the application being made the application is to be supported by affidavit. On that occasion, Mr. Fleming made the following affidavit:—

I, William Fleming, do solmenly swear that I am over eighteen years of age; that to the best of my knowledge and belief the land in respect of which my application is made, is of the class opened for homestead and pre-emption entry; that there is no person residing on the said land, nor are there any improvements thereon, and that this application is made for my exclusive use and benefit, with the intention of residing upon and cultivating the said land, and not directly or indirectly for the use or benefit of any other person or persons whomsoever; and that I have not heretofore obtained an entry for a homestead on Dominion lands.

WILLIAM FLEMING.

Subscribed and sworn to, this 23rd day of November, 1894, before me.

W. SHAW COTTINGHAM,
Clerk of Dominion Lands.
(Agent not present.)

According to that affidavit, Mr. Fleming swore that there were no improvements on that particular quarter-section. It was as-

certained subsequently that this quarter-section had been cultivated during five or six years, and that there was some fifty acres of breaking on it; and, consequently, Mr. Fleming made a false oath when he said there were no improvements on the quarter-section. When the attention of the department was called to the fact, he was notified that he had made a false entry in view of the fact that there were improvements on the quarter-section, and, in consequence, his entry for that land would be cancelled, and it also stated that the department might take proceedings against him for perjury. The hon. gentleman makes out that letter, which the officers of the department had a perfect right to send Mr. Fleming, to be a blackmailing letter, and that it was written to Mr. Fleming because the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd) happened to have a lease of the land. If the hon. member for Marquette had not had a lease of the land, and it had not been brought to the attention of the hon. member for Winnipeg, that hon. member would not have made such suggestions as he has made to-day, and, in fact, the hon. gentleman, in his letters, made all sorts of threats to the department.

Mr. MARTIN. What threats?

Mr. DALY. You made several threats. The correspondence will be laid before the House, and no doubt hon. members will be highly edified by it.

Mr. MARTIN. Name one threat.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member for Winnipeg stated in a communication to the department, that the officers had no right to communicate in this way with Mr. Fleming. He said in a letter of 5th April, addressed to the secretary of the department, as follows:—

> Yours of 30th ultimo at hand. I fail to find in your letter any reference to any laws which enable you to cancel a homestead entry on account of false affidavits having been made. I consider the extract from lease regulations wholly inapplicable to the case in question. At any rate, I must object to your selling to Mr. Boyd Mr. Fleming's homestead under that or any other regulation. What right has Mr. Boyd to crop land of which he has only a grazing lease? Your proposed inquiry is not necessary, as Mr. Fleming's statement as to improvements was made under a mistake.

The hon. gentleman in a letter dated 13th March, sent to the department, said:

> If Fleming ought to be prosecuted, it is your duty to do so; you have no right to use a weapon of that kind for the purpose of inducing him to give up a right which he has bona fide acquired. I may say that Mr. Fleming is quite prepared to meet your prosecution, and demands that you either proceed or apologize most fully and completely to him for your outrageous conduct in making the threat contained in your letter. Mr. Fleming has made no false affidavit.

Yet the hon. gentleman in the letter I read previously said that Mr. Fleming made a mistake. That is a matter of degree. If a man deliberately goes into a land office and swears that there are no improvements or cultivation on certain land, and it subsequently appears that fifty acres of it are under cultivation, and the hon. member for Winnipeg considers that under this state of facts the man did not make a false affidavit, but made a mistake, I do not think any other hon. member will agree with this construction.

Mr. MARTIN. I think every lawyer will.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman's letter continues:

> I may say that I have never known so flagrant an attempt upon the part of a governmental department to bulldoze a settler for the benefit of a political supporter of the head of the department as is contained in your letter of the 9th instant.

If there has been any bulldozing in the matter it has come from the hon. gentleman himself, because, what interest could the Government have in taking proceedings against this man, particularly if he is a poor man, in view of the fact that neither the Government nor its agent are specially interested in Mr. Fleming's action? Mr. Fleming, no doubt, went to this section, examined the land, or had the opportunity of doing so, whether he did so or not, and it is presumed that he did, because he returned to the land office and made affidavit that there was no cultivation on any part of the land; and then, because the department called the attention of Mr. Fleming to this fact, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) takes up the cudgels on the part of Mr. Fleming and says the Government is bulldozing and blackmailing. I fail to see where the blackmailing comes in, and I think the officers of the department would have been derelict in their duty if they had not informed Mr. Fleming that he had made a false affidavit, and was open to proceedings being taken against him. In regard to the other features of the hon. gentleman's speech, I may say in regard to his assertion that these improvements were made in violation of the lease, the lessee had a perfect right to make the cultivation. Further, under the regulation relating to grazing leases, by clause 15, they had a right to acquire this particular quarter-section, or any other section for which they applied. The fact is that Mr. Boyd had, prior to the application made by Mr. Fleming, made application to the department to purchase this particular quarter-section. Section 16 of the regulations provides that a lessee can acquire any particular section for constructing corrals, and erecting house. The hon. gentleman said that the regulation had reference to grazing leases in the west. I want him to understand that

there is only one form of grazing leases, either in Manitoba, or that part of the western country known as the ranching country; and, consequently, when Messrs. Boyd and Crowe assigned the lease to the hon. member for Marquette, the lease was the same as those used in Alberta and other portions of the western country where grazing leases are granted, and the regulations apply equally as regards leases in Manitoba or in the North-west Territories. So Mr. Boyd was clearly within his rights as assignee of the lease in making application for the purchase of this particular quarter-section and others, in view of the fact that the department has always dealt with leases in accordance with these regulations and the Government would not have been doing justice to him if they had not given him the right to purchase this particular quarter-section. For the information of the House, and this hon. gentleman, I may add that since that time the hon. member for Marquette, the lessee of this whole township of land, has had on the land during the continuance of the lease, 1,400 sheep, 120 or 130 head of horses, and from 50 to 100 head of hogs, and he has fully complied with the terms and regulations of the lease made to him. This Mr. Fleming cannot complain of having received unjust treatment at the hands of the department in any way whatever. He went to that township with his eyes open, and with a knowledge of the facts that the agent had told him that this land was under leasehold. He knew, or should have known, that he could only make an entry for land that was subject to homestead entry, and more than that, he went to the land office and subscribed to an affidavit that was read to him and which clearly indicated that there were no improvements upon the land. The same thing might have obtained if Mr. Fleming had made an entry anywhere else. Suppose he had made entry in a township that was not covered by the lease of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd); so far as Mr. Fleming's position is concerned, the department would have taken the same attitude towards him as they do at this moment. I want the hon. member (Mr. Martin) to understand, that the fact of the department having written as it did to Mr. Fleming has no relation whatever to the fact that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd) is the lessee of this particular township, because, as I said previously, the officers would be derelict in their duty had they not called Mr. Fleming's attention to the fact that he had made this false affidavit. I repudiate the idea that the letter written to Mr. Fleming was on account of the member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd) having anything to do with this lease, or being entitled to any rights under it. On the contrary, it was written to Mr. Fleming in due course, and if Mr. Fleming had acted the same as the other man, who had made an entry within this lease, and immediately upon notification by the department that he had no right to make that entry, had withdrawn and accepted his $10 fee, he would not be in the position he is in to-day. I can say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) that so far as relates to the department carrying out its threat about prosecuting Mr. Fleming, the department has no desire to put this Mr. Fleming or anybody else to the trouble of a prosecution. The hon. gentleman knows that if we undertook to prosecute, the expense of the trial would have to be borne by the department.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not say so.

Mr. DALY. This is one of the quasi-criminal cases in reference to which the Act provides that when the complaint is laid before the Grand Jury by the Attorney General and a true bill found, the subsequent prosecution must be at the expense of the private prosecutor

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think I said that.

Mr. DALY. But I am saying it. The Government would have no reason for following up this Mr. Fleming. If he had done what the other man did, and simply applied to the department for a refund of his $10, his entry would be cancelled and he would be dealt with then the same as the other man. If Mr. Fleming has suffered in this matter, he has suffered in consequence of his own actions. The department are not responsible in any way whatever. If Mr. Fleming, upon being notified of the fact that he got an entry for lands which he was not entitled to, and upon being further notified that he had made a false affidavit, had been properly advised he would have allowed the matter to drop, and had he done so, the department also would have allowed the matter to drop.

Mr. MARTIN. I have a word or two to say with regard to the remarks of the Minister of the Interior. It is not true, as every lawyer knows, that because an affidavit is incorrect you can found a charge of perjury upon it. A man may make an affidavit which is not true, but for which there can be no charge of perjury brought. Does it not occur in the courts every day that witnesses swear to something which is entirely inaccurate and untrue, but that they do not intend to be guilty of a false oath. It is the intention that counts, and that is what the Minister would find out when he came to prosecute this man. This man has not been guilty of perjury, and the hon. Minister, knowing the facts, has no right to say that he made a false affidavit. If the hon. gentleman thinks he has made a false affidavit, it is his duty to prosecute him, but Mr. Fleming has not made a false affidavit in the sense of being guilty of perjury, and no prosecution would lie against him. Mr.

Fleming was informed by the department that it was leased land, and that he could homestead it. That is to say, that it being leased was no bar whatever to his right to homestead. I have here the original paper which the land agent handed to him giving the numbers of the sections with a cross opposite each section which is open for homestead, and then there is a cross at the bottom of the paper with this memorandum :

Open for entry, grazing leases cannot interfere with homestead entry. Leases are granted subject to it.

That is a plain intimation to Mr. Fleming that these lands are all covered by grazing leases, but that a grazing lease is subject to a homestead entry. If Mr. Boyd had acquired some right prior to this time entitling him to buy these lands, why was it that the Department of the Interior, through its agent, gave to Mr. Fleming this piece of paper upon which this particular land is marked as being covered by a grazing lease, and being still open to homestead entry ? The real fact is, that the department made an error ; and you might as well charge them with fraud and misrepresentation as to charge Mr. Fleming. They made it innocently, no doubt, and I do not charge the agent with any fraud or intention to deceive Mr. Fleming. If he made a mistake, it was just as much a criminal act as the act of which Mr. Fleming was guilty. Mr. Fleming made a mistake as to the location, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, that is a very easy thing to do in Manitoba. The mounds and posts have disappeared in many cases, and I have time and again gone to examine land myself, and examined the wrong land.

Mr. DALY. That is all the more reason why Mr. Fleming should have been careful in making his entry.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, and so should the Department of the Interior be careful. If Mr. Boyd had a right entitling him to purchase this land at a certain figure, what possible excuse can there be for the conduct of the department ? It was not a question of mounds or posts in the department, because they have the entire record there, and could easily have prevented any mistakes. There is a clear case of negligence on the part of the department there. The department having got themselves into a scrape, undertook to get out of it, and how ? By blackmailing this man, and by bringing a charge of perjury against him, which they knew they could not substantiate, and which the Minister has failed to substantiate, although challenged by Mr. Fleming to do so. They have made a charge against this man which is utterly and entirely groundless. If it is not groundless, it is true, and if it is true, the department should prosecute him. But the department have not done so. They have no right to be lenient in a case of that kind, because it is of great importance that perjury arising in these matters should be promptly detected and punished. The moment a false affidavit is made to the department, it is most important that the department should at once prosecute and punish the man who makes it. But the hon. Minister is well aware, from what I have said, that no prosecution could succeed in this instance. Mr. Fleming denies that he is guilty of perjury and is prepared to defend himself against that charge in a court of law. That being the case, I state here, as I stated in my letters, that the department should either proceed with this threatened prosecution, or they should withdraw the charge and apologize to Mr. Fleming. Either the one thing or the other should be done.

Mr. DALY. The department has not made a charge against this man, nor have I done so in my speech. It will be time enough for the hon. gentleman to say that when the charge is made.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know what you can prosecute a man for making a false affidavit for if not for perjury. Here is what the letter of the department says :

In order that you may be under no misapprehension as to the letter of the agent sent you in this matter, I may inform you that the departmen are seriously considering whether it would not be in the public interest to prosecute you for making the affidavit that there were no improvements on the said lands at the time of making entry, which affidavit was not true.

What does that mean if it does not mean perjury ? And did not the hon. gentleman in his speech to-day charge this man with making a false affidavit ? Every man is liable in mistake to make an affidavit which is incorrect and untrue. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has done it ; I know I have.

Mr. DALY. No, I never did.

Mr. MARTIN. Then, he has escaped. I have known most honourable men to have done it repeatedly—to have made statements before a court which were not known to them to be incorrect at the time, but which were afterwards found to be incorrect. There is that great distinction, which the hon. gentleman does not seem to see, between an incorrect and untrue statement which is made inadvertently and with no intention to deceive, and a false statement made with the intention of deceiving, which is perjury. If a man makes a false statement with no intention of deceiving, thinking he is telling the truth, as this man did, there is no perjury. The hon. gentleman says that I made threats against the department. I made no threats whatever. I simply made that statement to them, that it was the most outrageous case I had ever known—a case in which the department undertook to threaten a criminal prosecution against

a man for the purpose of inducing him to give up a legal right. The hon. gentleman speaks of this man as unfortunate. He is not unfortunate in any respect, except in having levelled against him a charge of perjury by the department, which they cannot substantiate and have not the manliness to apologize for. He owns the homestead; he has a right to it; it was open for homestead entry according to the document I hold in my hand; he obtained homestead entry for it, and if there is any matter between the hon. member for Marquette and the department, Mr. William Fleming has nothing to do with that. I question very much, however, if under the provisions of the lease, which the hon. gentleman did not read to us, Mr. Boyd had any right whatever to use this land for growing wheat. I should be very much surprised if it was the intention of the department, or the intention of Parliament in granting them power to lease public lands for grazing purposes, to allow them to be used for growing wheat for sale on the market. There may be, and it would be reasonable that there should be in the lease a clause allowing the rancher owning cattle or horses or sheep to grow a limited quantity of oats or barley for the use of his stock; but that is a different thing from growing wheat and selling it on the market, which in this case has been done for years; and that is the reason this question of improvements arose. But that is a question between the hon. member for Marquette and the department. The question between the department and Mr. Fleming is the one I have put, that they tried to blackmail Mr. Fleming into giving up his legitimate right on this homestead entry, in order that the department might get out of a mistake they made; and the department not being prepared to go on and prosecute Mr. Fleming, have not the manliness or decency to withdraw the charge and state that it was made under a misapprehension of the facts.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Winnipeg in bringing this matter before the House, not only makes an attack on the Department of the Interior, but, in his attempt to rectify any wrong done to the gentleman referred to by him, has endeavoured to connect me with it, in stating that I have done things that I should not have done, I shall ask a few moments of the time of the House to explain the position I occupy in regard to this matter. About ten years ago I discovered this tract of land, which extends for about 30 miles between the town of Carberry and the Assiniboine River, and which is composed entirely of sand-hills. It is totally unfit for settlement; no settler would settle upon it. All the good land in the neighbourhood was taken up previous to the time I applied for the lease of that land. For three miles south of the town of Carberry the land is good, and has been occupied by settlers for years before I applied for my lease; but from there to the Assiniboine River, for eighteen or twenty miles the land is totally unfit for settlement, and no settlers up to the present time have applied for homesteads there. I applied for a lease of the lands for grazing purposes, and I explained to the department at the time that there was not sufficient hay on the land to winter the stock which I proposed to keep. I explained to the department that there were small tracts which might probably be classed as second-class lands and which could be made to produce sufficient crops every second year to enable me with what hay I could get to obtain food enough to winter my stock; and I have cultivated in that way two or three hundred acres. There are not more than three or four hundred acres in that tract suitable for settlement. Even if any settlers should go in, there would not be more than sufficient for two or three, and they would be ten or fifteen miles away from any other settlers. Within the last year, this gentleman—I believe at the instigation of my opponents—made an application for the piece of land, on which he knew I was growing my crops and wintering my stock. The hon. gentleman referred to me as growing wheat on this land. I grow wheat and oats mixed for the feed of my stock. At times I grow wheat and feed it. I fed 1,000 bushels of wheat last year and the year before, and found it was the cheapest feed I could get.

Mr. MARTIN. Did the hon. gentleman sell wheat?

Mr. BOYD. Yes; and for every bushel I sold I brought back ten bushels of oats, and used it for no other purpose than feeding my stock. I have in no way injured the settlement, but have benefited it by bringing in the very best of stock of all kinds, of which the settlers have had the benefit. My political opponents instructed that man to proceed with that application, and the hon. gentleman took it up and tried to make out of it a great case of wrong to the poor settlers. That man has done nothing; he has made no improvements. I have fifty acres of crop on that land, and still this man Fleming says he is told to go on by his solicitors and they will indemnify him against any loss, and they are the same solicitors who were consulted by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). Those are the facts. It was not to rectify any wrong but simply to make an attack upon the Minister of the Interior that the hon. gentleman has brought this motion before the House.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE, PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council respecting the purchase of a site for a post office building in the town of Portage la Prairie, in Manitoba; also for copies of all instructions to, and reports by

Mr. Daniel Smith respecting said site; also of all petitions presented to His Excellency the Governor General or the Department of Public Works in connection with the selection of a site for said building.

He said: I desire to draw the attention of the House to the very extraordinary proceedings of the Department of Public Works in connection with the location of the new post office in the town of Portage la Prairie. An amount was put in the Estimates last year for the erection of a new post office and customs building at Portage la Prairie, and since then a location has been made of the site. It will be admitted by the House that in selecting a site for a public building in any town, the Government should not endeavour in any way to affect the position of the business centre of that town, but put the building in a place convenient to the largest number of persons interested, and not allow the member who represents the constituency in which the town lies, or any other person, to bring influence to bear in favour of a location which is not suitable, and which has the effect of interfering with the people as to the business centre of the town. I contend that that has been done in this particular instance. The old post office, which was in a rented building, was located in its present position many years ago, when the town was in an unsettled condition as regards its business centre. At that particular time, the post office was very far from what was then the business centre of the town. It was, however, upon a street which was likely to become in a few years the business street of the town, and the anticipations in that respect have been realized. The street called Saskatchewan Avenue, upon which the old post office was located has become the business street of the town, and the town may be said to have become, to a certain extent, solidified and settled. However, this particular site, where the old post office is situated, is entirely on one side of the town. When it was known that the Government intended to build, petitions were sent in—one petition at any rate, very largely signed indeed, was sent in to the Department of the Interior. A gentleman, now the mayor of the town, came all the way down from Portage la Prairie to present the petition and lay it before the Minister of Public Works, and along with it was presented a map, showing the location of the business houses and the business institutions. By that map, it most clearly appears that the site which the Government proposed to adopt, lying immediately west of the old site, was most unsuitable. I may say that I went myself last session to see the Minister of Public Works and suggested to him that as a dispute was likely to arise between the citizens generally and the business people on the one hand, and the particular few who are interested in real estate in a certain part of the town on the other hand, he should, under the circumstances, send a disinterested Government official to make a report entirely free and independent of all these influences. I believe the Minister of Public Works did carry out my suggestion and sent to Portage la Prairie Mr. Daniel Smith, who is an officer of the department located in Winnipeg. Mr. Smith made a report upon the three different sites offered to the Government. But I also understand that an Order in Council has since been passed at the instance of the Department of Public Works, overruling entirely the report of Mr. Smith. There are three sites available for this post office, all of which are on corners, and in that respect equal. One site, which is acceptable to the citizens at large, is that at present occupied by the Presbyterian Church. It has long been the intention of the Presbyterian Church-people to move their church off the business street, and they would be very willing to sell the land on which it is located to the Government for this purpose. The price they ask is $80 per front foot. The location is admirable, almost in the centre of the business portion, except that, even with regard to that particular site, there is a considerably greater number of business places lying east of the Presbyterian Church. Another site is two blocks west of the Presbyterian Church. It belongs to the Massey-Harris Company. The third site, and the one which has been finally accepted, is a block west of that again, or on the outskirts of the business portion of the town. I may say that there is not a business place on the same side of the street west of the site chosen by the department for the post office, except one—an implement establishment. The department purchased land at this point having 99 feet frontage, as I understand; and they have given for it, I am informed, $75 per foot front. This is $5 less than the land upon which the Presbyterian Church is located could be obtained for. Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation is saying that the price given for that land was at least three times more than it was worth; and I understand that Mr. Daniel Smith's report was against the site which the Government accepted, and in favour of the site occupied by the Presbyterian Church. It would be quite impossible for the Minister of Public Works or for any independent man not connected with local matters to go to Portage la Prairie and look over the situation, and then say that the site of the Presbyterian Church was not eminently a more fitting site for a public building than the site which has been chosen. Because, as I say, it is entirely on one side—there is only one business place on that side of the street, west of it, and one or two scattered places of business to the west of it on the other side. I can tell the hon. Minister that

he could have obtained, in the eastern part of the business street, land just as valuable, and just as suitable as a site for a post office for $25 per foot—land that is just as valuable to-day, as that they have selected and paid $75 per foot for. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? The Government, in the first place, took the proper course of sending an independent, fair-minded official up to the town to make a report upon the various sites offered to the Government. That official goes up, and he gives the Government the facts. He points out the location of the several sites, quotes the prices that are asked, and recommends to them one or two sites. Then, in the face of that report, as I understand through the influence of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd), the Government selected a site and paid $75 a foot front for it, although, as a matter of fact, it is not worth more than $25 a foot front. Moreover, the selection of this site entails for all time to come upon that town the very serious inconvenience of having a public building in a place most inconvenient to the vast majority of the people of the town. You understand, Mr. Speaker, that in a country town like that, the post office is an important point. It is a place visited by the most of the people every day; for there is no letter delivery, and every person has to go or send to the post office for his letters. If the Government were anxious to act in the public interest—and I suppose that gentlemen opposite will take the stand that they are—they would be most careful, when they are about to spend $15,000 or $20,000 on a public building, not to choose such a site as would inconvenience the majority of the people. They would, at any rate, be very careful in choosing a site not to pay three times the actual value for a site which was most against the interest of the town. The hon. Minister has, no doubt, before him the report made by Mr. Smith, and I desire to get that report, and also the correspondence with regard to this matter. For that purpose, I put this motion in your hand.

Mr. BOYD. Before this motion is put, I wish to say a few words with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). The hon. gentleman has taken particular pains to connect me—and in a somewhat unfair way, I think—with this transaction. I shall best explain the position by describing to this House the general situation of the town of Portage la Prairie. On the south side of the town is an inlet of the Assiniboine River—a slough, as it is called. On the north is the Canadian Pacific Railway. Between these two the town lies. It is probably not more than half or three-quarters of a mile broad. The people do not want to build too close to the railway, nor do any wish to go too close to the slough; so, you will understand, there is a tendency for the town to extend laterally and, like all towns, it grows westward. There has always been considerable competition between the east end and the west end. The hon. member for Winnipeg has been one of the most ardent supporters of the east end, owing to his having property in that locality, property in regard to which many doubts have been expressed, as to the manner in which it was purchased. Every building of the local government in Portage la Prairie has been located on land the hon. gentleman was interested in——

Mr. MARTIN. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am obliged to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement. The hon. gentleman is too old a parliamentarian——

Mr. MARTIN. But the hon. member makes a statement with regard to me which is absolutely untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his expression.

Mr. MARTIN. But I cannot withdraw what I know——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman refuses to withdraw his expression I shall be obliged to name him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Chair.

Mr. MARTIN. I will submit to the Chair, but I must say——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have said that the hon. gentleman must withdraw his statement.

Mr. MARTIN. I accede to that, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is very unfair that the hon. gentleman—I do not see how I can withdraw——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. MARTIN. I do withdraw.

Mr. BOYD. As I was remarking, every public building put up by the provincial government during the time the hon. gentleman was in the local legislature was placed upon the property which it was claimed he was interested in. The home for incurables——

Mr. MARTIN. I rise to a point of order. I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. gentleman can make statements with regard to me which are absolutely untrue, and I have no means of protecting myself?

Mr. BOYD. I say that was what the report was.

Mr. MARTIN. I say it was untrue.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The report?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not say that the hon. member is making statements respecting him that are absolutely untrue. That would be unparliamentary, and the hon. gentleman knows that. The hon. gentleman will have the opportunity of speaking again, and, if there are statements made by the hon. member which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) says are without foundation and untrue, he will have an opportunity of stating his position.

Mr. BOYD. As I was remarking about these buildings, I have reference especially to the home for incurables. The hon. gentleman speaks about petitions that were sent here to the Dominion Government. Does he forget the application that was made to him at the time that the land titles office was being placed there? I am credibly informed by gentlemen there that petitions signed by members of the county council and of the city council were presented to the hon. member for Winnipeg when he was Attorney General of the province, when he had the patronage of that town, asking him to place the lands title office in a more central locality, and I have been told that he answered them that they could go to the father of all lies, that he would put it where he pleased, and he did so. I have been told this by a man who occupied the position of mayor of the town. Now, the next building mentioned is the court-house and jail in Portage la Prairie, which he has placed immediately at the east end of the town. The present post office site was situated in a very central place. Now, it has been moved fifty yards west of where it was, in other words, taken from the centre of the block and placed on the opposite corner; and yet he says it was taken away out of the town. The hon. gentleman makes a statement regarding the report of Mr. Smith. Although I have not seen that report, I have no hesitation in saying that the meaning he puts upon it is not correct. What Mr. Smith did report was the other site west was a good site, that could be purchased for $80; that the next site east of that was not so good, and he would not recommend. He reported that the other site west was a good site, that the foundation was safe, and therefore he would recommend that site. No person knows better than the hon. member for Winnipeg that in the eastern end of the city the cellars are nearly all filled with water at certain seasons; in fact the hon. member's cellar is the only one in the east end that is kept dry, as I understand he has a windmill that pumps the water out. That is one reason why he suggested that this building should not be erected there. It is a well known fact that the court-house which the local government is now erecting is costing to-day for the foundation as much as it would cost to build the balance of the building; whereas the site of the building that is being proposed will give a good foundation seven or eight feet distant from the surface before reaching water. He speaks about the business being done. I have evidence that 40 per cent of the business of the town is done west of the site where this building is proposed to be erected. Another point is that the central school, which you would suppose would be in some central locality, is one block west of the present proposed site. I may say that the centre of the population of the town is one or two blocks east of the present proposed post office site. I do not know that a post office should be erected for the benefit of the business men of the town any more than for the benefit of the rest of the people. As regards the location, I am quite prepared to assume the responsibility of the site for that post office; and if the hon. member for Winnipeg thinks that he would have a chance of making a better case than he has made here, he will have a good opportunity of doing so by coming up there and testing it at the next election.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd) has stated that the home for incurables and the land titles office building in the town of Portage la Prairie, were placed upon land owned by me.

Mr. BOYD. I did not.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course if he withdraws the statement, that is all right. But that is what I understood him to say, and then he qualified his statement by saying it was so reported. It makes no difference to me whether the report came from him, or to him from somebody else. Then he says that these two institutions which were built by the local government when I was a member of that government, were built on property belonging to me. The hon. gentleman knows that if that were so, it would have the effect of unseating me as a member of the House, because it was quite impossible for the local government to purchase from me land for either of these buildings. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that the local government did not purchase from me, directly or indirectly, either the land upon which the home for incurables was placed, or the site for the land titles office; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that I never at any time owned the land upon which either of these buildings were located, and never had any interest in either of those properties. In the one case, the land was bought from Mr. William Smith, and in the other case from Mr. Michael Burke, and in both instances these men had owned the land for a long time previous to the time when I first saw the town of Portage la Prairie. But even if his charges were true, I do not think

they would have anything to do with the question of the site of the post office, or what I did in the local government. The hon. gentleman also stated that a deputation came to me with regard to the site of the land titles office. I do not know that that makes any difference either with the case now before the House. I may say that the site of the land titles office was chosen by a committee of the municipal council of Portage la Prairie, and the site was recommended by them to the Government, and afterwards it was purchased by the Government. Afterwards, other interested parties in the town came to me and asked me to change the site. I made no such statement to them as the hon. gentleman suggests, but I did tell them that the site could not be changed. It is a most proper site for that institution and one which people generally are perfectly satisfied with. On the other hand, the site for the post office is a most improper one. From the silence of the Minister of Public Works, I take it for granted that he acquiesced in the statement of the hon. member for Marquette that he considers it part of his patronage, and that he is responsible for the selection of that site. It is a somewhat new doctrine, I think, that the Government should delegate its duties to individual members of this House. I was under the impression that it was the duty of the Public Works Department to select the site for the construction of the building. I did not know that there was any patronage belonging to individual members of the House in selecting a proper place upon which to construct a public building. I draw the attention of the House to this fact, that while the hon. gentleman claims it is part of his patronage to select a site for these public institutions, he has not said a word upon the very grave matter which I brought to the attention of this House, namely, that the Government gave for that site $75 a front foot, when its actual value was not more than $25 a front foot.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not think it was necessary to say anything, but I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) say that this site has been chosen exclusively because it has been recommended by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd).

Mr. MARTIN. He said that, I did not say it.

Mr. OUIMET. His argument would be worth something if the department was unwilling to take the responsibility upon themselves. The pretended doctrine he has enunciated may appear very funny, but on the other hand, the House will agree with me that it is the duty of the heads of any department, as well as of the Government, whenever the interests of a constituency are concerned, to consult the representatives of that constituency. I did not consider that the advice of the hon. member for Marquette, as representative of the town of Portage la Prairie, was to be thrown aside just because the hon. member for Winnipeg came to me and told me that another site would suit him better. I have followed the hon. gentleman's suggestion to this extent: I have sent to Portage la Prairie an officer representing the department in Winnipeg, and generally in the province of Manitoba and the Northwest, a man in whose judgment, honesty and ability every one has full confidence, at least so far as I know, in that part of the Dominion. It is on the advice of Mr. Smith that this special site has been chosen. It is situated on the main business street of the town, Saskatchewan Avenue.

Mr. MARTIN. There was no other possible street for it.

Mr. OUIMET. So we did not make a mistake so far as regards the street.

Mr. FRASER. Because there was no other.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry to hear that the only street in Portage la Prairie is Saskatchewan Avenue.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the only business street.

Mr. OUIMET. I have learned that at the eastern end of Portage la Prairie, the hon. member and other parties have built quite a town, but of course that has not diminished the value of the other portion. The interests of the west end must be taken into consideration. The present site, as far as I understand, lies between two main parts of the town, and if either one of the two sections is to be preferred it must be, according to my judgment, the west end, as that is the growing part of the town, and not the east end, which, although it has received the greater amount of patronage from the local government, has made practically no growth recently. The site is only about 150 feet from the site of the old post office, and during the last fourteen years no dissatisfaction has been expressed with respect to that site. If the old site had been available at a reasonable price, my preference would have been to have purchased it in order to avoid any question as to site. As to the value, the present site cost $75 per foot frontage, and I am told by Mr. Smith and others that there is not a single lot to be purchased at that price in the neighbourhood.

Mr. MARTIN. No, but for about one-third of that price.

Mr. OUIMET. On December 8th, a few days before the selection was made, a telegram was sent by Mr. Smith to Mr. Fuller, the chief architect of the department, as follows:—"Post office price is reasonable;

below current rates for adjoining property." That, in my judgment, settles the question of price. It was the best site available, it was the cheapest site that could be purchased, and distinctly the best site, as a building lot, as in the foundations alone, the department will save several thousand dollars in the construction of the building. I hope the House will agree that the department did the best that could be done, and selected the most suitable site available, and I trust that when the papers are brought down at as early a date as possible, they will establish these facts to the satisfaction of every one concerned.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION IN PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Petitions, letters or other documents from the inhabitants of Duvar Road, Prince County, P.E.I., or from any other person, asking for a flag station at Duvar Road railway crossing.

He said : About a year ago the Department of Railways ordered the station at Mill River, Prince County, to be transferred to Howland Road. That was done at the request of several parties who petitioned the Government. It is about four miles to the north, while the location of the old station was about midway. I am well aware that the people in the locality of the old station agreed to its removal to Howland Road, but on the distinct understanding that a flag station should be placed at Duvar Road station. I trust the department will carry out their promise in this respect. No doubt. Duvar Road is an important settlement. Although it is thickly settled, no railway accommodation will be afforded to the inhabitants unless this flag station is provided at the crossing. This is a matter involving only a few dollars, and I trust the Minister will see his way clear to have the promise given carried out, and thus provide for the necessaries of the people. They now have to travel four or five miles further than if the station was in the old locality. I have no objection to the removal to Howland Road, which is a very important settlement, but this change was made on the distinct understanding made and the solemn promise given by the Railway Department that a flag station would be erected at the Duvar Road crossing. I am not aware that any step has so far been taken to provide this station, but I hope the Minister, in the near future, will furnish the people this accommodation they require.

Motion agreed to.

EXPORT OF CANADIAN SHEEP.

Mr. FEATHERSTON moved for :

Copies of all correspondence or papers passed between the Dominion Government and the Imperial authorities relating to any shipments of sheep from Canadian ports to Great Britain since the 31st October, 1894, and alleged to have been diseased, and any reports or correspondence from our veterinary inspectors relating to the same.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I move this as a precaution against having our Canadian sheep scheduled in the British market, and I take this course on account of reports that Canadian sheep in England were found diseased with what is known as "scab." I wish to bring before the attention of the House the fact, that American sheep have been shipped through Canadian territory, and some of which have been condemned as diseased when they reached the other side. It is my opinion, Sir, that the cause of the disease existing amongst our Canadian sheep is on account of their coming in contact with American sheep in transit. In the Annual Report of the Minister of Agriculture for last year, I notice that there was no disease found among the sheep that were shipped from the port of Montreal. Out of the 121,000 sheep which we shipped from that port, only some seventeen were condemned, but they were condemned on account of injuries they received in transit and not because of any contagious disease. However, I find that a great many of our Canadian sheep were condemned in England, and had to be slaughtered there, and sold at a less price than if they had been sold on foot. I notice also in the Report of the Minister of Agriculture to which I have referred, that there is no reference to any American sheep coming through Canadian territory, except those entered at the port of Sarnia by the Grand Trunk Railway and Michigan Central in transit to Buffalo and Suspension Bridge on their way to American ports. The report of Mr. Westell, who is the Government veterinary inspector at Sarnia, states that sheep have been entered there, and they also have been entered at St. Armand, in the province of Quebec. There is no reference whatever in the report to any American sheep being exported from the port of Montreal. The 121,304 sheep shipped at Montreal are all set down as amongst the products of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is to my knowledge that over 30,000 American sheep were shipped from Montreal last year, and about half that number were shipped before this report was published. This year there are a great many more American sheep going from Montreal, and I have noticed that many American sheep which have been shipped from Boston and other United States ports, have been condemned in England during this last month. Several shipments of American sheep shipped through Canada have also been condemned in England, and last week our inspectors in Montreal noticed disease amongst American sheep sent to that port. Last week when I was in Montreal I had an opportunity of inspecting a

lot of sheep that had arrived there from Chicago, and I noticed that some of them had this disease. The question in my mind, and in the minds of a great many people in Canada is that through the mixing up of American sheep with Canadian sheep in transit, there is great danger that our sheep will become diseased. This is a matter which demands the serious and immediate attention of the Government. I trust that they will see that no animals will be allowed to come in here for export which will be a cause of danger to the sheep export trade of Canada. We shipped a great many sheep to England in the fall of the year. Last winter especially we shipped a number of our best lambs, and if we have a good season we expect to ship a great many next year. It is therefore important in the interests of the country that our sheep should not be diseased, for, of course, if they are scheduled in England they will have to be slaughtered there, and their value will be immensely depreciated. I submit, therefore, that we should take all the precautions possible, and take them in time, so as to prevent our live sheep being debarred from the British market.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there can, of course, be no objection whatever to the motion passing. Indeed, the Government appreciates the interest which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Featherston) as a practical man, has taken in the matter, and I may say to him, that the Department of Agriculture are very alive to the question of protecting our sheep export trade from any possible contamination which may come to it, through associations with the trade of the United States in that same line. I fear, however,—and the hon. gentleman will probably know the facts to which I allude—that the feeling which is now very widespread among the British farmers in their desire for protection against foreign importations, has had not a little to do with the suspicion which has been passed upon the shipment of sheep, as it had a very great deal to do in connection with the charge made that our herds were not free from pleuro-pneumonia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Featherston), who no doubt has followed the discussion in the public press in this matter, will notice that at some time ago, the "Mark-Lane Express," while congratulating Mr. Gardner, the President of the Board of Agriculture, for dealing so effectively in the line of protecting the cattle resources of Great Britain from the competition of importations from Canada, went out of its way to suggest that the Department of Agriculture should now complete the work it had so well begun in connection with the cattle importations, and find some disease in Canadian sheep whereby they, as well as cattle, might be shut out of the British market alive. There is no doubt that there is a desire on the part of those who raise cattle and sheep in the British isles to shut out our products or to cause the trade to be hampered and checked, and I fear that we may have some such effort made in reference to sheep as has been made in reference to cattle. However, I assure my hon. friend that we are glad to have his assistance as a practical man in our efforts to protect the sheep trade from every possible danger.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is unquestionably a very important subject; and, while the representative of the Minister of Agriculture in this House declares that the Government are ready and willing to give every assistance to protect the purity of our herds of sheep, we are sorry to have to say, and experience has proved that the Government have not given that assistance to protect the purity of our cattle.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, yes, we have.

Mr. McMULLEN. No. Our experience has been that the Government have been very neglectful of their duty in that regard. It has been proven most clearly that, for several years they have quietly and knowingly winked at violations of the law.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We will discuss that later on.

Mr. McMULLEN. As a result of that, Canada is to-day suffering from her cattle being scheduled in the British market.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister is not posted, when he says, no. He says that the reason there is opposition to Canadian cattle in England is that the English people are anxious to secure the largest possible home market for the productions of their own people. The hon. Minister is, perhaps, not aware of the very serious effects resulting from the introduction of diseased animals, both cattle and sheep, into England; and it is not much wonder that they make a thorough inspection of the cargoes of these animals that are sent there. They are anxious to preserve the purity of their own herds, and if our Government had tried to cultivate the confidence of the English Government in this matter, we would not to-day be running the risk we are doing.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. The object of the hon. member for Peel, in making this motion, is, if possible, to protect our Canadian sheep trade from disease being introduced into our herds by allowing American sheep to come into Canada and be exported to the English market as Canadian

sheep. He has stated to the House, and his statement is backed up by official reports, that no less than 30,000 sheep have been imported into Canada from the United States, and exported from Canada to the English market as Canadian sheep. The House will understand easily what an enormous risk Canada is running in permitting this trade, in its very infancy, to be injured in this way. Is it possible that the Government will close their eyes to these facts? If this is allowed to go on, the interest of the Canadian farmer will be in danger of being placed upon as bad, or worse, a footing than that of the American farmer, in the English market. We know that the Americans are large exporters of sheep, not only to England, but to other countries, and we know that a large proportion of these exports is in the form of frozen mutton. Is it too much to ask, in the interest of the agriculturists of this country, that some effort be made by the Government to guard that great and important industry, when we consider the immense possibilities of our North-west in regard to developing an export trade in sheep? We know that there is an unlimited field there for the production of sheep; and are we going to allow the intermingling of the herds of the United States with our own to such an extent as seriously to injure the purity of our herds, and neutralize or ruin this important trade which is now in its infancy? I very much regret that we have not, in this House, as Minister of Agriculture, an experienced farmer. The gentleman supposed to preside over that department is comfortably ensconced in the other Chamber, beyond the reach of interrogations, and the hon. member who answers on his behalf in this Chamber is not a practical farmer, either. I am sure that there are many extensive and intelligent farmers in the ranks of that party who would ably discharge the duties of Minister of Agriculture. Why was it that over this most important industry, the most important in this Dominion, a man is appointed to preside as Minister of Agriculture who has no practical experience in that industry, and knows no more about its requirements than he does about the contents of the moon. He has not even a seat in this House, but has been ostracized to the Chamber of the Senate where nobody can reach him, and the gentleman who in this House has been appointed to discharge the duties of sponsor to the Minister of Agriculture, is a doctor by profession. I contend that agriculturists are not properly treated in this matter. We know perfectly well that when the interests of the manufacturers are at stake, the Government think nothing of picking up a man like Mr. Larke, at a salary of $3,000, and sending him to Australia, paying his expenses and the expenses of his family. Is he sent there in the interests of the agriculturists? Not at all. He is sent in the interests of our manufacturing industries; he is sent for the purpose of working up a trade for the Canadian manufacturers and the agricultural implement manufacturers, and classes of that kind. Have we ever heard of a man being employed and sent to any particular point for the purpose of working up the farming interest? See what the Americans are doing. They have in the British ports to-day veterinary surgeons, the ablest men in their profession, to look after the American shipments of sheep and cattle, to do everything they can in the interests of that trade, and these men are paid out of the revenues of the United States, and kept there at the expense of the United States. We have nobody. We have no one to take the Canadian exporter by the hand and give him advice. We can hire a man and send him to the Australian colonies in the interests of our manufacturing institutions, but the farmers are neglected. Nobody is sent abroad in their interests to take charge of matters of vital importance to them. I make this appeal because I know that the farmers of this country realize that they have been neglected, and they find fault with us if we do not persistently appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to do something in the interests of this growing trade. Take the facts. The hon. First Minister (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) went to Australia some time ago, and travelled around at the expense of this Dominion. He addressed several meetings of the board of trade and other gatherings; he came back to this country and addressed the Board of Trade of Toronto, and other gatherings, concerning his visit to the Australian colonies. Was there a single word said with regard to the interests of the farming community? Not a word. All the addresses and speeches had for their burden the benefit of our manufacturing industries, and our farming interest was neglected as if it had no existence. We have subsidized a line of steamers to the Australian colonies, and they are now bringing to us frozen mutton, frozen beef, and other agricultural commodities, to compete with the products of this country. I hope that when the return asked for by the resolution of my hon. friend is brought down, the Government will, in the interests of the farming community, make an honest and earnest effort to preserve the purity of our sheep, and the advantages we have been enjoying in the English market. I am very sorry that the Secretary of State is not present to hear my remarks in this connection. I claim that the interests of our cattle trade were sacrificed through the neglect of the Government. I know that the hon. Secretary of State tried to cast ridicule on the information secured by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with regard to the cattle. I know he said that they were from an unreliable source, and that the man

who gave the information told an untruth. But that information was sworn to; it was given under a sworn affidavit, and if the Secretary of State believes it to be untrue, why does not the Minister of Agriculture have this man arrested for perjury. The Government may reply that he is living in the United States, but perjury is an extradictable offence, and if the Government want to punish this man they can do it. But they dare not make the attempt, because they know his statement cannot be refuted. They cannot show that the unfortunate condition in which that trade is at present is not directly attributable to their neglect. Are they going to have the sheep trade put in the same condition? Are they going to allow carload after carload of American sheep to come over our lines and be shipped from Montreal as Canadian exports? That has been done. Thirty thousand have been so exported. Are the Government going to permit that to continue until such time as our sheep trade is ruined along with our cattle trade. If the same line be followed out, which is followed with regard to our cattle trade, our sheep trade will shortly be in the same condition; and, unfortunately, we have not a man at the head of the Department of Agriculture who has the knowledge and the experience to enable him to grasp the situation. The man we have in that position, besides lacking the requisite knowledge and experience, has a seat in the Senate, and the duty of answering questions across the House has been put in the hands of a gentleman who is equally at sea with regard to farming matters and the export trade of cattle and sheep. For my part, I consider it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the House on every opportunity, and thus clear my skirts of any responsibility.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad that my hon. friend the Secretary of State has come back to the House in time to hear the closing remarks of my hon. friend who has just spoken. The reason why, perhaps, the Secretary of State did not consider it necessary that he should be here was that he had successfully replied to the objections made by the hon. mover of the resolution. Now, it would not improve matters if I were to attempt, after the remarks of my hon. friend, to discuss these important agricultural questions, because the hon. gentleman has stated that one of the great troubles under which Canada is at present labouring is that the Minister of Agriculture is a lawyer, and I happen to belong to the same profession. The hon. gentleman stated that it was of great importance—and I agree with him—that that department should be presided over by a gentleman who understands the matters which he has to administer. But the hon. gentleman must be forgetting a page in the history of his own party.

Mr. McMULLEN. Two wrongs never made a right.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite certain we may have made a mistake in taking a leaf out of the hon. gentleman's book, and it might be a question whether we ought not to make up our minds never again to commit such an error. In the brightest days of the Mackenzie regime, gentlemen opposite who had been appealing to the people as Reformers, ready to rectify the mistakes which the Conservative party had made during so many years of power, selected as the First Minister of Agriculture the Hon. Mr. Letellier, who resigned to become a Lieutenant-Governor, and who was succeeded by a lawyer, a member of the same bar as the present Minister, and a member of the Senate like the present Minister, Hon. Mr. Pelletier. It seems to me that it comes with bad grace from these gentlemen to say that the troubles which, according to them, afflicts this Dominion, result from the agriculturists not being represented by one of their own class. I do not believe, as a matter of principle in judging men by the position they occupy in life, but I believe in judging them by the work they do. And, as far as I can judge public opinion, the present Minister of Agriculture is regarded as more successful in advancing the interests of the farmers than any of the gentlemen who occupied a similar position when the gentlemen now on your left, Mr. Speaker, had control of the Government. So far as the motion is concerned, I believe the Secretary of State, who represents the Minister of Agriculture in this House, has successfully replied to every objection. He has pointed out what must not be forgotten by the people of Canada, that the change in regard to our cattle was brought about in order to give the British farmers the semblance of protection. There is no farmer in England who does not know that no disease exists among the cattle of Canada, but the cattle of Canada were shut out in order to afford the English farmer protection against the Canadian farmer; it was the effort to secure for the English farmer that protection that was giving to our farmers the prosperity which we claim they enjoy under the National Policy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to remind the Postmaster General that it was under the Mackenzie Administration that our trade in cattle and sheep in Great Britain began. They had business men in that Government, and if they had a lawyer as Minister of Agriculture, he was a lawyer who knew something about farming, theoretically at least. I do not think the present Government or the Department of Agriculture can take much credit for their management of our cattle and sheep trade. We have been quarantined in the United States as a result of the impracticable and irritating policy pursued by this Administration. Then the Government have so badly maintained the regulations

which the Imperial Government insisted upon, that they had our cattle scheduled in Great Britain. These are the reasons why, for the last two or three years, our market has been so low. For the last three years our people have not been able to sell their lambs at anything like a profitable price, and, for that reason, we have larger flocks to-day than at almost any other time in the history of the country. Now that the Government allow sheep to come in afflicted with disease, we are likely to see destroyed the trade in sheep as well. I am willing to give gentlemen opposite every credit where they deserve it, but the fact remains that this trade in cattle and sheep was built up under the Mackenzie Administration, and I was one of those who gave them a loyal support in carrying out that work. What the members of the Government did not know some of the rest of us did know, and our knowledge was used to develop this trade so that it became one of the most important to the farmers of Canada. I am sorry that gentlemen opposite have not any agriculturists among their supporters deemed fit for this position. Those who are given positions by gentlemen opposite are not those who are successful farmers in the ordinary sense of the word, but those who are successful in managing the political farm. There are some gentlemen among the supporters of the Government who have sought the place of Minister of Agriculture. They are fit for the position and would discharge its duties with credit to themselves and benefit to the country, at least we have it upon their own authority that they would do this. Still those who are called to the higher places under this Government are those who have been successful in political farming. It is no secret that the present Minister of Agriculture would not occupy the position he does to-day had it not been for the work he did for this Government in Quebec. He acted in a way to please the Government and so he is given a place in the Senate and taken into the Cabinet. I think if the Government will look around among their supporters they will find gentlemen whose knowledge better qualifies them for this position than one who has never had any connection with agriculture. But there is the contrast—while the Mackenzie Administration built up the trade in cattle and sheep, these hon. gentlemen have had our cattle scheduled in England and our cattle and sheep quarantined in the United States. I charge the Government that it is through their incapacity that these results have followed; I say it is through the laxity of the administration of this department that these calamities have overtaken, not only the cattle trade, but the sheep trade of this country. Why, I remember one occasion last summer when I was driving out through the riding I have the honour to represent, I saw immense flocks of sheep in every field, and I said: "How comes it that we have so many sheep up here?" "Why," the gentleman said to me, "they cannot sell sheep; there has been no market for sheep, they can scarcely give them away, and the consequence is that they have to keep them." And now the Government, through their negligence, are going to imperil the trade in sheep, which have been accumulating in such large numbers in our country. I feel a great interest in this matter, as well as in the cattle trade, because it is a large and important industry and adds to the revenue of the country, and a great deal of its material wealth; and I am anxious that the Government should not, through laxity, imperil this business, or destroy this trade, which promises so much, if properly looked after. I think I have replied to the Postmaster General, and have shown him something that he had probably forgotten in the heat of opposition.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to protest against the system of allowing American sheep to come into Canada and be shipped to England as Canadian sheep. These sheep should be properly inspected when they come into this country, and they should not be allowed to go out of this country and be shipped to England as Canadian sheep. It is a strange thing that our inspectors knew nothing about this disease being brought into the country until it was exposed in the public press. If any of these diseased sheep are allowed to go to the old country, our Canadian sheep will certainly be scheduled. The Postmaster General states that the present Minister of Agriculture has done more for the farmers of Canada than any of his predecessors. What has he done? He and the Premier has given a subsidy to steam vessels by which the farmers of the Antipodes are able to send their beef, and their mutton, and their butter into Canada to compete with us very keenly, while, at the same time, the Government pretend to be benefiting the farmers by giving them 20 cents per pound for their butter. That is what they have done. They have taken our market away from us; they have taken from us the advantage which nature had given us. I saw, the other day, that a shipment of butter had come from Australia to Vancouver, and thence to Sudbury, in the province of Ontario; while, at the same time, the Government have been taking the butter from Ontario and sending it to the old country. Let me say that the English farmers are not a unit against Canadian cattle being allowed to go to the old country. I know from experience that many English farmers are anxious to get our cattle, and if it had not been for the careless manner in which they were handled on this side by the Government, they would not have been scheduled. But when the

Government allowed American cattle to come in in this manner, with as little inspection as is now given to American sheep, they were guilty of a negligence which has been one of the great causes of our animals being scheduled. I can assure the Minister that a large number of English farmers are anxious to get Canadian cattle, but when it is known that the Canadian Government, through their inspectors, are so very careless as to allow so many diseased animals to come in and to be shipped to England as Canadian animals, it will be another obstacle, not only to our sheep trade, but also to the renewal of our cattle trade. I say that the Government are doing a greivous injustice to the sheep raisers and the cattle breeders of our country, and if this thing is allowed to go on and sheep are allowed to be shipped from Canada to the other side without proper inspection, and the disease is not rigidly excluded at once, depend upon it, the day is not distant when our Canadian sheep will be prohibited from importation into England as well as our cattle.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am pleased with the remarks that have fallen from the Secretary of State to the effect that the Government would give all needed assistance for the protection of Canadian sheep. Now, Sir, I, for one, as being interested in the trade, am willing to give all the assistance I can, not only as a member of the Dominion Live Stock Association, but as a member of the House, representing the old county of Peel, whose farmers send so large a number of animals to the British market. I think it is very desirable that the Government should at once take this question into their serious consideration. The report has gone abroad to England by this time that diseased sheep have been stopped in Montreal; and, no doubt, as the Secretary of State has said, that the English farmers are watching with all their eyes, and desire to see our sheep prevented from going in there. Now, when the American Government was asked to remove the restrictions and allow Canadian cattle to be shipped from the ports of Boston, New York, and other places, to England, the department issued an order which read as follows:—

The Secretary of Agriculture has declined to modify the regulations regarding the importation of Canadian cattle so as to permit their export from the United States by way of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore. The decision has been communicated to the collector at Plattsburgh by the Secretary of the Treasury, with instructions to notify the Deleware and Hudson Canal Company that their similar request is refused. The regulations in question were issued 11th February, 1895, and Secretary Morton wrote Secretary Carlisle, in reply to the suggestion of the latter that they be modified, in the following terms:—"The owners of cattle and sheep in the United States are entitled to protection by proper sanitary regulations in regard to imported animals. It is a difficult matter to carefully and thoroughly inspect sheep and cattle at the port of entry, when they must be hurried on for exportation from some other port. In order to give reasonable protection against the importation of contagious diseases, this traffic must be confined to as narrow an area as possible, and, therefore, the regulations restrict the importation of Canadian stock to the one port of Portland, Me., and require them to be taken there by the most direct routes. To allow the shipment of such stock to Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, which subject a large part of our territory to any danger which might exist from contagious diseases, and it also allows the cattle to go to cities where it is difficult to keep them isolated, and still more difficult to secure the disinfection of cars."

Now, those are the restrictions that are imposed by the American Government. I think it is the duty of our Government to arrive at some conclusion as to the best mode to adopt to prevent the spread of this disease amongst our sheep, because, I have been informed by Canadian sellers now in England, that unless we do something immediately, our sheep will likely be scheduled as our cattle have been. That will be a very serious thing for this country, because mutton is quite different from beef. When mutton is slaughtered in England, and put in cars as beef is, it will not keep as well, and cannot be handled as well as beef. Therefore, it is to our interest that this disease should be stamped out as soon as possible, and that we should prevent any unhealthy stock from coming in from the United States and being exported again. I think the Government ought, at the earliest moment to look into this matter, and take some decided step. No doubt the reports that this motion was on the paper created considerable excitement in Montreal, and the inspector there, as well as other men interested in the trade, immediately made a close inspection of the four cars of American sheep that came in last week, and in those four cars, containing over 600 sheep, they found six sheep diseased in two cars. I am satisfied that it was the fact of this motion being put upon the paper that brought this matter to the attention of the inspectors, and led them to find all the diseased animals they possibly could. I hope the Government will give them such assistance as will enable them to inspect every animal coming into the country, and to keep out every animal that is diseased. Now, Sir, these sheep had been purchased in Chicago, subject to this disease, and when the owner heard that these six diseased sheep were discovered, he sent orders from Chicago to have those two cars forwarded on to Boston, and they were forwarded on to Boston that they might be slaughtered and shipped in dressed meat cold storage. We want to preserve our sheep industry in its present form; we want, if possible, the opportunity to send

our best lambs in the fall of the year by way of Montreal, and Portland, through the winter, to England, as we did last year, whereby we were able to realize pretty fair prices, now that we are shut out of the American market by the duty imposed on our lambs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I trust that what I said before dinner in reply to the hon. gentleman, was not taken as a statement that the Government were not alive to the importance of this matter. From the tone of the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), I think they must have concluded that the statement made was that we were paying no attention to it whatever. On the contrary, my statement was that the Government were paying attention to it, not when the motion was placed on the Order paper by the hon. member for Peel, but as quickly as the reports were sent abroad. The departmental officers were instructed to exercise the very keenest observation in regard to this subject, and I pledge the Government to the hon. gentlemen that we will not under any circumstances allow any point to escape which will prove a benefit to the sheep trade.

Mr. McMILLAN. In many cases the very best inspectors of cattle are utterly ignorant of sheep and their diseases. As the matter stands at the present time there should be a practical shipper employed, one who possesses a thorough knowledge of sheep, particularly as to their disease, and that is what very few cattlemen possess. I hope the Government will pay attention to this matter, because the facts I have stated come within my knowledge as a practical farmer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And the hon. gentleman will not object to the expense involved ?

Mr. McMILLAN. No. What we do object to is that large expenditures should be involved without any real benefit resulting to the people, and at the same time no affective measures be taken when they are required.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING RIGHTS ON MATANE RIVER.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all contracts made by the Government granting fishing rights to individuals in the River Matane, and of all complaints and correspondence in relation thereto.

He said : I particularly desire to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that there is a standing lease of the fishing privileges on River Matane, which has been in existence, I believe, for fifteen years and over. As I understand the jurisprudence as at present settled by a recent decision of the Supreme Court, the Government of Canada can claim no right to the exclusive privileges of fishing in any waters. Those privileges, if they exist at all, would go to the benefit of the riparian owners, and I do not understand that at the present moment the Government can claim that they have any such rights as were conferred by them at the time the lease was entered into. The riparian owners along the river Matane, which is a valuable salmon river, have been debarred from the privilege of fishing for a great many years, but I should like to have an expression of opinion from the hon. Minister that if the riparian owners exercise the privilege of fishing for salmon they violate no law, and the Government have conferred no right whatever on the lessee under the old lease. At one time it was supposed the Dominion Government had the right to the fishing, and they extended it to any one they pleased ; but I suppose at this date, in view of the decision that has been given in a New Brunswick case, if I remember rightly, the Government no longer claim that privilege.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not present, but I have no doubt he will offer no objection to the papers being brought down. I may say to the hon. gentleman that, speaking from recollection the lease for fishing in this river was granted a good many years ago, and in my time it expired. I renewed the lease, with a provision saving the rights and responsibilities of the Crown in that matter, and allowing the lessee to take it at his own risk. The hon. gentleman has correctly referred to the view of the fishing rights and privileges laid down in the case of the Queen and Robertson ; but as the case was argued many questions were involved which did not directly come within the purview of that decision, or that could be said to be properly before the court. The practice after that decision rendered was, that while recognizing the rule laid down and the rights of the riparian proprietors, the governments and parties interested, not having taken action elsewhere, and the question being considered by the different local governments with the Federal Government in connection with the general principle involved, there being considerable difference of opinion as to the ultimate decision, these questions having to be finally decided by the Privy Council, there was put on foot negotiations by the Dominion Government, with all the different local governments so as to consolidate every question as to the fisheries, the jurisdiction over the harbours and the great lakes and questions regarding the foreshore, and in fact all the claims under the Fisheries Act of Canada, and the Fisheries Act of some of the provinces, notably that of Ontario. Finally these points were consolidated in a case that has been prepared for argument before the Supreme Court, with a view of obtaining the final decision

of the Privy Council on all these questions. In view of the condition of the subject-matter, the Department of Marine continues to exercise jurisdiction which was no doubt indirectly questioned in the case of the Queen vs. Robertson. Where there was a renewal of these leases, and there are quite a number outstanding, it was decided to put in that clause, so that the lessees took them at his own risk, and on his own responsibility. The action of the Government in that regard was based, in a measure, upon the view that ultimately the case might be decided differently from what it had been in the Queen vs. Robertson.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not know that the Government had made any claim in the matter since the case of the Queen vs. Robertson. I think the principle upon which the court proceeded in that case was very clear. They recognized that the Crown claims a proprietary interest in the lands under the bottom of a river, in which the tide does not ebb and flow, just precisely the same as it does in lands not covered with water at all. And so, in granting proprietary rights, it usually grants the right in the soil to the middle of the stream. It has always been held in England, that the right of fishery goes with the soil to the proprietor, and that being so, the proprietary interest in the ground being in the Crown as associated with the local government, the interest or property in the fish in the stream in which the tide does not flow, would be in the Crown as associated with the provinces, and not in the Crown as associated with the Dominion. That principle was recognized in the case of Queen vs. Robertson. In the case of fisheries where the tide does ebb and flow, the rule, of course, would be different, and there is an English case, the name of which I cannot recall just now, in which it was held that while the Crown could grant a right of fishery to an individual in a stream where the tide did not ebb and flow, the Crown could not grant the exclusive right of fishery in a harbour, or in any portion of the sea coast, because there the right of the Crown was a right as a trustee for the nation, and not a proprietary right with which it could part. If such a right were to be dealt with it would require to be dealt with by Parliament, so that any right in a fishery, or any right to the fisheries within the three-mile limit upon the sea coast, it seems to me would be governed by a different principle from that which would prevail with regard to fisheries in streams, even though they are navigable, but in which the tide does not ebb and flow. It is an important question, under which of these rules the fisheries in the lakes come. There is an Irish case in which that question is disposed of, where the right of fishery in the lakes (which are very much smaller than ours) is rather upon the Crown as public trustees than as proprietors to the soil. That would seem to class the lakes along with the sea shore fisheries, rather than with the river fisheries. How far that third proposition would be applicable to our case I do not say at this moment, but it seems to me, that the distinction is very clear, and I do not see upon what ground the Government could set up a right to license persons engaged in salmon fishing, or any other kind of fishing, in any of the rivers or streams of the provinces.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With reference to the point, as to how far these general principles have been affected by the British North America Act, the Federal Government is pressing for a decision and interpretation. That was one of the points involved directly here, and it was under this clause, to which I will refer, that Parliament assumed it had jurisdiction at the outset, and took authority to lease, and license, and regulate all these different fisheries. Section 91, of the British North America Act gives exclusive authority to the Parliament of Canada on matters coming within the subjects hereinafter enumerated, and clause 12 enumerates "sea coast and river fisheries." That, of course, will be set at rest by a judgment upon this comprehensive statement of the case.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST REBELLION—SCRIP FOR SCOUTS.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the outstanding claims for scrip from the Wood Mountain and Maple Creek scouts, and also individual claims elsewhere of scouts and teamsters who were engaged actively in warfare during the rebellion of 1885 in the North-west Territories, should now be fully inquired into and the demands of justice satisfied.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since putting this motion on the paper, I have had a conversation with the Minister of Militia, and he agrees with the motion, and has told me he would inquire into the claims of the persons in whose interest this motion has been moved. When I came down here in 1887, I brought before the House the claims of certain volunteers, and an inquiry was subsequently instituted into the claims of the volunteers and others. It was conducted by Mr. Sedgewick, now Mr. Justice Sedgewick of the Supreme Court, and Mr. Sedgewick decided in favour of the volunteers whose claims I put before him, and also in favour of certain other persons. But the claims of the scouts, and of teamsters who were under fire, have never been attended to. An Act was passed in 1885 which provided for giving land or scrip to volunteers engaged in putting down the rebellion,

and in 1886 an Act was passed providing that those who acted as scouts should get land or scrip. It was under these two Acts we made the claim, and it is under the Act of 1886 I make the claim that is implied by the motion before the House. The only object of bringing the motion before the House and urging the House to pass it would be to influence the Government. But as the present Minister of Militia has told me that he intends to do the very thing which this motion asks should be done, namely, to inquire into the demands of these persons, who still feel that in justice they should get either scrip or land, I will not put the House to the trouble of dividing on the motion.

Motion agreed to.

CREAMERY AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

On the Order

That in the opinion of this House, it would be expedient to apply $20,000 to aid in establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west Territories, and that this sum should be considered as an addition to the immigration grant; that, further, the Government should at once take into consideration the propriety of giving a bonus on butter exported to the London markets, as is done by some of the Australian colonies, and also of raising the Customs duty from 4 cents per pound to 6 cents, in order to enable the North-west farmers to compete with the Australian exporters in the British Columbia markets.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In deference to the wish of some gentlemen who are not here to-night, and who desire to take part in the discussion of this question, I would like this motion to stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) According to your ruling of the other day, Mr. Speaker, this motion is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, this is merely the expression of an abstract opinion that it would be expedient to apply $20,000 to aid in establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west Territories. That imposes no burden on the public, because no Bill can be introduced into Parliament, even supposing this resolution passes, except on the authority of the Crown.

Motion allowed to stand.

BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND.

Mr. FORBES moved for:

Return giving copies of all petitions, letters and telegrams in the possession of the Government relating to the placing of a bell-buoy on the inside of Little Hope Island, off Lower Port Joli Harbour.

He said: This resolution refers to the better lighting of the south coast of the province of Nova Scotia, in the interest of the shipping along that coast and of the fishermen who use our inshore fisheries. I had occasion to call the attention of the Government to this matter some time ago. Little Hope Island is situated off the south-west coast of Nova Scotia. It is an important island to navigators, and has upon it a very large lighthouse, being in the track of vessels going coastwise up and down that coast, and of the fishermen who use the inshore or nearer outside shore fisheries. Between that island and the mainland there is a reef over which at certain seasons of the year there is very shoal water, which a very slight tempest is sufficient to agitate to such an extent as to make it dangerous for vessels going in and out. It is also dangerous to fishermen when fogs are thick along the coast during the fishing season, which is about the whole year. If a bell-buoy or a fog-whistle were placed on or near the coast of this island, it would be a great convenience to the shipping and to the fishermen. The fishermen and others acquainted with the locality would rather have it placed on the reef than anywhere else. As a result of my negotiations with the department, I was referred to the Government agent at Halifax, who was instructed to make a survey of the locality. He did so, and reported that a bell-buoy of smaller size than that which I desired, if placed on the inside coast of the island, would serve the purpose. While I could not get what I considered best in the interests of the fishermen and the coastwise shipping, yet I was satisfied with the statement made by the officials of the department; but from that day to this, although three years have elapsed, nothing has been done, and I have not been able to get any satisfaction. Therefore, I would again urge upon the Government the absolute necessity of providing a bell-buoy or fog-whistle on the inside coast of this island, to serve as a guide to the fishermen and mariners during foggy seasons or at the end of a voyage, when they wish to make a harbour of refuge. It is the habit of the fishermen in that district to lay off for three or four days and engage in fishing. Their boats are of small size and are manned by small crews; and in tempestuous weather, or in an inclement season, or when their work is ended, and they make for the harbour, their lives and property are subjected to great danger in the absence of the protection for which I ask. I know that the last Minister of Marine and Fisheries looked into this matter carefully, and it was upon his report that the inspector went down and inquired into it; and I was led to believe that the necessary provision would at once be made, and supposed the Government was honest in its intention. Now that I have been obliged to call the Government's attention publicly to it, and to press upon them and upon the House the necessity of supplying this long felt

want, I do hope that I shall not be required to do so again. It is not necessary at this particular time that I should dwell upon the importance of the industry to which this bell-buoy would afford an aid. I beg, therefore, again simply to urge this matter upon the attention of the Government if they have not had it drawn to their attention by their own officers. I am satisfied that the petitions which have been sent by the fishermen and the inhabitants of the south shore, the letters and telegrams in possession of the Government, and the reports of their own officers, and my earnest and frequent solicitations, will show most conclusively the necessity of at once complying with this request of a large number of the inhabitants of Nova Scotia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite sure that when the papers are brought down, my hon. colleague—who was unable to be present to-night—will give the hon. gentleman all the information he requires.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AS TO INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY.

Mr. DENISON moved :

That in the opinion of this House, Canada should take advantage of the International Convention as to industrial property, and that the Government should take such steps as are necessary to attain that object.

He said : As this motion was so far down on the list, I did not expect it to be reached to-night, and, consequently did not expect to be able to go on with this motion. However, as it is late in the session, I think I had better briefly explain the object I have in view. I have in my hand "Sebastian on Trade-marks," which contains the terms of the International Convention, entered into by some of the countries of Europe for the purpose of protecting their trade-marks and patents. It was signed on the 20th March, 1883, but the Imperial Government did not give its adhesion until the 6th of June, 1894. Article 2 explains the arrangement, as follows :—

The subjects or citizens of each of the contracting states shall, in all the other states of the union, as regards patents, industrial designs or models, trade-marks and trade names, enjoy the advantages that their respective laws now grant or shall hereafter grant to their own subjects or citizens.

Consequently, they shall have the same protection as the latter and the same legal remedy against any infringement of their rights ; provided, they observe the formalities and conditions imposed on subjects or citizens by the international legislation of each state.

The next article provides that subjects or citizens of states not forming part of the union but who are domiciled or have industrial or commercial establishments in the territory, of any of the states of the union, may be assimilated to the subjects or citizens of the contracting states. Article 4 provides :

Any person who has duly applied for a patent, industrial design or model, or trade-mark in one of the contracting states, shall enjoy, as regards legislation in the other states, and reserving the rights of third parties, the right of priority durthe periods hereinafter stated.

Consequently, subsequent legislation in any of the above states of the union, before expiry of these periods, shall not be invalidated through any acts in the interval : either, for instance, by another legislation, by publication of the invention, or by the working of it by a third party, by the sale of copies of the design or model, or by the use of the trade-marks.

The above mentioned terms of priority shall be six months for patents and three months for industrial designs and models and trade-marks. A month longer is allowed for countries beyond sea.

Article 16 allows all other nations to be brought under the terms of this treaty :

States which have not taken part in this convention, shall be permitted to ahere to it, at their request.

Such adhesion shall be notified officially through the diplomatic channel of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, and by the latter to all the others. It shall imply complete accession to all the clauses and admission to all the advantages stipulated by the present convention.

The Imperial Government evidently found it was in the interests of their merchants and traders that they should give in their adhesion to this convention, and, on the 6th June, 1884, the United Kingdom joined the convention, at the same time reserving their right to accede thereto on behalf of any of the colonies, after giving due notice. By Order in Council subsequently passed, the provision of the Patents, Design, and Trade-mark Act of 1883 (Imperial) were made applicable to the different countries that were in convention at the time, as follows :—

Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Italy, Holland, Norway, Portugal, Servia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunis, the United States, New Zealand and Queensland.

The benefits to be derived would be : Protection to the different trade-marks in all the different countries within the convention for a period of seven months ; rights of priority to parties applying for patents during the same space of time ; within that period, no rights could be invalidated by publication of the inventions, by another registration, by the importation of the article, by the working of it by a third party, or by the sale of a design, or use of a trade-mark. On importations, &c., all goods bearing illegal trade-marks will be seized, trade-marks duly registered in Canada would be admitted to protection in the form originally registered ; trade names would be protected without registration, whether forming part of a trade-mark or not. The question, of course, now comes

in, why Canada should not enter this convention as there are annually about 725 Canadian inventors and 375 parties who obtained trade-marks. Evidently, when our criminal code was passed, our possible adhesion to this convention was foreseen, because the paragraphs in our criminal code dealing with trade-marks are taken almost verbatim from the Imperial statutes on the same subject.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is a very important question, and, as several of my colleagues who are particularly interested are absent, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not propose to discuss this question at all, only I would like to call the attention of the Government to this state of affairs. They went into a convention once on the subject of copyright—at least they allowed England to go in and represent them at the Berne convention. Perhaps they were right, perhaps wrong, but, at any rate, Canada, for reasons of her own, made up her mind a good while ago that she wanted to get rid of that treaty, and this Parliament unanimously passed an address, many years ago, asking the Government, on behalf of Canada, to denounce that treaty. And the British Government has, so far, failed to do that. Well, now, I suggest that if this convention ever goes on, and if Canada ever joins in it, the representatives of Canada should take good care that there shall be a clear and distinct understanding that if and when Canada desires to denounce that treaty she shall be at liberty to do so.

Motion agreed to.

TOWING SAW-LOGS ACROSS GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE HURON.

That as an immense number of saw-logs are towed across Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, the bark of which coming off, causes great damage to the nets of fishermen in those waters, it is advisable that the Government take steps to compel those persons towing logs to take the bark all off before the logs are put in a boom for export.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be of great value to me in arguing this motion; and, as it is not yet distributed, but is expected to be distributed in a few days, I would ask that this motion be allowed to stand.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Stand.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all reports made by officers of the Government in connection with the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway. Also, copies of letters received by the Government having reference to the same subject.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Return of all petitions, letters, and other papers to the Government asking for legislation to prevent alien labour being employed in Canada.—(Mr. Lowell.)

Return showing the names of vessels, &c., that paid wharfage dues at Tignish harbour, P.E.I., the amount paid by each vessel, the date of entry and clearance of each vessel, and the sum total collected and paid in.—(Mr. Perry.)

Copies of all correspondence and estimates of value for the 135 acres of lands on the banks of the Richelieu River sold to one Foster for $650, the date of sale, and all correspondence as to value of timber as well as land.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the number of experimental farm reports published for the year 1893. The number published in English and French, respectively. The number allotted to each member of the House of Commons and Senate. The number distributed from each of the experimental farms, and the number still on hand.—(Mr. Grieve.)

Copies of all tenders received by the Government in response to an advertisement dated October, 1894, calling for tenders for the construction of section 1 of the Simcoe and Balsam Lake division and section 1 of the Peterborough and Lakefield division of the Trent Canal. Also, for the approximate quantities of the various classes of work, as specified in the forms of tender for both the above sections, and on which the total amount of each tender was based.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Return showing :—1. Number of manufacturing industries in the town of Wingham, specifying the name of each and the name of the proprietor. 2. Number of hands employed in each factory. 3. The value of the output of each factory. 4. Amount of capital invested in each factory. 5. Total wages paid by each factory. 6. Value of raw material in each factory.—(Mr. Macdonald, Huron.)

Return showing :—1. Number of manufacturing industries in the city of Chatham, specifying the name of each and name of proprietor. 2. Number of hands employed in each factory. 3. The value of the output of each factory. 4. Amount of capital invested in each factory. 5. Total wages paid by each factory. 6. Value of raw material in each factory.—(Mr. Campbell.)

Copies of all papers, protests and other documents received from Louis Zénophile Mallette in relation to the contract and the building of the Langevin Block.—(Mr. Monet.)

Copies of the following papers :—1. Affidavit of Philippe Robert Landry, alias Philippe Landry, a pupil at the Quebec Military School, in or about April, 1865, to the effect that, during his stay at the said school, his residence was at Carleton, in the county of Bonaventure. 2. Account from the same for mileage from Carleton to Quebec. 3. Receipt from same for amount of the said account for mileage.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Copies of all corespondence and petitions in reference to the construction of the embankment and lock on the Yamaska.—(Mr. Mignault.)

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.40.

INDEX

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1895.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following;—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts, Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept.. Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recomit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3948 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Kent District, Ont. (Ques.) 698.

Port Rowan Wharf, Construction, &c., (Ques.) 2360 (i).

Smith, Henry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 926 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3572 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1222 (i).

Butter Shipments to Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4826 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2545, 2550 (ii).

Debates, Official Rep., on M. for Sel. Com. (remarks) 181 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 730 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1928 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 745, 1854 (i).

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on personal explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2080 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4216 (ii).

Private Bills Petitions, on M. to suspend Rules (remarks) 1178 (i).

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1584 (i); Sen. Amts., 4863 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia and Defence (Military College) 3797 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting (Ms.) 265 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3562 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2123 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3243, 3413 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3580 (ii).

Baird, Mr. G. F., *Queen's, N.B.*

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 509 (i).

Baker, Mr. G. B., *Missisquoi.*
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4696 (ii).
Pub. Accounts, ref. to Standing Com. (M.) 425.
—— Shorthand Writer, Emplymt. (M.) 1267 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Disallowance Man. School Act (M. for Pets.*) 300 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4243 (ii).
Montreal Field Battery, Drill (Ques.) 3194 (ii).
N.W.T., Ordinance No. 22, Protests against (M. for Pets., &c.*) 300 (i).
Representation in House of Commons B. 124 (Mr. *Ouimet*) on consdn. of B., 3458 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35, on M. to refer back to Com., 1695 (i).

Bechard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Govt. Land in Iberville (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1858 (i).
Public Employees, Assignment of Salaries (B. 108) 1°, 2136 (i).

Belley, Mr. L. de G, *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 14.
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°., 2555 (ii).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4455 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4236 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 5.
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2839 (ii).
Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on personal explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2047; on M. to adjn. deb. 2076 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4697 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
"Ocean" SS., Claims for Damages against, *re* Lock 12, Beauharnois Canal (M. for Cor.*) 2023 (i).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry., Subsides (M. for Ret.) 333 (i).
Valleyfield Sewer, Repairs (Ques.) 2509 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4067 (ii).
Dom. Franchise Act Amt. (B. 20) 1°, 222 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1852 (i).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Three Rivers Hay Shed (Ques.) 2358 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Agricultural Implements and Tariff, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4827 (ii).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3385 (ii)
Customs Collectorship, Montreal (Ques.) 205 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2605 (ii).
Kemptville P.O., Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2815 (ii).
Liquor Traffic Commission, Number of Meetings, (Ques.) 3084 (ii).
Morden Pier, Engineers' Reps. respecting (M. for Cor., &c.*) 477 (i).
San Jose "Scale" Pest (Ques.) 926 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum 3552 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3984 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 4329 (ii).
Indians (N.S.) 2484 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2629 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2278. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2308 (i).

Boston, Mr. R., *South Middlesex.*
Dingman, Absolam, General Inspector Indian Agencies, Appmnt. (Ques.) 4186 (ii).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3663, 3673 (ii).
Lobsters, Regulations as to Size of Catch (Ques.) 574 (i).
Kinney, Jos. R., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ques.) 573 (i).
Meteghan Mail Service (Ques.) 3192 (ii).
Pilotage, St. John, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 2360 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Public Works, 4278; Weights and Measures, &c., 4285 (ii).
Fisheries (Distributing Bounty) 3988; (Fish-breeding, &c.) 3621 (ii); (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335 (i); (N.S.) 3618 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (St. John, &c., and Annapolis) 3593; (St. John and Halifax) 3598 (ii); (St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth) 2332 (i).
Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3178 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 3176 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Seal Island Lighthouse Station) 3661; (Tidal Service) 3617 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2275 (i); (Que.) 3496. Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 3511; (P.E.I.) 3514 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Marquette.*
Lands Leased for Homesteading, Wm. Fleming's case, on M. for Cor., 2375 (i).
Portage la Prairie P.O., Purchase of Site, on M. for O.C., 2379 (i); (remarks) 4902 (ii).
"Stanley," Str., and Hudson Straits (remarks) 4905 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., *Monck.*
Insurance Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3119 (ii)
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3759 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Sen. Amts., 4776 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Votes on Divisions, 4358.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 2268 (i).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Chenier, Dr., Monument, Customs Duties (Ques.) 3712, 4115 (ii).
Civil Service Promotion Examinations (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— Frauds, Montreal (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries, on prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1884 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Return respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1885 (i).
——— Papers *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 481 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiries) 2671, 2942, 3373 (ii).
McDonald, Patrick, Emplymt. by Govt. on Lachine Canal (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
P. O. Inspector, Montreal District, Vacancy (Ques.) 482 (i).
Ste. Angele de Monnoir, ex-Postmaster (remarks) 3713 (ii).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3843 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Printing (Ques.) 230 (i).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1521 (i).
Census and Agricultural Classes (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition, Commissioner Cockburn's Expenses (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Guilbault, E., Emplymt. by Pub. Works Dept. (Ques.) 305 (i).
House of Commons Reading Room, U.S. French Can. Papers (Ques.) 319 (i).
International Fraternal Alliance Ass. Co.'s Registration (Ques.) 3995 (ii).
Louisbourg, proposed Monument by U.S. Citizens (Ques.) 925 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Contract for Cordwood (Ques.) 2726 (ii).
St. Roch des Aulnets Lightship, Cordwood Contract (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Seigniory of Sorel, Govt. Tenants (Ques.) 304 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 513 (i).
State Funerals (Ques.) 2570 (ii).
——— Hon. Thos. White (Ques.) 3193 (ii).
Superannuation of Civil Service Employees (Ques.) 4116 (ii).
Yamaska and St. Ours Locks, Charges on Vessels (Ques.) 2735 (ii).
Yamaska River, Obstructions in Channel (Ques.) 924 (i).

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2587 (ii).
Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3625 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Amt. to Sen. Amts., 4776 (ii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 213 (i).
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4774 (ii).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 23) 1°, 269 (i).
Ry. Employees, Payment of, *re* B. 23 (remarks) 4359 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4463 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3515, 3525 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1429 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Point Tupper Terminus (M. for Pets., &c.) 340 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3402, 3418 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3463 (ii).
I.C.R., Siding or Flag Station in Inverness (M. for Pets., &c.*) 343 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., &c. (M. for Cor.*) 300 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 508 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4334 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2315 (i).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3699 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Brigade Camp No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2610 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1539 (i).
Columbian Exhibition, Can. Expenses (Ques.) 1361 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. 6 m.h., 2150 (i)
Cullers at Montreal and Quebec, Number, &c. (Ques.) 577 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3463 (ii).
Industrial Establishments in Chatham (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).
McGregor's Creek, Sheet Piling (Ques.) 577 (i)
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 1942 (i).
Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2678 (ii)
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Lighting, &c.) 2303: (Man.) 2300 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3529 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Continued*

Toronto Drill Hall, Cost (Ques.) 1362 (i).
World's Fair, Dom. Employees (Ques.) 3710 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2291 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*

Antigonish and Shelburne Mail Service (Ans.) 2510 (ii).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Subsidy, Amount paid B. C. Express Co. (Ans.) 932 (i).
Athlone-Tottenham Mail Service, Tenders for Contract (Ans.) 1588 (i), 3193 (ii).
Baie St. Paul and Chicoutimi Mail Contract (Ans.) 3816 (ii).
Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, Ret. *re*, 4358 (ii).
Bealton P.O., Change of Name (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Boston P.O., Change of Name (Ans.) 1267 (i).
B. C. Mail Service, Contracts (Ans.) 3708 (ii).
Cape Breton Mail Service (Ans.) 427 (i).
DeBlois Station (P.E.I.) Mail Contract (Ans.) 771 (i).
Grey, Lt.-Col. John, Appnmt. as Supt. of Stores (Ans.) 3358 (ii).
Hull P.O. Letter Carriers (Ans.) 1586 (i).
International Convention *re* Industrial Property, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 2405 (i).
Kemptville Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).
Kildare Station (P.E.I) Post Office (Ans.) 2511 (ii)
Kingston and Ottawa Mail Service (remarks) 840 (i).
Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail (Ans.) 1182 (i).
Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford Mail Contract (Ans.) 575 (i), 3715 (ii).
Lamontagne, Jos., Mail Contract, on M. for copies (Amt.) 1974 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 2353 (i).
Laprairie Camp, Supply of Groceries (Ans.) 3193.
Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4805 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Sen. Amts. 4775, (ii).
Little Hope Island Bell Buoy, on M. for Ret., 2403 (i).
Loiselle, Papers *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 482 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1887 (i).
McIntyre's Station (C.B.) and Hawkesbury Mail Service (Ans.) 1971 (i).
Malignant Cove, Merigomish, Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 2140 (i).
Mattice, Lt.-Col. G., Retirement and Reappointment (Ans.) 3358 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—*Continued.*

Mar. Provs. Mail Service (Ans.) 2359 (i).
Metapedia and Caplan Mail Service (Ans.) 305 (i).
Meteghan Mail Service (Ans.) 3192 (ii).
Militia Force, Savings by Reduction (Ans.) 3356.
Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured (statement) 4189 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Letter Box Contract (Ans.) 1969.
—— Field Battery, Drill (Ans.) 3194 (ii)
Ocean Mail Service, Dom. and Allan Lines (Ans.) 922 (i).
Papineauville and Cheneville Mail Contract (Ans.) 580 (i).
Port de Bert, Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 305 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 1697 (i).
Post Office Expenditure (Ans.) 926 (i).
—— Inspector Montreal District, Vacancy (Ans.) 482 (i).
Richmond Station and Denison's Mills Mail Contract (Ans.) 3357 (ii).
Ste. Angele de Monnoir Postmaster, Papers respecting (presented) 3627: (remarks) 3713 (ii).
St. Louis Station (P.E.I.) and Palmer Road, &c., Mail Contract (Ans.) 699 (i).
—— Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 771, 2359 (i).
St. Thomas P.O., Employees' Salaries (Ans.) 2357 (i).
Savings Banks Deposits, Gross Amounts, on M. for Ret., 332 (i).
—— Total Amounts (Ans.) 2508 (ii).
Secretan, J. A., Amount Paid by Govt. (Ans.) 3358 (ii).
Standing Coms., Lists (presented) 223 (i).
—— Names added (M.) 767 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor. 2391 (i).
Shields, F., ex-Postmaster at Milton, N.S. (Ans.) 304 (i).
—— on M. for Cor., 325 (i).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2505, 4312 (ii).
Civil Government (Post Office) 1913 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2101. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2106 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3612 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3407 (ii).
Trois Pistoles, Charges against Postmaster (Ans.) 4708 (ii).
Wakefield and Rupert Mail Service (Ans.) 1585.

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*

I.C.R., Summer Time Tables, Changes (Ans.) 1970 (i).
Laurentides P.O., Purchase of Building (Ques.) 3083 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*

Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4758 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 54 (i).
Allan, late Dr., Gratuity to Widow (M. for O. C., &c.) 298 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet., *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2435 (ii).
——— Rep., Delay in presentation (remarks) 86 (i)
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers by Russian Cruisers (remarks) 3372 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3867.
——— on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
——— Expenses *re* Arbitration (Ques.) 426 (i).
Budget, The (reply) 553, 622; (Amt.) 655; neg. (Y. 71, N. 117) 1816 (i).
——— on Finance Minister's Explanations (remarks) 622 (i).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4798 (ii).
Canada and N'fld., Conference of Delegates (remarks) 271 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 350 (i).
Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com., 2293 (i).
Canal Improvements in St. Lawrence (Ques.) 306
Census Inaccuracies, Return respecting, on Ques. of Order, 1831 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3746 (ii).
Commercial Treaties. *See* "Treaty with France."
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4781 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4164; on consdn. of B., 4473 (ii).
——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1268 (i).
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 236 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Distribution (remarks) 231 (i).
Dom. Govt's. Credit in Banks (Ques.) 204 (i).
Dom. Notes Act Amt. (remarks) 197 (i).
Estimates, Suppl. (Ques.) 572, 619, 1182 (i).
Exchange Bank, Rets. *re* (remarks) 3368 (ii).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret*) 222 (i).
Farm Lands in Ont., Value (explanation) 772.
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 456 (i).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2700 (ii).
Immigration to the N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3780 (ii).
——— Transport of Jew Pedlars, on M. for Cor., 262 (i).
Imports and Exports, 1893-95 (Ques.) 425 (i).
——— Dutiable Goods (remarks) 576 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
Ins. Act Amt. (remarks) 571 (i).
——— B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3116 (ii).
Industries, Returns *re* (remarks) 1186 (i).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3592 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries, on prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1884 (i).
Kingston and Ottawa Mail Service (remarks) 839.
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3070.
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4268.
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1898 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb., 4573 (ii).
Markland Mortgage, Kingston (remarks) 1267 (i), 3557 (ii).
——— Discharge B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 1883 (i); on M. for 2°, 3928; in Com., 3930; on M. for 3°, 4063 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations, on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 360 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 377.
Piping for Wells, Duty (Ques.) 3708 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time (remarks) 1177 (i)
———Petitions, on M to suspend Rules (remarks) 1177 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Controller of Customs, M. to adjn. Hse., 4709 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2945 (ii)
Public Works, Contracts Entered into (Ques.) 204, 230 (i).
Revenue and Expenditure for April, 1894-95 (Ques.) 427 (i).
Savings Banks Deposits, Total Amounts (Ques.) 2598 (ii).
Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 79 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3552 (ii).
——— Meetings during Sittings of House, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3911 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 498 (i).
Senate, Vacancies and Appnmts. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Sittings of the House, Delay in Opening (remarks) 2607 (ii).
Statistical Year-Book, Printing, &c., Instructions, on M. for copy, 220 (i).
Sugar Imported into Montreal and Halifax (Ques.) 1060 (i).
——— Raw and Refined (Ques.) 768 (i).
Superannuation Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1821 (i).
——— List, Names, Appnmts., &c., on M. for Ret., 274 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3383; (Photographic Exhibition) 3355 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Rapide Plat) 3703: (Trent Valley) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Cornwall) 2263: (Chambly) 2261: (Lachine) Expenses re Commission, 2229: (Rideau) 2256: (Welland) 2267 (i).

Civil Government (Customs) 2710: (Finance) 2704 (ii); (Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office) 1912 (i); (Post Office) 2719, computing Interest, 3090: (Railways and Canals) 2723 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Beauharnois) 2270: (Lachine) 2273: (Williamsburgh) 2272 (i). Culling Timber, 4282. Customs, 4349. Dominion Lands, 4347. Excise, 4279. Post Office, 2501, 4312. Public Works, 4276. Trade and Commerce, 4347. Weights and Measures, &c., 2504, 4301 (ii).

Fisheries (Frauds re Bounty) 2351 (i).

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 3814; (Ont. and Que.) 2483 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (B.C.) 1948; (Ont.) 1847.

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2097: (Hugh Sutherland's Indemnity) 2091: (Voters' Lists) 1952, 2099 (i). Library (Salaries, &c.) 3341 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 3617 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3609; (Baddeck, &c., and Port Mulgrave) 3608: (Pictou and Montague Bridge, P.E.I.) 3599: (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 3597 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Esquimalt Defences) 3189: (Military College) 3806 (ii): (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2197, 2217 (i), 3177 (ii):

Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490 (ii): (Duties on Army and Navy Supplies) 3906: (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2491, 2611, 2626; (Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund) 2653: (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2500, 2632; (Surveys, &c., Northumberland Straits) 3808 (ii).

Mounted Police, 3075 (ii).

Open Account (Seed Grain) 2661 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3141, Binder Twine, 3145 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3468 (ii): *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 2298: (N.B.) 2274 (i), 3490: (N.S.) 3477 (ii); (Ont.) 2296 (i), 3505 (ii): (Que.) Lighting Montreal P.O., 2295: (Repairs, &c., Rideau Hall) 2302 (i); Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3525: (Que.) 3514.

Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3675: (I.C.R.) 3683 (ii).

Scientific Institutions, &c. (Hydrographic Surveys) 3618 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 266 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3559; in Com., 3567; on M. for 3°, 3820 (ii.

—— B. 44 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 479 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Contracts (Ques.) 204 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*

Vacancies in the Senate, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3848: neg. (Y. 55. N. 95) 3855 (ii)

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1827 (i).

Ways and Means, on M. for Com. (remarks) 180.

—— The Tariff: in Com., 4856 (ii).

Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 435 (i).

Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry., Legislation (remarks) 4254 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Address to His Ex., on the, 131 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet (remarks) 4581 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4274 (ii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3128 (ii).

Baie St. Paul and Chicoutimi Mail Contract (Ques.) 3816 (ii).

Baie St. Paul Pier, Contract for Construction (Ques.) 3816 (ii).

Barry's Bay Station, Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry., Closing (M. for Ret.) 4004 (ii).

Board of Experts (Customs) in U.S. (Ques.) 1826.

Budget, The (remarks) 1263 (i).

—— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1794 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3762 (ii).

Commercial Treaties. *See* "Treaty with France."

Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4718 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4694 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 1°, 3914 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4490.

—— Deptl. Employees, Special (Ques.) 2164 (i).

—— Duties on American Hardware, on Ques. of Order, 1283 (i).

—— Valuations, Outside Agents, &c. (Ques.) 1826 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4071 (ii).

Drainage across Ry. Lines (M. for Stmnt.) 208.

—— Ry. Lands (B. 49) 1°, 477 (i).

Fenelon Falls, Filling up Road (Ques.) 4581 (ii).

Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3977 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638, 3641; in Com., 3658 (ii).

Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3621 (ii).

Govt. Contracts to Aliens Prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2528 (ii).

Imports of Free Goods by Govt. (Ques.) 2571 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3759 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3002.

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4115 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 839 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Amt. to Sen. Amts., 4777.

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Com. (Ques.) 85 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Royal Commission, Date, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 210 (i).

Locomotive Boilers, Inspection by Govt. (prop. Res.) 3199 (ii).

Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb., 4578 (ii).

Ministerial Explanations, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 370 (i).

N'fld, Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1184 (i).

Orange Procession on Parliament Grounds (remarks) 4255 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2513 (ii).

——— (Ques. of) Man. Schools, 820 (i).

——— (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 3001 (ii).

——— Sel. Com. on Rys., &c., 3911 (ii).

Ottawa Public Buildings, Protection against Storms, &c. (remarks) 2573 (ii).

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 609 (i).

Ry. Act Amt., Security of Passengers (B. 65) 1°, 617 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, Expend., &c. (Ques.) 4355 (ii).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Judge Desnoyers's Decision (Ques.) 1552 (i).

——— Civil Proceedings against (Ques.) 1588 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, par. in North Sydney *Herald* (Ques.) 4580 (ii).

St. Thomas P. O., Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (i).

——— Employees' Salaries (Ques.) 2357 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 485, 501 (i).

Statistical Year-Book, Printing, &c., Instructions (M. for copy) 217 (i).

Superannuation List, Names, Appnmts., &c., on M. for Ret., 275 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 3343; (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 3349 (ii); (Dairying Interests) 2116 (i), 3351, 3981, 4469; (Experimental Farms) 3981; (*Patent Record*) 3345; (Photographic Exhibition) 3352 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2223. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2254 (i).

Civil Government (Sec. of State) 3930 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, &c., 4309. Post Office, 4334. Weights and Measures, &c., 4285, 4301 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 3886 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1954 (i).

Miscellaneous (Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund) 2656: (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2676 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3186; (Drill, City Corps, &c.) 4460: (Military College) 3790: (Military Properties) 3180 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2214, 2221 (i); (Transport, Freight, &c.) 3187; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 3185 (ii).

Quarantine (Organized Districts) 3354 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Revenue and Expenses (Ques.) 4356 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3826 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Outside Printing (Ques.) 229, 308 (i).

Wheat Profits, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2051 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*

Athlone-Tottenham Mail Service, Tenders for Contract (Ques.) 1587 (i), 3193 (ii).

Bealton P.O., Change of Name (Ques.) 1268 (i).

Boston P.O., Change of Name (Ques.) 1267 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1187 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 3) Seduction, &c., 1°*, 79; 2° m., 2145 (i).

——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4086 (ii).

Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1273 (i).

——— Employees, Extra or Regular (Ques.) 3191.

Commercial Treaties. *See* "Treaty with France."

Deptl. Reps., Distribution (M. for Stmt.) 312 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 716, 1875 (i).

Exports to Australia (Ques.) 84 (i).

Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal (B. 14) 1°, 182.

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 446 (i).

Geological Survey Rep. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Govt. Business, precedence of deb. on Address, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 78 (i).

——— precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).

Immigration, Transport of Jew Pedlars, on M. for Cor., 264 (i).

Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1825 (i).

Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4121 (ii).

Land Grants (Denominational) in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).

Langevin Block, Ottawa, Claim for Extras (Ques.) 1970 (i).

Lord's Day Observance (B. 2) 1°*, 79; 2°, 465; in Com., 737, 741, 1841 (i).

——— (M.) to restore to Order Paper, 766 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Lumber and Saw-logs Free, on M. for Com. of Sup. (personal explanation) 2031; on M. to adjn. deb., 2067 (i).
Maps of Electoral Districts, Preparation (Ques.) 1081 (i).
Military College, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 1588.
——— Number of Cadets (Ques.) 1973 (i).
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4076, 4117 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4368 (ii).
Road and Road Allowances in Man. B. 114 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4073 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal and C.P.R. (Ques.) 1973.
Schools in Man., Judicial Decisions (M. for copies*) 221 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3548 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 490 (i).
Subsidies Voted to Rys. in 1891 (Ques.) 230 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Rapide Plat) 3704 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4284 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3607 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3466. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 3487; (Que.) 3495 (ii).

Sutton, Mr., Appnmt. to Royal Can. Dragoons (Ques.) 1972 (i).
Tay Canal, Revenue and Maintenance (Ques.) 230 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3233 (ii).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3559; in Com., 3577 (ii).
U.S. Legislation re Navigation of the Great Lakes (remarks) 3556 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1828 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*

Butter Shipments to Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4824 (ii).
Can. Ins. Promotion Ass. incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 1179 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2548, 2553 (ii).
Gendreau, Telesphore, inquiry respecting (Ques.) 2138 (i).
——— Charges against (Ques.) 3712 (ii).
I.C.R., Cap St. Ignace and Halifax Express (Ques.) 1973 (i).
——— Cap St. Ignace Station, new Siding (Ques.) 2571 (ii).
——— Sale of Newspapers, Contract (M. for Ret.*) 222 (i).
——— Summer Time Tables, Changes (Ques.) 970 (i), 2571 (ii).
——— Thefts from Carleton Sheds (Ques.) 272 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*

Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4807 (ii).
Little River St. François, Improvements (Ques.) 1361 (i).
Lowe, Henry, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1179
Puize, L. T., Claim against Govt. (M. for Pets.*) 300 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Contract for Cordwood (Ques.) 2726 (ii).
St. Roch des Aulnets Lightship, Cordwood Contract (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Extra Work by Contractors (Ques.) 272 (i).
Seizure of Illicit Still at L'Islet Station (Ques.) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).
Silver-Lead Smelting, Encouragement B. 142 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4125 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Justice) Gisborne, &c., services, 1914 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, &c., 2593 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2495 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3654 (ii).

Tobacco Seizure at Isle Verte (Ques.) 697 (i).
——— in Temiscouata (Ques.) 489 (i).
Trois Pistoles, Charges against Postmaster (Ques.) 4708 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4102 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Collector of Tolls (Ques.) 4357.
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2806 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jr., *East Toronto.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1408 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 24) Union Labels, &c., 1°, 269 (i).
Fish Imports from France, Quantities, &c. (Ques) 1550 (i).
Fishing Licenses paid N'fld., Refund (Ques.) 1551 (i).
Imperial Trusts Co. of Can. consolid. Act Amt. (B. 72) 1°*, 839 (i).
Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail (Ques.) 1182 (i).
Lieut. Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 836 (i).
Lobster Hatcheries in Maritime Provinces (Ques.) 1551 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 425 (i); in Com., 3230, 3244, 3408, 4030; 3° m., 4154; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4159.
——— (M.) to ref. back to Com., 3589 (ii).

Cleveland, Mr. C. C., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2126 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1084 (i).
Canals, Depth of Water (Ques.) 921 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4105 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3756 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4269.
Ocean Mail Service, Dom. and Allan Lines (Ques.) 921 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4677 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 494 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4160 (ii).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Carleton, N.B., Bonded Warehouses, Closing (Ques.) 2357 (i).
Fishery Officers on the Miramichi (Ques.) 1081 (i).
——— Regulations, St. John River (Ques.) 430 (i).
Maduxnekeag, Fishway at Dam (Ques.) 699 (i).
St. John River, Improved Navigation (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
——— Fishing Regulations (Ques.) 273 (i).
Salmon Fishing in N.B. (Ques.) 3455 (ii.)

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2196 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1864 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4377 (ii).
Penitentiary, B.C., Jas. Fitzsimmons's Reinstatement, on M. for Cor., 298 (i).
——— Justice Drake's Instructions (M. for copy) 297 (i).
——— Warden McBride's Retirement (Ques.) 308.
——— W. A. Kearney's Retirement (Ques.) 308.
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4819 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3533 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 171 (i).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers, on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
——— Expenses *re* Arbitration (Ans.) 426 (i).
——— Payment of Indemnity to Sealers (Ans.) 620 (i).
——— Seal Fisheries, Arms and Implements (Ans.) 1083 (i).
——— Compensation to Sealers (Ans.) 83 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Camp Harmony Angling Club incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1733 (i).
Cascumpeque Harbour Buoys, Contract *re* (Ans.) 2358 (i).
Cattle Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 145 (i).
Darnley Basin, &c., Buoys and Range Lights (Ans.) 589 (i).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 229 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt., Exemptions (B. 67) 1°, 618 (i); 2° m., 2574; in Com., 2593 (ii).
——— (B. 91) 1°, 1179 (i).
——— Salmon Fishery (B. 118) 1°, 2919 (i).
Fishery Officers on the Miramichi (Ans.) 1082 (i).
——— Overseer, Kent District, Ont. (Ans.) 698 (i).
——— Regulations, St. John River (Ans.) 273, 430 (i).
Fishing Licenses paid N'fld., Refund (Ans.) 1551.
——— Regulations in Detroit and St. C'air Rivers, &c. (Ans.) 2356 (i).
——— Regulations, Gulf St. Lawrence (Ans.) 427.
Gendreau, Télesphore, inquiry respecting (Ans.) 2138 (i).
——— Charges against (Ans.) 3713 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission, Rep. (Ans.) 3983 (ii).
Kinney, Jos. R., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ans.) 573 (i).
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 91) 1°, 1179; 2° m., 3092; in Com., 3094, 3659; Sen. Amts., 3672 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Season, Extension of Time (Ans.) 2573 (ii).
——— Hatcheries in Maritime Provinces (Ans. 1551 (i).
——— Packing, License Fees (Ans.) 286 (i).
Lobsters, Regulations as to Size and Catch (Ans.) 574 (i).
Maduxnekeag, Fishway at Dam (Ans.) 699 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4688 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Reps. (presented) 758 (i), 2569 (ii).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. C's, &c., 1986 (i).
North Cape (P.E.I.) Whistling Buoy (Ans.) 931.
Pilotage in Bonaventure, Compulsory, on M. for Cor., 340 (i).
——— St. John, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 2360 (i).
Plummer's Wharf, Sault Ste. Marie, Govt. Title (Ans.) 2363 (i).
St. John River (N.B.) Fishing Regulations (Ans). 273, 430 (i).
St. Rochs des Aulnets, Cordwood Contract (Ans.) 2727 (ii).
"San Pedro," Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 933 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1978 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*

Sea Fisheries, &c., Development (B. 74) 1°, 839 (i); 3°, 3086 (ii).

Shipping Regulations on the Great Lakes (Ans.) 2361 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Marine and Fisheries) 2721 (ii).

Collection of Revenue: Post Office, 4331 (ii).

Fisheries (Distributing Bounty) 3891 (ii); (Gratuity to J. R. Spencer's Widow) 2334 (i); (Man.) 3519; (N.S.) 3548 (ii); (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 2091 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gratuity to William Smith's Widow) 2234 (i); (Maintenance, &c.) 3517 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Seal Island Lighthouse Station) 3616; (Tidal Service) 3616 (ii).

Lignish Breakwater, Wharfage Fees Collected (Ans.) 982, 2358 (i).

—— Wharfinger, Amounts Collected, &c. (Ans.) 430 (i).

Curran, Hon. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*

Connolly, Messrs., Process of Execution against (remarks) 233 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. 6 m. h., 2149 (i).

—— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4107 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4183 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4070 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M for Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii)

Larkin, Connolly & Co., Suit against (Ans.) 203 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 739, 1858 (i).

Penitentiaries' Rep. (presented) 1353 (i).

Penitentiary, B. C., James Fitzsimmons's Suspension (Ans.) 205 (i).

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 608 (i).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Prosecution *re* Lachine Canal Bridge Contract (Ans.) 927 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 512 (i).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35, on M. to refer back to Com., 1692 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2654 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3417 (ii).

Watters, T. J., Offences under Customs Act (Ans.) 929 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1113 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D.—*Continued.*

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ingram*) 723 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4679 (ii).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2799 (ii).

Daly, Hon. T. M., *Selkirk.*

Anderson, Jas., of Sutton, Emplmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 306, 479 (i).

Booth, Gen., Land for proposed Colony (Ans.) 427, 2361 (i).

Dingman, Absolam, General Inspector Indian Agencies, Appmnt. (Ans.) 4186 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 116) 1°, 2507; in Com., 3270; Sen. Amts., 3920 (ii).

Foster, H. S., Sale of Govt. Land in Iberville (Ans.) 3195 (ii).

General Revenue Fund, N.W.T. (B. 134) prop. Res., 2573; in Com. on Res., 3122; 1° of B., 3267; in Com., 3720 (ii).

Geological Survey, Summary Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

—— Madoc and Marmora (Ans.) 2943 (ii).

Governor General, Reduction of Salary B. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m.h., 3252 (ii).

Hatch, Walter, Superannuation (Ans.) 1079 (i).

Huron Indians at Lorette and agent Bastien, M. for Cor. 1975 (i).

Immigration, Michigan to Ont., Govt. Aid (Ans.) 429 (i).

—— to N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3771.

Indian Act Amt. (B. 100) 1°*, 2351 (i); 2° m., 3933.

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1082 (i).

Irrigation in N.W.T. (B. 120) 1°, 3079; in Com., 4768 (ii).

Isle aux Noix, Govt. Land Sales (Ans.) 2510 (ii).

Jew Pedlars, Transport from Chicago to Calgary, on M. for Cor., 250, 263 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2187 (i); in Com. on B. 127, 3732 (ii).

Land Grants (Denominational) in Man and N.-W.T., on M. for Ret., 209 (i).

Lands Leased for Homesteading, Wm. Fleming's Case, on M. for Cor., 2367 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) in Com., 1965 (i).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 811, 812 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1908 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb. 4576 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 121) 1°*, 3080; in Com., 4074, 4118; on 3°, 4361, 4762; Sen. Amts., 4470 (ii).

—— Act Amt. (B. 135) 1°*, 3455; 2°, m., 3930; in Com., 3932 (ii).

Daly, Hon. T. M.—*Continued.*
Oka Indians, Transfer to Muskoka, Number (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Census Inaccuracies, 1831 (i).
——— Manitoba Schools, on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 804 (i).
Paradis, Rev. Father, Colonization Scheme (Ans.) 3197 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2169 (i).
Pre-emption Lots in Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 3199 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
Qu'Appelle Valley Indian Reserves, Shooting Privileges (Ans.) 1550 (i).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4007.
Railway Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Foster*) 2° m., 4078; in Com., 4079 (ii).
Reed, Hayter, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 1830 (i).
Road and Road Allowances in Man. (B. 114) 1°*, 2405; in Com., 4073 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Water Lots (Ans.) 1549 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Indians, Memorials, &c., on M. for Ret., 4009 (ii).
Salvation Army, Gen. Booth's Immigration Scheme (Ans.) 427, 2361 (i).
Seigniory of Sorel, Govt. Tenants (Ans.) 304 (i).
Six Nation Indians, Deptl. Reps., Distribution (Ans.) 429 (i).
Sugar Island, Sale by Govt. (Ans.) 3359 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1945 (i), 2691; contingencies, 3102 (ii); (Interior) 1918, 1938 (i), 2389 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 4352, Dominion Lands, 4348, Post Office, 4342 (ii).
Geological Survey (Artesian Borings) 2488 (ii).
Government of N. W. T., 3305 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2487, 3875, 3895; (Man. and N. W.T.) 3814; (N.B.) Salaries, 3813; (N.S.) 2481; (Ont. and Que.) 2483, 3813 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Medicine Hat Hospital) 2499; (Passamaquoddy Bay, Boundary) 3308; (Roads and Bridges, Banff) 3307 (ii).
Mounted Police, 3679 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 2661 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3172 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 2298.
Survey of Township 16, Range 16-W. (Ans.) 2138.
Thousand Islands, Reservations for Park, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4003 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4868; in Com, 4870; on M. for 2° of B., 4883 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3134 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2464 (ii).
Ballot Papers, B. respecting (remarks) 3915 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Behring Sea, Conference between Great Britain and United States (remarks) 1185 (i).
——— Seizure of Sealers by Russian Cruisers (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3856, 3873 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1622 (i).
Can. and N'fld., Conference of Delegates (remarks, 270 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 343 (i).
Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com., 2293 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Point Tupper Terminus, on M. for Pets., &c., 341 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. 6 m. h., 2149 (i).
——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4085 (ii).
——— Joint Com., Reduction of Quorum, 3266.
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4144, 4167 (ii).
Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1288 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 4065; in Com., 3922, 4066 (ii).
——— (B. 76) 1°, 918 (i).
Dom. Notes Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3087 (ii).
"Duart Castle," &c., SS., Manifests of Cargoes (M. for Ret.*) 2023 (i).
Female Offenders in N.S., B. 128 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 3717; in Com., 3719 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (Exemptions) B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 619 (i); on M. for 2°, 2576; in Com., 2607 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3462 (ii).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2699 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Subsidies respecting (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1824 (i).
Imports of Dutiable Goods, Amount and Duties Collected (Ques.) 576 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., in Com. on Res., 4063 (ii).
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3117.
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Time Tables (Ques.) 1828.
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3945 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (Salaries) in Com. on Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2181, 2193 (i); in Com. on B. 127, 3724 (ii).
——— (Superannuation) in Com. on Res., 3088 (ii)
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 2815; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3077.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3096; on 2° of Amts., 3672 (ii).

Lobster Fishing, Extension of Season (Ques.) 2573, 3360 (ii).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Return respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1899 (i).

Manitoba Schools, Papers respecting Law (remarks) 572 (i).

Ministerial Explanations, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 378 (i).

Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* Confederation (remarks) 840, 855, 919 (i).

——— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1183 (i).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4077 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2176 (i).

——— Bill 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4366 (ii).

Pickford and Black's Contract, Halifax and W. Indies (Ques.) 922 (i).

Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 309.

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 605 (i).

Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2946 (ii).

Rice Imports, July '94 to May '95, Quantity (Ques.) 1585 (i).

Rustico Breakwater, Tenders for Contract (Ques.) 699 (i).

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret. 2777 (ii).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c., B. 74 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 3087 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 506 (i).

Steam Service, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 292 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. and Rys. Built by Dom., Names, Cost, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2023 (i).

Subsidized SS. Contracts, Mar. Provs. and W. Indies (M. for Ret.) 2023 (i).

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2162 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3983 (ii)

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2224. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2229 (i).

Charges of Management, 3106 (ii); (Asst. Receiver Gen.'s Office, Charlottetown) 1910 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3105: (Civil Service Examiners) 3100; (Customs) 2710: (Finance) 2708 (ii): (Interior) 1909; (Justice) J. W. Hughes' services, 1915 (i); (Marine and Fisheries) 2721; (Militia and Defence) contingencies, 3100: (Post Office) 2720; (Public Works) 2722, contingencies, 3102; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 3101; (Trade and Commerce) contingencies, 3105 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4331 (ii).

Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335; (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Justice, Administration of (Official Arbitrators) 3106: (Supreme Court) 3108: (Travelling Expenses High Court Judges) 3107 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2104. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2107 (i).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 3907; (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2493, 2616; (Mr. Fabre's Salary) 3907: (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2500, 2633, conc., 2673 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3178 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3142 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) St. John Custom House, 2285: (Repairs, &c., Rideau Hall) 2302. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2323; (N.B.) 2295 (i); (N.S.) 3510; (Que.) 3524 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3683 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (remarks) 2516 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3839 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1828 (i).

Watters, T. J., Offences under Customs Act (Ques.) 920 (i).

West Indies, Subsidised Service Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3819 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*

Address to His Ex., on The, 115 (explanation) 154 (i).

Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4794 (ii).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1838 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4716 (ii).

Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage (prop. Res.) 4011 (ii).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 239 (i).

Debates Official Rep., Distribution (remarks) 232 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women (prop. Res.) 701, 1837; neg. (Y. 47, N. 105) 2144 (i).

Freight Rates Commission, N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 4022 (ii).

Jew Pedlars, Transport from Chicago to Calgary, on M. for Cor., 262 (i).

Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4267.

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii)

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4667 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119; on M. for 3°, 4364 (ii).

Qu'Appelle Valley Indian Reserve, Shooting Privileges (Ques.) 1550 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

Rebellion in N.W.T., Scrip for Scouts, &c. (prop. Res.) 2400 (i).

Rifle Associations in N.W.T., Discarded Rifles (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3550 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2130 (i)
Canals—Income (Welland) 2268 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies 3104 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 3879 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3143 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3574 (ii).

U. S. Alien Labour Law (remarks) 4908 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. (sawed boards) 4854 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*

Calgary and Lethbridge Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 839 (i).

Dawson, Mr. G. W. W., *Addington.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1436 (i).

Dominion Bank, Vanluven's Declarations (Ques.) 3996 (ii).

West Rideau Lake Dam, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3996 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*

Bankers' Life Association of Can. incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 425 (i).

Canals, Depth of Water (Ques.) 921 (i).

Customs Officials, Toronto, Emplymt. (Ques.) 305 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1875 (i).

Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2698 (ii).

International Convention *re* Industrial Property (prop. Res.) 2403 (i).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3594 (ii).

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 616 (i).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4216 (ii).

Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) M. for Com. (objection) 1731 (i).

Ocean Mail Service, Dom. and Allan Lines (Ques.) 921 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3552 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 493 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Rapide Plat) 3703 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4318 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' List) 1951. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2195 (i).
Militia and Defence (Military College) 3781 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2199 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) Lighting Montreal P.O., 2294 (i)

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa (County).*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1092 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse. 4723 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2595 (ii).

Govt. Surveys, &c., Outside Work (Ques.) 1586.

Hull P. O. Letter Carriers (Ques.) 1586 (i).

Immigration, Michigan to Ont., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 429 (i).

"Laval" Dredge, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 428 (i).

Leduc, Charles, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4356.

Papineauville and Cheneville Mail Contract (Ques.) 580 (i).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Condition, &c. (Ques.) 574 (i).

——— Gross Earnings (M. for Stmnt.) 211 (i).

——— Payment of Subsidy (Ques.) 1586 (i).

——— Reps. to Govt. (M. for copies, &c.*) 2405 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Interior) 1944 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2625 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3143 (ii).

Voters' Lists for Wright (remarks) 2351 (i).

Wakefield and Rupert Mail Service (Ques.) 1585.

Dickey, Hon. A. R., *Cumberland.*

Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2472 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 860, 1661 (i).

Beacon Hill (B.C.) Powder Magazine (Ans.) 919.

Brigade Camp No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2609 (ii).

Can. Troops for England (Ans.) 1180 (i).

Carling Brewing Co.'s Property, Govt. Lease (Ans.) 573 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4735 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4106 (ii).

Garrison Artillery, Quebec, No. 3 Battery, on M. for Cor. (Amt.) 1974 (i).

Guy, Charles, Peterborough, Pension (Ans.) 1452.

Herbert, Maj.-Gen. Resignation as Commander of Militia (Ans.) 2137 (ii).

Isle aux Noix, Govt. Property (Ans.) 2511 (ii).

Lazier, Lt.-Col., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3596 (ii).

Dickey, Hon. A. R.—*Continued.*

Laprairie Camp, Supply of Groceries (Ans.) 3193.
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 793 (i).
London Military School, Sewage Discharge (Ans.) 1359 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 759 (i).
Louisbourg, Proposed Monument by U.S. Citizens (Ans.) 925 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
Military College, Board of Visitors (Ans.) 1588 (i).
——— Kingston, Number of Cadets (Ans.) 1973.
——— Grounds at Annapolis, Rental of Stores (Ans.) 2140 (i).
Militia and Defence Deptl. Rep. (presented) 571.
——— Drill, 1895 (Ans.) 573 (i).
Permanent Corps, Total Strength (Ans.) 2362 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Contract for Cordwood (Ans.) 2726 (ii).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4904 (ii).
Rifle Associations in N.W.T., Discarded Rifles (Ans.) 1078 (i).
Royal Standard, Right to Hoist (Ans.) 2137, 2354.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Justice) J. W. Hughes' services 1916 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4333 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3185; (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 3189; (Drill, City Corps, &c.) 4460: (Esquimalt Defences) 3189; (Military College) 3800: (Military Properties) 3178 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2197, 2221 (i) 3177; (Provisions, &c.) 3187; (Transport, Freight, &c.) 3187; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 3184 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2626 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Drill Shed, New Westminster) 4462 (ii).
Sutton, Mr., and Appmnt. in Royal Can. Dragoons (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
Troops in Quebec, Reduction in Strength (Ans.) 2361 (i).
Volunteers' Long Service Medals (remarks) 4906.
Weir, Mr., of Keene, Pension (Ans.) 1453 (i).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2141 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 1974 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4442 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4060, 4197 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
Boards of Trade incorp. Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3722 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*

Bounties on Pig Iron made in Canada (M. for Stmnt.*) 2022 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1837 (i).
Can. and N'fld., Negotiations, *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 353 (i).
"City of Midland" Str., Seizure, &c. (Ques.) 4708 (ii).
Copyright, Berne Convention (Ques.) 82 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2683 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 15) 2° m., 2542 (ii).
——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4105 (ii).
Customs Dept. Alleged Irregularities (Ques.) 2754.
——— Duties on American Importations (remarks) 1271 (i).
——— on Spirits (Ques.) 698 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2697 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1873 (i).
Excise Duty on Spirits (Ques.) 698 (i).
Fenelon Falls, Filling up Road (Ques.) 458 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) (Voters' Lists) on M. for 2°, 3635; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638 (ii).
Frauds upon the Govt. Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°, 196 (i).
French Treaty and Foreign Powers, Privileges under (Ques.) 1697 (i).
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3112 (ii).
I.C.R., Maintenance of Way and Works (Ques.) 430 (i).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3751, 3944 (ii).
International Arbitration (remarks) 773 (i).
——— Convention *re* Industrial Property, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 2405 (i).
——— Waterways Commission (remarks) 3456 (ii).
Jarvis, Helen Woodburn, Relief (B. 115) 1°*, 2506.
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2185 (i).
Liquor Traffic, Royal Com. Expenses (Ques.) 83, 201 (i).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 359 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 361 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2513 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 2166; in Com., 2175 (i).
Penitentiary, B.C., Jas. Fitzsimmons' Suspension (Ques.) 204 (i).
Permanent Reserve Life Ass. of Can. incorp. (B. 78) 1°*, 1000 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Groceries Contract (Ques.) 82, 201 (i).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Subsidies, on M. for Ret., 334 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., Meetings during Sittings of House, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3909 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3547 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 488 (i).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1692 (i).

South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4395 (ii).

Sugar Imports (Ques.) 1357 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Welland) 2269 (i).

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2660 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 265; (M. for Ret.) 335 (i).

Treaty with France (B. 126) (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3558, 3564; on M. for 3°, 3821 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision (Ques.) 83, 229 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1129 (i).

——— (explanations) 1114, 1173, 1261 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2577; in Com., 2597 (ii).

Gilmour & Hughson incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 1000 (i).

Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4907 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2290 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. on Res. (sawed boards) 4850 (ii).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., *Bonaventure.*

Anticosti, Electoral Lists, Revision (Ques.) 1359.

I.C.R., Thefts from Carleton Sheds (Ques.) 272.

Metapedia and Caplan Mail Service (Ques.) 305.

Pilotage in Bonaventure, Compulsory (M. for Cor.) 339 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Extra work by Contractors (Ques.) 272 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*

Brampton Industrial Establishments (Ques.) 1182 (i).

Binder Twine, Govt. Sales (Ques.) 3818 (ii).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4847 (ii).

Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 144 (i).

Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 425 (i).

Sheep Exports to Great Britain (M. for Cor.) 2385, 2395 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 744 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee on M. for Com. of Sup., 3139 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1303 (i).

Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 352 (i).

Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 107) 1°, 2136 (i).

Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s (M. for Ret.) 3202, 3375 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4089 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Salaries) in Com. on Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2185 (i).

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Commission (Ques.) 203, 1083, 1951 (i).

——— Expenses of Royal Commission, including Printing, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3094 (ii).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (prop. Res.) 2789 (ii).

St. Thomas P. O., Employes' Salaries (Ques.) 2357 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 492 (i).

Senate, Vacancies and Appnmts. (Ques.) 480 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) on M. for 2°, 4827 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 3343; (Dairying Interests) 3988 (ii).

Fisheries (Distribution of Bounty) 3991 (ii); (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335 (i); N.S.) 3618 (ii).

Indians (N.B.) Salaries, 3813; (Ont. and Que.) 3813 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2612; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2679 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Exam. of Masters &c.) 3615 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2305 (i).

Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3694 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3347 (ii).

Thousand Islands, Number Sold, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 1975 (i).

Yarmouth Bar Breakwater, Cost and Expenditure (M. for Cor.*) 2023 (i).

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*

Anticosti Island, Ownership (M. for Ret.) 322 (i).

Census, Industries in Queen's and Shelburne (M. for Ret.) 326 (i).

——— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).

Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3209, 3378, 4039 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2584; in Com., 2600 (ii).

Halifax Deep Water Terminus, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 3817 (ii).

——— Freight Shed, Tenders (Ques.) 2727 (ii).

I.C.R., Employees' Summer Vacation (Ques.) 2511 (ii).

Forbes, Mr. F. G.—*Continued.*

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Com. (Ques.) 203.
Little Hope Island Bell Buoy (M. for Ret.) 2401.
Liverpool Harbour, Engineers' Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 325 (i).
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3095 (ii).
Military Grounds at Annapolis, Rental of Stores (Ques.) 2139 (i).
Port De Bert Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ques.) 305 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers, N.S. (M. for Ret.) 1975 (i).
Shelburne Harbour, Iron Buoys (Ques.) 700 (i).
Shields, F., ex-Postmaster at Milton (Ques.) 304.
——— (M. for Cor.) 324 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s Contract (Ques.) 1078 (i).
——— B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4396, 4615, 4771 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2338, 2341 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3537 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2305; (N.S.) 2304 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*

Address, to His Ex., on The, 36 (i).
——— Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 3191 (ii).
Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet (remarks) 4581, 4274 (ii).
Agricultural Implements and the Tariff, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4829.
Anticosti Island, Names of Owners, on M. for Ret., 323 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3125 (ii).
Auditor General's Rep., Delay in presentation (Ans.) 86 (i).
——— (presented) 309 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept. (remarks) 2136.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2260, (i), 2421 (ii).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty (B. 148) 1°*, 4861 (ii).
Behring Sea, Conference between Great Britain and U. S. (remarks) 1185 (i).
Boards of Trade incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 3621; 2° m., 3721 (ii).
BUDGET, THE (Financial Stmnt.) 518 (i).
——— (explanation) 620 (i).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4791 (ii).
Can. and N'fld., Conference of Delegates (remarks) 271 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 346 (i).
Can., France and Belgium SS. Line (Ans.) 3197.
Cattle Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 142 (i).
——— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Ret., 297 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting, on Ques. of Order, 1831; (remarks) 1833 (i).
Chignecto Ship Ry., Newspaper par. *re* (remarks) 1354 (i).
Civil Servants, Payment to Temporary Clerks (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 1881 (i).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3746 (ii).
——— Temporary Employees (Ans.) 3995 (ii).
Colonies and the Empire (remarks) 4894 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition Commissioner's Expenses (remarks) 2733 (ii).
Commercial Treaties affecting Can. (B. 44) 1°, 479 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3085 (ii).
——— *See* "Treaty with France."
Companies' Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 3707; 2° m., 4778; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4780; in Com., 4781 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Copyright, Berne Convention (Ans.) 82 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4140 (ii).
——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1275; (Ques. of Order) 1275 (i).
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4017 (ii).
Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4761 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M). 180 (i).
Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 317.
Dom. Govt's. Credit in Banks (Ans.) 204 (i).
——— Notes Act Amt. (B. 22) 1°, 268 (i); in Com., 3087 (ii).
——— Loan (1894) Negotiations (Ans.) 1181 (i).
——— Day, adjnmt. (M.) 3545 (ii).
——— Bank, Vanluven's Declarations (Ans.) 3996.
Drouth in Ont. (remarks) 4582 (ii).
Estimates, The, 1895-96 (presented) 331 (i).
——— Suppl. (Ans.) 619 (i).
——— Suppl., 1894-95 (remarks) 1183 (i).
——— (presented) 1539 (i).
——— Suppl., 1895-96 (presented) 4352 (ii).
Exchange Bank, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3368 (ii).
——— Mr. Ogilvie's Guarantee (Ans.) 3455 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 735, 1867 (i).
Finance Minister's Private Secretary (Ans.) 1361.
Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal B. 14 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 195 (i).
——— B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638 (ii).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 442, 453 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence of deb. on Address (M.) 78 (i).
——— on Thursdays (M.) 2026; agreed to (Y. 87, N. 55) 2029 (i).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 3111, 3621 (ii).
——— Mondays (M.) 4254 (ii).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 2569, 2614 (ii).
Govt. Land in Iberville (Ans.) 1969 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Govt. Surveyors, Outside Work (Ans.) 1587 (i).
Gov. General's Warrants (presented) 85 (i).
Gravel, Bishop, Communication *re* Man. Schools (Ans.) 3368 (ii).
Halliwell, J. L., Pension (Ans.) 1969 (i).
Heir Apparent, Birth Acknowledgment of Address from H. M., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 85 (i).
House of Commons Reading Room, U. S. French-Canadian Papers (Ans.) 3195 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., on adjnmt. (remarks) 181 (i).
——— Subsidies respecting (remarks) 207 : (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Imperial Honours, Recommendations by Gov. Gen. (Ans.) 1973 (i).
——— Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1589 : (Ans.) 1823 ; on Ques. of Order, 1825 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c. (prop. Res.) 3915 ; 2° of Res. and 1°* of B. 143, 4121 (ii).
Internal Economy Com., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 5 (i).
International Arbitration (remarks) 773 (i).
——— Fraternal Alliance, Ass. Co.'s Registration (Ans.) 3995 (ii).
Industries, Returns *re* (remarks) 1185 (i).
Ins. Act. Amt. (B. 92) 1°, 1352 (i) ; in Com., 3112 ; Sen. Amts., 3716 (ii).
——— Exemption of Societies (B. 145) 1°, 4354 ; 2° m., 4768 ; in Com., 4770 (ii).
Ins. Co.'s in Can., Abstract of Statements (presented) 1829 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, precedence of deb. (M.) 2917 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
Lands in Ry. Belt, B.C., Settlement (B. 141) 1°*, 3993 (ii).
Langevin Block, Ottawa, Claim for Extras (Ans.) 1970 (i).
Leduc, Charles, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4356.
Library, Sel. Com. (M.) 223 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 783 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. of Man., Appnmt. (Ans.) 3710 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4265.
Liquor Traffic, Royal Com., Expenses (Ans.) 83, 202 (i).
——— Rep. of Royal Commission (Ans.) 85, 203, 208, 1083, 1959 (i).
——— Number of Meetings (remarks) 3084 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Extension of Season (Ans.) 3360 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1900 (i).
——— Ret. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 3373 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 476 ; in Com., 756 (i).
Magog Wharf, Expenditure of Vote (Ans.) 1968.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Malone, Thos., Civil Service Ins. Policy (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, 1894, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1453 (i).
——— Communications with His Ex. (Ans.) 2572.
——— Judgment of Imp. Privy Council, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 85 (i).
——— Papers respecting Law (remarks) 571 (i).
——— Remedial Order (Ans.) 3716 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3997 (ii).
——— Memorial of Legislative Assembly (presented) 4186 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4403 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4568 (ii).
Markland Mortgage Discharge (B. 92) 1°, 1352 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 2408 (ii).
——— prop. Res., 1883 (i), M. for Com., 2406 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3557 (ii).
——— Discharge (B. 136) 1°, 3558 : 2° m., 3928 ; 3°, 4063 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 5, 331, 1453, 1539 (i), 3191, 4186, 4352 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 354 (i).
——— on (M.) for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).
——— Resignations, Rumoured (statement) 4187.
Moneys Paid to Members outside of Sessional Indemnity, on M. for Ret., 331 (i).
Mounted Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2814 (ii).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 842 (i).
——— Mr. Bond's Mission (remarks) 919 (i).
——— Papers *re* Negotiations (presented) 1539 (i).
——— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1183 (i).
——— (Papers presented) 1246 (i).
Northumberland Straits, Tunnel Borings (Ans.) 206 (i).
Oaths of Office, Administration (B. 1) 1°, 2 (i).
Order (Ques. of) American Hardware Duties, 1275 (i).
——— Man. Schools on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 804 (i).
——— Ruling of Mr. Speaker questioned by Mr. Martin (remarks) 2513, 2515 (ii).
Penitentiary (B.C.) Warden McBride's Retirement (Ans.) 308 (i).
"Prince Edward" Dredge (Ans.) 700 (i).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 223 (i).
——— Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 309 (i).
Private Bills, on M. to Extend Time (remarks) 1177 (i).
Prorogation, Two Sittings each day (remarks) 4738 (ii).
Provincial Payments into Dom. Treasury, on M. for Ret., 299 (i).
——— Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) adjnmt. of deb. (M.) 616 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Public Accounts (presented) 181 (i).
——— Com., Irregular Meetings (remarks) 1829.
——— Meetings (remarks) 2945 (ii).
Quebec Citadel, Groceries Contract (Ans.) 82, 202 (i).
Queen's Birthday, adjnmt (remarks) 1355 (i).
——— adjnmt. (M.) 1452 (i).
——— State Festivities (M. to adjn. Hse.) 2030 (i)
Receiver General (Asst.) St. John, N.B. (Ans.) 1360 (i).
Returns, Cost since 1891-95 (Ans.) 2507 (ii).
——— on Inquiries (remarks) 2671, 2815, 3111, 3818 (ii).
Revenue and Expenditure for April 1894-95 (Ans.) 427 (i).
Rustico Breakwater, Tenders for Contract (Ans.) 699 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, Expend., &c. (Ans.) 4355 (ii).
Savings Banks Deposits, Total Amounts (Ans.) 2508 (ii).
Seizure of Smuggled Goods, on M. for Ret., 4006.
Senate, Vacancies and Appnmts. (Ans.) 481, 483 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5, (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 486 (i).
——— *See* "Indemnity."
Silver-Lead Smelting, Bounty (prop. Res.) 3456; in Com., 3925 (ii).
——— Encouragement (B. 142) 1°*, 4065; in Com., 4124; (M. to recom.) 4763; in Com., 4767 (ii.)
Sittings of the House, Delay in Opening (remarks) 2607 (ii).
——— Morning Sittings (M.) 4770 (ii).
Smith, Henry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 926.
Standing Committees, Select (M.) 4 (i).
——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 180 (i).
Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 284 (i).
Streams Exempted under Fisheries Act (Ans.) 3356 (ii).
Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2152 (i).
——— (B. 102) 1°, 1818 (i); (prop. Res.) 3915 (ii).
——— List of Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 274, 299 (i).
——— Returns *re* (remarks) 774, 1084, 3819 (ii).
Superannuations since 1st Jan. 1895 (Ans.) 3994.
SUPPLY: (Res. for Com.) 189 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3986.
Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 2672; (Farran's Point) conc., 2672 (ii).
Charges of Management (Asst. Rec.-Gen 's Office, Charlottetown) 1910 (i); 3106 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3102; (Civil Service Examiners) 3100 (ii); (Customs) Bales's Salary, 1911 (i); (Finance) 2705; (Geological Survey) 2724 (ii); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec's Office) 1912 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 3097; (Post Office) 2719; (Public Works) 2722;

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Sec. of State) contingencies, 3101 (ii); (Trade and Commerce) Carleton's services, 1912 (i), contingencies, 3105 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Beauharnois) 2270; (Welland) 2273 (i). Post Office, 4339. Trade and Commerce, 4347 (ii).
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Official Arbitrators) 3106 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1949, 1950 (i). Senate (Late Senator Burns's Indemnity) 4466; (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2669 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3601, conc., 4861; (Baddeck, &c., and Port Mulgrave) 3598; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 3598; (Pictou and Montague Bridge, P.E.I.) 3599 (ii); (P.E.I. and Mainland) 2331 (i), 3597 (ii); Port Mulgrave and Guysboro') 2333; (St. John, Digby and Annapolis) 2332 (i); St. John, &c., and Annapolis) 3599 (ii); (St. John, Halifax and London) 2332 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 3597 (ii); (St. John, and Halifax *via* Yarmouth) 2332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490; (Surveys, &c., Northumberland Straits) 3908; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2659; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2633: (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2491, 2611, conc., 2673 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2482, 3675 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) Justice Drake and Foster, 2669; (Regina Jail) 3176 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (B.C.) Drill Shed, New Westminster, 4461. *Income:* Buildings (N.B.) 3489: (Ont.) 3596 (ii); (Que.) Lighting Montreal P.O., 2296. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2330 (i).
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3675 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Hydrographic Surveys) 3618.
Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Supply (B. 125) 1°*, 3085 (ii).
——— (B. 149) Res. in Com., 4862; 1°* of B. 4863 (ii).
Thibault, Chas., Payments to Superannuation Fund (Ans.) 577 (i).
Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (remarks) 2516 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Revenue and Expenses (Ans.) 436, 4356 (ii).
——— Cost to Date (Ans.) 3995 (ii).
——— Act Amt. (B. 113) 1°, 2259 (i).
Treaty with France, Ratification (Ans.) 1968 (i), 3356 (ii).
——— (B. 126) 1°, 3085; 2° m., 3558; in Com., 3567, 3833 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 83 (i).
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 180 (i).
——— Res. in Com., 4847 (ii).
——— The Tariff: in Com., 4852 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry., Legislation (remarks) 4255 (ii).
World's Fair (1892) Medals and Diplomas (Ans.) 84 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Anticosti Island, Names of Owners, on M. for Ret., 324 (i).
Antigonish and Shelburne Mail Service (Ques.) 2510 (ii).
Cape Breton Mail Service (Ques.) 427 (i).
Census, Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret., 327 (i).
—— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3392 (ii).
Customs Collectors as Brokers (Ques.) 1358, 1971.
Eastern Ass. Co. of Can. (B. 83) 1°*, 1078 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2591; in Com., 2607 (ii).
Fishing Regulations, Gulf of St. Lawrence (Ques.) 427 (i).
Grand Etang Channel (Ques.) 2141 (i).
—— Contract for Works (Ques.) 3709 (ii).
Halifax Drill Shed, Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 2357 (i).
I.C.R., Employees' Summer Vacation (Ques.) 2511 (ii).
Illicit Distilleries, Seizures (Ques.) 3357 (ii).
Industries in Guysborough Co. (remarks) 774 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 822 (i).
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3093, 3659, 3673 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1909 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1844 (i).
McIntyre's Station and Hawkesbury Mail Service (Ques.) 1971 (i).
Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 56) 1°*, 616.
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 614 (i).
St. Peter's Canal, par. in North Sydney *Herald* (Ques.) 4580 (ii).
—— Opening of Navigation (Ques.) 307 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 487 (i).
Sugar, Raw, Imports (Ques.) 307 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2245 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4318; (Outside Service) 2505 (ii).
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2345; (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Ont.) 1947 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093, 2102. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2105 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Port Mulgrave and Guysboro') 2333 (i).
Militia (Military College) 3789 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2655; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2639; (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2496, 2519 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3151 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3475. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 3480 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2310 (i).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3691 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3238, 3407; on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4160 (ii).
Wallace, George, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3084 (ii).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 4436 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revision during Year (Ques.) 576.

Frechette, Mr. L. J. C., *Megantic.*
Montreal P.O. Letter Box Contract (Ques.) 1969.
Oka Indians, Transfer to Muskoka, Number (Ques.) 1358 (i).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4772 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1602 (i).
Customs Employees, Extra or Regular (Ques.) 3191.
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2532 (ii).
Herbert, Maj. General, Resignation as Commander of Militia (Ques.) 2137 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2848.
Permanent Corps, Total Strength (Ques.) 2362 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Farran's Point) 2264; (Welland) 2266 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 1921; (Justice) Gisborne, &c., services, 1913 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Welland) 2273; (Williamsburg) 2270 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3466; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 3464. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 3490 (ii); (Ont.) 2297; (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2274 (i).
Sugar Imported into Montreal and Halifax (Ques.) 1000 (i).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3582 (ii).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3382 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1879 (i).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2541 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission, Rep. (Ques.) 3083 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4320 (ii).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2594 (ii).
Granite and Freestone, Imports (Ques.) 306 (i).
Granite (Red) Monuments, Imports (Ques.) 306.
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1979 (i).
Shore Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 3078; M. to place on Order paper for 2°, 3111 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Dynamite Factories on Lachine Canal (Ques.) 1080 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3067.
Manitoba School Question, Future Negotiations (Ques.) 4187 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4451 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4194 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. J., *Two Mountains.*
Hay Exports to U. S. and Great Britain (Ques.) 2357 (i).
Oka Indians. Transfer to Muskoka, Number (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Tobacco, Can., Amount of Duty Collected (Ques.) 1587 (i).

Grant, Sir J. A., K.C.M.G., *Ottawa City.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 97 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 982 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2582 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co's (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).
Jas. McLaren Co.'s incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 425 (i).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C.'s, &c., 2019 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2806 (ii).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4908.
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2630 (ii).
Militia (Military College) 2783 (ii).
Trans-Canadian Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).
Deschenes Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 30) 1°*, 425 (i).

Grieve, Mr. J. N., *North Perth.*
Binding Twine manufactured at Kingston Penitentiary, Sales, &c. (M. for Ret.) 2022 (i).
Connor, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3993.
Experimental Farm Reports, Number Published, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).
Moir, Geo., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3196 (ii).
Sugar Island, Sale by Govt. (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3987 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3143 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Census and Agricultural Classes (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
Customs Collector, Three Rivers, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 574 (i).
I.C.R., Employees at Chaudière Curve (Ques.) 575 (i).
International Fraternal Alliance Ass. Co., Registration (Ques.) 3995 (ii).
Mallette, Louis Z., Langevin Block Contract (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Malone, Thos., Civil Service Ins. Policy (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Princess Pier, Lévis (Ques.) 575 (i).
Revising Officers Laprairie County (Ques.) 930 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 3497 (ii).
Thibault, Chas., Payments to Superannuation Fund (Ques.) 577 (i).
Tobacco Seizure at Isle Verte (Ques.) 697 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *Northumberland, Ont.*
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) Amt., 2899; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 57) 2812 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Barry's Bay Station, Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry., Closing, on M. for Ret., 4006 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 655 (i).
Canal Improvements in St. Lawrence (Ans.) 307 (i).
Canals, Depth of Water (Ans.) 921 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Capital Expended to 1895 (Ans.) 1551 (i).
——— Receipts, &c. (remarks) 1587; (Ans.) 2354 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Gross Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 273 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) on M. for Com., 2353 (i); in Com., 2697.
Dynamite Factories on Lachine Canal (Ans.) 1080.
Farm Lands in Ontario, Value (remarks) 773 (i).
Fenelon Falls, Filling up Road (Ans.) 3581 (ii).
Freight Rates Commission in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4025 (ii).
Galops Rapids Works, Employees Dismissed (Ans.) 2509 (ii).
Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Co. (Ans.) 2509 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2526 (ii).
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 3359 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Collector of Tolls (Ans.) 4357.
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2700 (ii).
Halifax Deep Water Terminus, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3817 (ii).
——— Freight Shed, Tenders (Ans.) 2727 (ii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Time Tables (Ans.) 1829.
——— Burning of Sheds at Richmond (remarks) 1355 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., Cap St. Ignace and Halifax Express (Ans.) 1973 (i).
——— Cap St. Ignace Station, new Siding (Ans.) 2571 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Conductor McCulley (Ans.) 2140 (i).
——— Employees at Chaudière Curve (Ans.) 575.
——— Summer Vacation (Ans.) 2511.
——— Thefts from Carleton Sheds (Ans.) 272 (i).
——— Maintenance of Way and Works (Ans.) 430 (i).
——— Summer Time Tables, Changes (Ans.) 1970 (i), 2571 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3757, 3943 (ii).
——— Waterways Commission (remarks) 3456 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) in Com., 1962; on M. for 3°, 2352 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 1974 (i).
Locomotive Boilers, Inspection by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3201 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1891 (i).
McDonald, Patrick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3994 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Contract for Cedar Sleepers (Ans.) 3084 (ii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 214 (i).
——— Condition, &c. (Ans.) 574 (i).
——— Payment of Subsidy (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Princess Pier, Levis (Ans.) 576 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2946 (ii).
Pub. Works, Contracts Entered into (Ans.) 204, 230 (i).
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4772 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 515.
Railway Rates, Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 839 (i).
——— Employees, Payment of *re* B. 23 (remarks) 4359 (ii).
Rapide Plat Canal, Overseer, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3711 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Subsidies, on M. for Ret., 334 (i).
St. Louis, Emmanuel, Judge Desnoyers Decision (Ans.) 1552 (i).
St. Peter's Canal, Opening of Navigation (Ans.) 307 (i).
——— par. in North Sydney *Herald* (Ans.) 4580.
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Extra Work by Contractors (Ans.) 273 (i).
——— Permanent Staff (Ans.) 1972 (i).
——— and C.P.R. (Ans.) 1973 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Sheik's Island Dams, Completion and Cost (Ans.) 3198 (ii).
South Shore Ry. (N.S.) Contract (Ans.) 1078 (i).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1694 (i).
Straits of Northumberland, Borings (Ans.) 3712 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys., 1894-95 (Ans.) 1079 (i).
——— Provinces Located, Miles Built, &c. &c., on M. for Ret., 4007 (ii).
——— Voted in 1894 (Ans.) 230 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 3703; (Galops) 3704; (Grenville) 3707; (Rapide Plat) 3703 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2223 (i); (Soulanges) 3699; (Trent) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Beauharnois) 2257; (Chambly) 2261; (Cornwall) 2262; (Farran's Point) 2264; (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2229; (Rideau) 2256; (Trent) 2265; (Welland) 2266 (i).
Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 2723 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 2272; (Lachine) 2273; (Welland) 2273; (Williamsburg) 2270 (i). Post Office 4331, 4345 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Thompson late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2500 (ii).
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3682; (I.C.R.) 3683 (ii).
Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret., 2775 (ii).
Tay Canal, Maintenance and Revenue (Ans.) 230 (i).
Tobique Valley Ry., Dom. Bonus Voted, &c. (Ans.) 2941 (ii).
——— Opening for Traffic (Ans.) 2755 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Contracts (Ans.) 204 (i).
——— Cost since Confed. (Ans.) 481 (i).
Valleyfield Sewer, Repairs (Ans.) 2509 (ii)
Welland Canal, Lumber and Timber Supplies, Contract, on M. for Ret., 2363 (i).
West Rideau Lake Dam, Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 3996 (ii).
Williamsburg Canal Supt., Appnmt. (Ans.) 3711.
Winnipeg and G. N. Ry. Co. (prop. Res.) 4819; Com. on Res. (M.) 4863; in Com., 4869; (B. 150) 1°*, 4876; on 2°, 4885; in Com., 4891 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Grant (Ans.) 928 (i).

Haslam, Mr. A., *Vancouver Island.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2289 (i). Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3535 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. (sawed boards) 4855 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3764 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4090 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
Dredge, New, Preparation of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2942 (ii).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, on M. for Ret., 446 (i).
Gardiner's Creek Breakwater, Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 2942 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, &c., B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 4063; in Com. on B., 4470 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 754 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 499 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2275 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4101 (ii).
Harvesters, Self-binding, Number Exported, &c. (Ques.) 2734 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3159 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 3541.

Hughes, Mr. W. H., *North Middlesex.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4149 (ii).
Gravel, Bishop, Communication *re* Man. Schools (Ques.) 3360 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Co., Liens or Debts (remarks) 4740 (ii).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4684 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Trent) 2266 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4345 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 3813 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' List) 2090 (i). Senate (Late Senator Burns's Indemnity) 4460 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3187; (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 3189; (Military College) 3809 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2207 (i).
Statistics (Year-Book) 3346 (ii).

Hutchins, Mr. W. H., *North Middlesex.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 4468 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 36) 1°*, 425 (i).
Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 617 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2560 (ii).
Gov. Contracts to Aliens, prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2541 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 507 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3520 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (M. for Cor.) 209 (i).
Controller of Customs Private Secretaries (Ques.) 1550 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3507 (i).

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Atlantic Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 305 (i).
Controller of Customs Private Secretaries (Ans.) 1550 (i).
Fish Imports from France, Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 1550 (i).
French Treaty and Foreign Powers, Privileges under (Ans.) 1697 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 827 (i).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 851, 857.
Order (Ques. of) relevancy of Member's remarks to deb., 345 (i).
——— Unparliamentary Language, 826 (i).
Pickford and Black's Contract, Halifax and West Indies (Ans.) 922 (i).
World's Fair, Mr. Larke's Services (Ans.) 206 (i).

Jeannotte Mr. H., *L'Assomption.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1775 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 760 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4214 (ii).
Tobacco, Entry of Foreign Leaf Duty Free (remarks) 2030 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 3501 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Matane and Ste. Anne des Monts Daily Mail Service (M. for Pets., &c.*) 2023 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4213 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2590; in Com., 2606 (ii).
Fish Imports from France, Quantities, &c. (Ques.) 1550 (i).
Fishing Licenses paid N'fld., Refund (Ques.) 1551.
Lobster Hatcheries in Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1551 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1977 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2344 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2322 (i).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3133 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1553 (i).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3093 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1691 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3607 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 3485 (ii).

Lachapelle, Mr. S., *Hochelaga.*
"Alliance Nationale" (B. 61) 1°*, 617 (i).
Cattle Shipments to Belgium, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4830 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 726 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4208 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 35) 1°*, 425; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 1689 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Binding Twine, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2815 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1754 (i).
Carling Brewing Co.'s Property, Govt. Lease (Ques.) 573 (i).
Courtright, Customs Officer, Superannuation (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
Customs Collectorship, Montreal (Ques.) 205 (i).
Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 314 (i).
Drouth in Ont. (remarks) 4582 (ii).
Exchange Bank, Rets. *re* (remarks) 3368 (ii).
——— Mr. Ogilvie's Guarantee (Ques.) 3455 (ii).
Galops Rapids Works, Employees Dismissed (Ques.) 2509 (ii).
Govt. Pensioners, par. in Peterborough *Examiner*, N.W.T. Rebellion (Ques.) 923 (i).
Guy, Charles, Peterborough, Pension (Ques.) 1452.
Halliwell, J. L., Pension (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Imperial Honours, Recommendations by Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 1973 (i).
——— Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1589; (Ques.) 1823 (i).
Markland Mortgage Discharge B. 93 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1353 (i).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 360 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 367.
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay (M. for O. C., &c.) 1979, 2016 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3820 (ii).
Returns, bringing down (remarks) 1186 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2392 (i).
Southampton Customs Officers, Names, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4116 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Finance) 2702 (ii); (Interior) 1941; (Justice) J. H. Hughes's services, 1915 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4316 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3605 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3186; (Military Properties) 3184; (Miscellaneous) 3188 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2622 (ii).
Sutton, Mr., and Appmt. in Royal Can. Dragoons (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 338 (i).
Tobique Valley Ry., Dom. Bonus Voted, &c. (Ques.) 2941 (ii).
Weir, Mr., of Keene, Pension (Ques.) 1453 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Centre Quebec.*
Atlantic Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 305 (i).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers, on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1837 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4090 (ii).
Culler's Office, Que., Abolition (Ques.) 579 (i).
——— Inspection Dues (Ques.) 1548 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. for Sel. Com. (remarks) 180 (i).
Garrison Artillery, Que., No. 3 Battery (M. for Cor.) 1973 (i).
Govt., &c., Contracts and Employees' Liability B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 1°, 81 (i).
Landry, Phillippe Robt., Affidavit *re* Residence, &c. (M. for copies*) 2406 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1909 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 476; in Com., 1844 (i).
Malone, Thos., Civil Service Insurance Policy (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Militia Force, Savings by Reduction (Ques.) 3355.
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, Expend., &c. (Ques.) 4355 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2094 (i).
Three Rivers, Hay Shed (Ques.) 2358 (i).
——— Harbour, Cost to Date (Ques.) 3995 (ii).
——— Revenues and Expenses (Ques.) 4356 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4060 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 94) 1°, 1353 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Census of Man., 1896 (Ques.) 429 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 268 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 696 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 3110 (ii).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 3544 (ii).
Lands unpatented in Municipality of Morris (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Continued.*
Manitoba Schools Question on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4583 (ii).
—— Appeal of R. C. Minority, &c. (M. for copies*) 299 (i).
Man. and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1**, 515.
Pre-emption Lots in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 3198 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 21 (i).
Anticosti Island, Names of Owners, on M. for Ret., 324 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2477 (ii).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers (M. for Cor.) 215.
Budget, The, on Finance Minister's Explanation (remarks) 621 (i).
Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse (remarks) 347, 848 (i).
Cattle Exports, Limitation of Space, on adjnmt. (remarks) 142, 144 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1839 (i).
Charlebois' Claim *re* Langevin Block Construction (Ques.) 933 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3741; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3742; in Com., 3765 (ii).
Colonies and the Empire (remarks) 4894 (ii).
Connolly, Messrs., Process of Execution (remarks) 233 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 516 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 1°, 3914; on M. for 2°, 4126; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 4482 (ii).
Debates, Official, on 1st Rep. (remarks) 268 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co's incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2697 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Daly*) on Sen. Amts., 3921 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 717; (Amt.) 719; neg. (Y. 47, N. 101) 2143 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Fishing Rights in River Matane, Contracts (M. for copies) 2397 (i).
Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal B. 14 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 196 (i).
—— B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 2°, 3629; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3640 (ii).
Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Co. (Ques.) 2509.
Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).
—— Wednesdays, 3625 (ii).
—— on adjnmt. (remarks) 2569 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Hudson Bay Ry., on adjnmt. (remarks) 181 (i).
—— Subsidy (Ques.) 207 (i).
—— Govt. Aid (M. for O. C.*) 300 (i).
—— O. C. respecting (remarks) 516 (i).
Huron Indians at Lorette and Agent Bastien (M. for Cor.) 1975 (i).
—— (M. for Ret.*) 2022 (i).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1823 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4123 (ii).
Ins. Act, Societies Exemption B. 145 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4769 (ii).
Intercolonial Conference between Imp. and Dom. Govts. (M.) 4894 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2188 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract (remarks) 2608 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2888 (ii).
La Jeune Lorette, Indian Agent Bastien (M. for Ret.*) 2022 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co's incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 2352.
Larkin, Connolly & Co., Suit against (Ques.) 203.
Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4813 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4262.
Loiselle vs. Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1890 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, Ministerial Statement (Ques.) 3996 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4699 (ii).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4379; neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4457 (ii).
Markland Mortgage Discharge B. 93 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1353 (i).
—— in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2408 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 256 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 375.
Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured (Ques.) 4054, 4116; (M. to adjn. Hse.) 4055; neg. (Y. 72, N. 111) 4061 (ii).
—— on Ministers' Statements (M. to adjn. Hse.) 4190; neg. (Y. 82, N. 116) 4252 (ii).
—— (explanation) 4876 (ii).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 347, 848.
—— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1184 (i).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. Cs., &c., 1988 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Man. Schools, on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 804 (i).
—— (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2514.
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2166 (i).
Pig Iron Imported into Can. from U.S. (Ques.) 932 (i).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 215 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*

Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 311.
Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2945 (ii).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*) on M. for 1°, 3082; in Com., 3267 (ii).
Queen's Birthday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1355 (i).
Railway Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4079 (ii).
St. John Wharf, Collection of Tolls (M. for O. C., &c.) 221 (i).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Subsidies, on M. for Ret., 334 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Indians, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies) 4007 (ii).
Sheik's Island Dams, Completion and Cost (Ques.) 3198 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3548 (ii).
——— Meetings during Sittings of Hse., on Ques. of Order, 3913 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 495 (i).
——— *See* "Indemnity."
Silver-Lead Smelting Bounty, in Com. on Res., (Mr. *Foster*) 3927 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to refer back to Com., 1634

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2224. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 232, 2242 (i).
Civil Government (Sec. of State) 3980 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4284 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2498, 2628; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2673; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2501, 2649 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3506; (Que.) 3498 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 231 (i). Roads and Bridges, 3541 (ii).

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1819 (i).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 336.
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3831 (ii).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 221 (i).
Troops in Quebec, Reduction in Strength (Ques.) 2361 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com., 4859 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co. (remarks) 4738 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4868; in Com., 4873; on M. for 2° of B. 150, 4879; in Com., 4890 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4111, 4742 (ii).
——— B. 133 (Mr. *Daly*) 1°, 3266 (ii).
——— (B. 106) 1°, 2024 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Electoral Lists, Drummond and Arthabaska, &c., Printing (Ques.) 769 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2589; in Com., 2593 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings (M. for Stmnt.) 1974 (i).
Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4800 (ii).
Richmond Station and Denison's Mills Mail Contract (Ques.) 3356 (ii).
Streams Exempted under Fisheries Act (Ques.) 3356 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3517 (ii).

Treaty with France, Ratification (Ques.) 3356 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1246 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Translation (remarks) 359.
McMurray, L. J. A., Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1001 (i).
Sugar, Raw and Refined, Imports (Ques.) 922 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2652. (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2648 (ii).

Thibault, Chas., Payments to Superannuation Fund (Ques.) 577 (i).

Lepine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*

Can., France and Belgium SS. Line (Ques.) 3197.
La Chambre de Commerce de Montreal (B. 117) 1°*, 2670 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Letter Box Contract (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Savings Banks Stamps (M. for Pets., &c.*) 2024.
Workmen and Labourers on Public Works (B. 43) 1°*, 478 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*

Coal Contract, Public Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.) 4709 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4817 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4782 (ii).
Courtright, Customs Officer, Superannuation (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4135, 4180; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4174 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse, 4488.
Finlay, W., Appnmt. in Customs Service (Ques.) 2139 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt., Exemptions, B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 619 (i).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 441 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*

Galops Rapids Works, Employees Dismissed (Ques.) 2509 (ii).

Hilton Wharf, St. Joseph's Island, Expend. (Ans.) 2362 (i).

Kemptville Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 697.

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co's. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1933; in Com., 1961 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1895 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 752 (i).

Militia Drill, 1895 (Ques.) 573 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. C., &c., 1998 (i).

Ogilvie, W. W., Drawback on Imported Corn (Ques.) 4357 (ii).

Plummer's Wharf, Sault Ste. Marie, Govt. Title, &c. (Ques.) 2363 (i).

Post Office Expenditure (Ques.) 926 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Irregular Meetings (remarks) 1829 (i).

——— (remarks) 2943 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Permanent Staff (Ques.) 1972 (i).

——— O.C., affecting (M. for copies*) 2023 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 503 (i).

Sheik's Island Dams, O. C. affecting (M. for copies*) 2023 (i).

Shipping Regulations on the Great Lakes (Ques.) 2361 (i).

South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4624 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Interior) 1922 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Ont.) 1947 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3231 (ii).

Lowell, Mr. J. A., *Welland.*

Alien Labour in Can., Legislation (M. for Ret.*) 2405 (i).

American-made Milk Cans, Free Entry (Ques.) 3815 (ii).

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 617 (i).

Customs Collectorship, Niagara Falls, Vacancy (Ques.) 574 (i).

Fort Erie Customs Officers, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3815 (ii).

Welland Canal, Lumber and Timber Supplies, Contract (M. for Ret.) 2363 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1340 (i).

Ministerial Explanations, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 382 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—*Continued.*

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension (M. for Ret.) 2756, 2786 (ii).

Steam Service, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 286 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2131 (i).

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2330 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*

Binder Twine, Prison-made (Ques.) 3707 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 954 (i).

Census, Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret., 330 (i).

——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).

Cullers at Montreal and Quebec, Number, &c. (Ques.) 577 (i).

Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 320 (i).

Fredericton and St. Marys Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 483 (i).

Industrial Establishments in Wingham (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).

McGregor's Creek, Sheet Piling (Ques.) 577 (i).

Moir, Geo., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3196 (ii).

Ogilvie, W. W., Drawback on Imported Corn (Ques.) 4357 (ii).

Public Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3326 (ii).

Returns (remarks) 3820 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2495, 2628; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2643; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2651 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Accounts *re* Funeral Expenses (Ques.) 2922 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Cost since Confed. (Ques.) 481 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G. H., *Algoma.*

Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2535 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1179 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 2005 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3468 (ii).

Towing Saw-logs across Georgian Bay, &c. (prop. Res.) 2405 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*

N'fld., Annexation and Immigration (remarks) 4908 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119 (ii).

"Stanley," Str., and Hudson Straits (remarks 4906 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3982. *Indians* (B.C.) 3879 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York, Ont.*

Chute, Julia Ethel, Relief B. 139 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 3948 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4097 (ii).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 729 (i).

Govt. Contracts to Aliens, prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2529 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co's B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3583, 3748, 3941 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 737 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4682 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 13) 1°, 143 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 488 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3532 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co's B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3231, 3418; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4154; neg. (Y. 39, N. 113) 4163.

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3573; on M. for 3°, 3838 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3139 (ii).

Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1732 (i).

Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2° *, 2534 (ii).

Grand Falls Water-power and Boom Co's incorp. (B. 95) 1° *, 1452 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co's incorp. (B. 80) 1° *, 1000 (i).

Private Bills Petitions, Suspension of Rules (M.) 1177 (i).

St. John River Bridge Co's incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 425 (i).

Temiscouata Ry. Co's (B. 70) 1°*, 839 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*

Address to His Ex., on The, 154 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4730 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4105 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 4126; in Com., 4130; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4473; neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 16) 1°, 197 (i).

——— B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4071 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3639; in Com., 3658 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3459 (ii).

General Revenue Fund of N.W.T B. 134 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3721 (ii).

Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3624 (ii).

House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 25) 1°, 301 (i).

Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4122 (ii).

Ins. Act Amt., Exemption of Societies, B. 145 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4355 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3727 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) precedence of deb., Ques. of Order, 2918 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3047 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov. of Man. (remarks) 735 (i).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 774 (i).

Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

Man. Schools Question, Alleged Utterances of Ministers (Ques.) 577 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4437 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4496; on M. to adjn. deb., 4568 (ii).

——— Communications with His Ex. (Ques.) 2572 (ii).

——— Remedial Order (Ques.) 578 (i), 3373, 3458, 3716 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4195 (ii).

Minister of Public Works' Speech in Prov. of Que. (Ques.) 925 (i).

Meeting of next Parlt., Gov. Gen.'s Authority (Ques.) 4054 (ii).

N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 17) Dual Language, 1°, 197.

——— Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119; on M. for 3°, 4363 (ii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4367 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 311.

Rapide Plat Canal, Appnmt. of Overseer (Ques.) 3711 (ii).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3547 (ii).

Road and Road Allowances in Man. B. 114 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4073 (ii).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Prosecution *re* Lachine Canal Bridge (Ques.) 926 (i).

Williamsburg Canal Supt., Appnmt. (Ques.) 3711.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Grant (Ques.) 928 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. (remarks) 4739 (ii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1876 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1507 (i).

McDonald, Mr. W. W., *East Assiniboia.*
Langenberg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 616; M. for Com., 1924; 3° m., 2352 (i).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4870 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 4033 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indians (B.C.) 3899 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. F., *Pictou.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 3510 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3973 (ii).
Fishing Regulations in Detroit and St. Clair Rivers, &c. (Ques.) 2356 (i).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2540 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2178 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502 (i).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3574 (ii).

McInerney, Mr. G. V., *Kent, N.B.*
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 734 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1392 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret. 3445 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1878 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3645 (ii).
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3668 (ii).
Malignant Cove, Merigomish, Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 2140 (i).
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 596 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4615 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works--Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 3511 (ii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1179 (i); 2° m., 2698 (ii).
Ottawa Land and Security Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 1959 (i).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 617 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3242, 3411 (ii).
Unlawful Associations and Oaths B. 7 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 2520 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Contracts to Aliens prevention (B. 9) 1°, 80 (i).
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. (B. 21) prop. Res., 208; in Com., 234; 1°* of B., 240 (i); on 2°, 4747 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention (B. 9) 2° m., 2520 (ii).
Govt., &c., Contracts and Employees Liability (B. 11) 1°, 80 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2874
Ry. Return Fare Tickets, Sale (B. 10) 1°, 80 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4275 (ii).
Butter Trade with Great Britain (Ques.) 2511 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1057 (i).
Cattle Shipments, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3457 (ii).
Cattle (Can.) Transport through U. S. for Export (Ms. for Cor.) 341, 477 (i).
Cheese Factories in P.E.I., under Dom. Dairy Commissioner (M. for Stmnt.*) 2023 (i).
Dairy Commissioner's Rep., presentation (Ques.) 2031 (i)
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 236 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2394 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2108 (i), 4465; (Experimental Farm Bulletins) 3350; (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 3350 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, &c., 4308. Weights and Measures, &c., 4305 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2661 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3144 (ii).
Public Works--Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3505. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3532 (ii).
Statistics (Year-Book) 3347 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 146 (i).
Agriculture, Inspecting Physician, Appnmt. (Ques.) 309 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3138 (ii).

Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2481 (ii).

——— Rep., Delay in presentation (Ques.) 86 (i).

Binder Twine, Prison-made (Ques.) 3707 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1002 (i).

Cape Breton Ry., Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 1587, 2354 (i).

——— Capital Expended to 1895 (Ques.) 1551 (i).

Carling Brewing Co.'s Property, Govt. Lease, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).

——— (M. for Cor.*) 2022 (i).

Cattle (Can.) Transport through U.S., on M. for Cor., 342 (i).

——— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4843 (ii).

Census, Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret., 330 (i).

——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3742; in Com., 3747 (ii).

——— Payments to Temporary Clerks (Ques.) 1585 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4098 (ii).

Cullers' Offices, Montreal and Quebec, Revenue and Maintenance (Ques.) 929 (i).

——— Supervisor at Quebec (Ques.) 1359 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4130, 4174 (ii).

——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1291 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 239 (i); on M. for 2°, 4762 (ii).

Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 315 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 722, 1874 (i).

Estimates, The (Ques.) 331 (i).

Finance Minister's Private Secretary (Ques.) 1360 (i).

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c. (M. for Ret.) 438, 451 (i).

——— Receipts, &c., Rets. made to Govt. (M. for copies*) 2024 (i).

Geological Survey, Madoc and Marmora (Ques.) 2942 (ii).

Governor General, Reduction of Salary B. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 3261 (ii).

Hatch, Walter, Superannuation (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Immigration to N.W.T, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3778 (ii).

Industries, Returns *re* (remarks) 1185 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2186 (i).

——— Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3722 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2867.

Lands Sold on Richelieu River to H. S. Foster (M. for Cor.*) 2406 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 2352 (i).

Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4809 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov.'s Salaries (B. 37) 1°*, 425 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1902 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1865 (i).

"Mexico" SS., Wreck in Straits of Belle Isle (Ques.) 4359 (ii).

Moneys Paid to Members outside Sessional Indemnity (M. for Ret.) 331 (i).

N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 859 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 2021 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3931 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2168 (i).

Receiver General (Asst.) St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 1360 (i).

Reed, Hayter, Amounts Paid in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 266 (i).

——— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 1829 (i); 2671, 2814, 3111 (ii).

Savings Banks Deposits, Gross Amounts (M. for Ret.) 332 (i).

Seizures of Smuggled Goods (M. for Ret.) 4006 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 505 (i).

Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2388 (i).

Statistical Year-Book, Printing, &c., Instructions, on M. for copy, 220 (i).

St. Louis, Mr., Civil Action against (Ques.) 3457.

Subsidies to Rys., Provinces Located, Miles Built, &c., &c. (M. for Ret.) 4007 (ii).

Superannuation Act Amt. (B. 6) 1°*, 79; 2° m., 2152 (i).

——— B. 102 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1820 (i); (remarks) 4739 (ii).

——— List of Names, Appnmts, &c. (Ms. for Ret.) 273, 299 (i).

——— Ret. *re* (Ques.) 744, 1083 (i) 3111, 3628, 3819, 3994 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2115 (i).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2223 (i); (Trent) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Beauharnois) 2257; (Cornwall) 2262; (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2249; (Trent) 2265; (Welland) 2267 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Charges of Management, 3106 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3102; (Finance) 2705; (High Commissioner's Office) 3097; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 3101 (ii); (Interior) 1920, 1938; (Justice) J. W. Hughes's services, 1914; (Post Office) 1913; (Sec. of State) 1918 (i); (Trade and Commerce) 4459, contingencies, 3105 (ii), Carleton's services, 1912; (Unforeseen Expenses) 1917 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 2272; (Welland) 2272; (Williamsburg) 2270 (i). Culling Timber, 4283, 4462. Customs, 4350. Dominion Lands, 4348. Excise, 4279. Post Office, 4316. Public Works, 4277. Trade and Commerce, 4347. Weights and Measures, &c., 4307 (ii).

Dominion Police, 3141 (ii).

Geological Survey (Artesian Borings) 2488 (ii).

Government of North-west Territories, 3905 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 2487, 3900: (Man. and N.W.T.) 3814 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 3169.

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2104; (Voters' Lists) 2087 (i), 3341. Library (Salaries, &c.) 3341 (ii). Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2105 (i); (Late Senator Burns's Indemnity) 4460 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3606 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3182 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2220 (i).

Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490; (Mr. Fabre's Salary) 3906; (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2497; (Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) 3907; (Roads and Bridges, Banff) 3907; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2647, 2675.

Mounted Police, 3678 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3142, Binder Twine, 3147 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3470; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 3464 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (Lighting Montreal P.O.) 2294; (Man.) 2298; (N.B.) 2278 (i), 3489; (N.S.) 3484 (ii); (Ont.) 2297 (i); (Que.) 3494 (ii).

Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3681; (I.C.R.) 3683.

Statistics (Year-Book) 3346 (ii).

Temporary Clerks Employed by Govt., Amounts Paid (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

Treaty with France, Ratification (Que.) 1968 (i).

——— B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3581 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com., 4858 (ii).

West Kootenay Customs Rets., on M. for Ret., 322 (i).

World's Fair (1892) Medals and Diplomas (Ques.) 84 (i).

——— Dom. Employees (Ques.) 3710 (ii).

——— Mr. Larke's Services (Ques.) 205 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4759 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3653 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3075 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4604, 4627 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4216 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Welland) 2267 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, &c., 4286 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 3885 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3729 (ii).

Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail Service (Ques.) 1182 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1847 (i).

Penitentiary, B.C., Justice Drake's Instructions (M. for copy) 297 (i).

——— James Fitzsimmons's Reinstatement (M. for Cor.) 298 (i).

——— W. A. Keary's Retirement (Ques.) 308 (i).

——— Warden McBride's Retirement (Ques.) 308 (i).

Ry. Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4080 (ii).

Silver-Lead Smelting, Encouragement B. 142 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4124, 4763 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Indians (B.C.) 3899 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 3509, Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3534. Telegraphs, 3542 (ii).

War Eagle Gold Mining Co. and Customs Collector at Rossland, (M. for Cor.*) 2022 (i).

West Kootenay Customs Rets. (M. for Ret.) 321 (i).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*

Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2610 (ii).

Martin, Mr. J., *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Utilization (B. 132) 1°*, 3266 (i).

Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

———Ret. *re* (Ques.) 4358 (ii).

Behring Sea Arbitration (Ques.) 4862 (ii).

Binder Twine manufactured in Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 2355 (i).

Booth, Gen., Land for proposed Colony (Ques.) 2361 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 879 (i).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1834 (i).

Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4778 (ii).

Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4723 (ii).

Martin, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 3°, 4494 (ii).
Freight Rates, N.W.T. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4026 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 1°, 3081 ; in Com., 3459.
Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3627 (ii).
Immigration to N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3766 (ii).
Jew Pedlars, Transport from Chicago to Calgary (M. for Cor.) 241, 258 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2947.
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Northrup*) M. to ref. back to Com., 4113 (ii).
Lands Leased for Homesteading, Wm. Fleming's Case (M. for Cor.) 2364 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) in Com., 1959 ; on M. for 3°, 1938 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. of Man., Appmnt. (Ques.) 3710 (ii).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 797 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1903 (i).
Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on personal explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2054 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb., 4573 (ii).
N.W.T. Act (Cap. 50, Rev. Stat.) Amt. (B. 52) 1°*, 515 (i).
——— Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119 ; on M. for 3°, 4364 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4373 (ii).
Penitentiary (B.C.) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4823 (ii).
Post Office Expenditure (Ques.) 926 (i).
Portage la Prairie P. O., Purchase of Site (M. for O.C.) 2376 (i).
——— Ret. (inquiries) 3457, 3628, 3715, 4894 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2512.
Royal Standard, Hoisting (Ques.) 2137 (i).
Subsidies to Rys., 1894-95 (Ques.) 1079 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Interior) 1923, 1938 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Customs, 4351. Post Office, 4339 (ii).
Fisheries (B.C.) 3620 ; (Man.) 3619 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2651 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 2662 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3171 (ii).
Public Works—Capital : Buildings (Drill Shed, New Westminster) 4461 (ii). *Income* (Lighting, &c.) 2303 ; (Man.) 2300 (i).
Survey of Township 16, Range 16-W. (Ques.) 2138 (i).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 431 (i).

Martin, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4864 ; in Com., 4872 ; on M. for 2° of B. 150, 4880 ; in Com., 4890 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 933 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4088 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 96) 1°*, 1548 (i) ; in Com., 3593, 3748, 3938 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2855.
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 748, 1844 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4658 (ii).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 1175 (i).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1689 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 4392 (ii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
Yamaska and St. Ours Locks, Charges on Vessels (Ques.) 2735 (ii).
Yamaska River, Obstructions in Channel (Ques.) 924 (i).
——— Lock and Dam, Repairs and Maintenance (Ques.) 1697 (i).
——— Construction (Ques.) 2359 (i).
——— Construction of Embankment (M. for Cor.*) 2406 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 87 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept. (presented) 2132 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2260 (i), 2408 (ii).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealing Vessels by Russia, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3868 (ii).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4799 (ii).
Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 348 (i).
Census, Industries in London (remarks) 207 (i).
——— Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret. 328 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 423 (i).
——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1830 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3743 ; in Com., 3746, 3762 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4779 ; in Com., 4781 (ii).

Mills. Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4714 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2562 (ii)

——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 515 (i); in Com., 4092 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 1°, 3914; on M. for 2°, 4126; in Com., 4127, 4167 (ii).

——— Duties on American Hardware, on Ques. of Order, 1280 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 4065; in Com., 4069 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3270 (ii).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 720 (i).

Fishing Rights in River Matane, Contracts, on M. for copies, 2399 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 1°, 768 (i); on M. for 2°, 3631; in Com., 3657; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638 (ii).

Grey, Lieut.-Col. John, Appnmt. as Supt. of Stores (Ques.) 3358 (ii).

Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2702; in Com., 2704 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry., on M. for adjnmt. (remarks) 182 (i).

Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4123 (ii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 2°, 3933 (ii).

Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3112.

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3758 (ii).

Irrigation Act (N.W.T.) Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4768 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2186 (i).

——— Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3730 (ii).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for Com., 1928; in Com., 1963 (i).

Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4803 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov. of Man. (remarks) 736 (i).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 788, 817 (i).

Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271 (ii).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1892 (i).

London Military School, Sewage Discharge (Ques.) 1359 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1861 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2063 (i).

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 1968 (i).

Markland Mortgage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2407 (ii).

——— Discharge B. 130 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3930 (ii).

Mattice, Lieut.-Col. G., Retirement and re-Appointment (Ques.) 3358 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., (remarks) 4058 (ii).

N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 845 (i).

——— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1184 (i).

N.W.T. Act. Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3931 (ii).

——— Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4074, 4120: on M. for 3°, 4360, 4762 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2515 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2169 (i).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Guillet*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2812 (ii).

Public Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3271; neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*) in Com., 3268 (ii).

Ry. Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4081 (ii).

Revising Officers, Duplicate Appnmts. (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1978 (i).

Secretan, J. A., Amount Paid by Govt. (Ques.) 3358 (ii).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3548 (ii).

——— Meetings during Sittings of Hse., on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3910 (ii).

Senate, Law Officers' Opinion *re* Speaker (M. for copies*) 221 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 496 (i).

——— *See* "Indemnity."

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 2161 (i).

——— List of Names, Appnmts., &c., on M. for Ret., 275 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 3343 (ii); (Dairying Interests) 2126 (i).

Canals—Income (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2248; (Trent) 2266; (Welland) 2268 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3103; (Civil Service Examiners) 3100 (ii); (Customs) 1911 (i), 2715; (Finance) 2707; (Geological Survey) 2723 (ii); (Justice) J. W. Hughes's services, 1915 (i); (Indian Affairs) 2663, contingencies, 3102 (ii); (Interior) 1939 (i), 2689; (Post Office) 2720;

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 3101; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 3101; (Trade and Commerce) contingencies, 3106 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Dominion Lands, 4348. Trade and Commerce, 4347. Weights and Measures, &c., 4306 (ii).

Indians (B. C.) 3877 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 3107; (Supreme Court) 3109 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2095: (Voters' Lists) 1949 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3608 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3186; (Military Properties) 3179 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2219 (i).

Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2492 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 3509 (ii); (Man.) 2299 (i); (N.B.) 3490; (N.S.) 3480, 3486; (N.W.T.) 3508; (Que.) 3494, 3500 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2327 (i); (Ont.) 3528; (Que.) 3522 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binding Twine, 3153 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 265 (i).

Thousand Islands, Reservations for Park, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4004 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3563; in Com., 3565; on M. for 3°, 3828 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co's. B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3244; on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4156 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. (sawed boards) 4855 (ii).

Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4865; in Com., 4871; on M. for 2° of B. 150, 4877, 4883 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*

Centennial Exhibition, Can. Commissioner's Expenses (Ques.) 2736 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) on Sen. Amts. 4777 (ii).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 4775.

Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 2359 (i).

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement (prop. Res.) 587 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*

Can. Benevolent Societies incorp. (B. 31) 1°*, 425 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4170 (ii).

Ont. Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1000.

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*

Bédard, Charles, Appnmt. as Revising Officer (Ques.) 3993 (ii).

Electoral Lists, Laprairie and Napierville (Ques.) 930 (i).

Monet, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

House of Commons Reading Room, U. S. French Can. Papers (Ques.) 3194 (ii).

Laprairie Camp, Supply of Groceries (Ques.) 3193.

Laurentides Post Office (Ques.) 3360 (ii).

Mallette, Louis Z., Langevin Block Contract (Ques.) 1180; (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).

Montreal Field Battery, Drill (Ques.) 3194 (ii).

Napierville Returning Officers, Appnmts. (Ques.) 3993 (ii).

Paradis, Rev. Father, Colonization Scheme (Ques.) 3197 (ii).

Revising Officer, Chambly and Verchères (Ques.) 930 (i).

Revising Officers, Laprairie County (Ques.) 930.

Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand.*

Agriculture, Rep. of Minister (presented) 229 (i).

——— Inspecting Physician, Appnmt. (Ques.) 309 (i).

——— Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4275 (ii).

Anticosti Electoral Lists, Revision (Ans.) 1359 (i).

Bédard, Charles, Appnmt. as Revising Officer (Ans.) 3993 (ii).

Brampton Industrial Establishments (Ans.) 1182.

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1698, 1733 (i).

Butter, Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 199 (i).

——— Shipments to Great Britain (Ans.) 1180 (i).

——— Trade with Great Britain (Ans.) 2512 (ii).

Cattle Trains, Conductors between U. S. and Can. (Ans.) 207 (i).

——— Entries into Can. from Montana, on M. for Cor., &c., 332 (i).

——— Embargo by Great Britain, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 585 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (remarks) 4840 (ii).

——— on M. for Ret., 209 (i).

Census and Agricultural Classes (Ans.) 3994 (ii).

——— Industries in London (remarks) 208 (i).

——— Queen's and Shelburne, on M. for Ret., 328 (i).

——— (Ans.) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).

——— Man., 1896 (Ans.) 429 (i).

——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1833 (i).

Centennial Exhibition, Can. Commissioners' Expenses (Ans.) 2753 (ii).

Chinamen in B.C., Quarantined, Amounts paid by C.P.R. (Ans.) 698 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°, 3190; 2° m., 3739; in Com., 3763, 3846 (ii).

——— Examiners' Rep. (presented) 2570 (ii).

——— Promotion Examinations (Ans.) 482 (i).

Columbian Exhibition, Can. Expenses (Ans.) 1362 (i), 3710 (ii).

——— Commissioner Cockburn's Expenses (Ans.) 2734 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—*Continued.*
Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (remarks) 2401 (i).
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4014 (ii).
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 238 (i); on 2°, 4746 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., Distribution (remarks) 231.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 68) 1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3921, 4065; in Com., 4070 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Drummond and Arthabaska, &c., Printing (Ans.) 771 (i).
——— Lotbinière Co., Printing (Ans.) 771 (i).
——— Laprairie and Napierville (Ans.) 930 (i).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) M. to adjn. deb., 716 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 69) Voters' Lists, 1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3628; in Com., 3657 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 109) 1°*, 2351 (i); 2° m., 3932 (ii).
Industries in Queen's and Shelburne, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).
——— in York County, on inquiry for Ret., 2814.
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1863 (i).
Maps of Electoral Districts, Preparation (Ans.) 1081 (i).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 847 (i).
Napierville Returning Officers, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3994 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2177 (i).
Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 311.
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3190 (ii).
McMurray, L. J. A., Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 1001 (i).
Returns *re* Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) 774 (i).
——— on inquiries (remarks) 3457, 3820 (ii).
Revising Officers, Laprairie County (Ans.) 930 (i).
——— Chambly and Verchères (Ans.) 931 (i).
——— Duplicating Appnmts. (Ans.) 1080 (i).
Statistical Year-Book, on M. for copy of Instructions, 219 (i).
San Jose "Scale" Pest (Ans.) 926 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2387 (i).
Superannuation of Civil Service Employees (Ans.) 4116 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 3348; (Archives) 3242 (ii); (Dairying Interests) 2111 (i), 3351, 3981, 4465; (Experimental Farm Bulletins) 3350; (*Patent Record*) 3345; (Photographic Exhibition) 3352 (ii).
Canals—Income (Welland) 2266 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 2721 (ii); (Indian Affairs) 1946; (Sec. of State) 1918 (i), 3979 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4340 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093; (Voters' Lists) 1949, 2086 (i), 3341 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous (Can Temperance Act) 3906; (Printing) 3906; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 3907 (ii).
Quarantine (Organized Districts) 3354; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3355; (Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital) 3355 (ii).
Statistics (Year-Book) 3346 (ii).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 338.
Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 229 (i).
——— Outside Printing (Ans.) 229, 308 (i).
——— Revision during Year (Ans.) 576 (i).
——— (correction) 1002 (i).
——— Wright division, Ottawa Co. (remarks) 2352 (i).
World's Fair, Dom. Employees (Ans.) 1362 (i), 3710 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4273 (ii).
Agricultural Products, Imports in June, 1894 (Ques.) 2137 (i).
——— Imports from Australia (Ques.) 2360 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3135 (ii).
Athlone-Tottenham Mail Service, Tenders for Contract (Ques.) 1588 (i), 3193 (ii).
Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1733 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Gross Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 273 (i).
Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 296 (i).
——— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 1830 (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4831, 4847 (ii).
——— Entries into Can. from Montana (M. for Cor., &c.) 332 (i).
——— Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 146 (i).
——— Trains, Conductors between U.S. and Can. (Ques.) 207 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1838 (i).
Charlebois, Mr., Arbitration *re* Claim for Extras (M. for Ret.*) 300 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co., on M. for Ret., 4031 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4783 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4169, 4177; on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4492 (ii).
Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 321.
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4016 (ii).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 460 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 2° (Amt.) 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656 (ii).
Gov. General's Salary Reduction (B. 4) 1°, 79 (i); 2° m., 3246 (ii).
General Revenue Fund of N.W.T. B. 134 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3720 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, &c., in Com. on Res., 4062 (ii).
Independence of Parliament (B. 111) 1°, 2257 (i).
Industries in York County, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2814.
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. 3117.
——— Exemption of Societies B. 145 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4355; on M. for 2°, 4769 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3594, 3750 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2190 (i).
——— Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3728; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3916; neg. (Y 57, N. 90) 3919 (ii).
——— Superannuation B. 129 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4252 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) precedence of deb., 2917 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1924 (i).
Langevin Block, Ottawa, Claim for Extras (Ques.) 1970 (i).
Lazier, Lt.-Col., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3596 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1905 (i).
Military College Board of Visitors (Ques.) 1588.
——— Kingston, Number of Cadets (Ques.) 1973.
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4077, 4120; on M. for 3°, 4365.
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2170 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4367 (ii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 215 (i).
Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 310.
Public Works Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4773 (ii).
Returns *re* Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) 773 (i).
——— (inquiry) 3820 (ii).
Salmon Fishing in B. C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4839 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal and C.P.R. (Ques.) 1973.
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3545 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 79; 2° m., 483, 495 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Silver-Lead Smelting B. 142 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4766 (ii).
Sutton, Mr., Appnmt. to Royal Can. Dragoons (Ques.) 1972, 2219 (i).
South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4394 (ii.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Photographic Exhibition) 3352 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2228. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2231; (Rideau) 2256; (Trent) 2265 (i).
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1945; (Interior) 1940; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 1912; (Sec. of State) 1918 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 3874 (ii).
Legislation: Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2669 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Drills, City Corps, &c.) 4461; (Military College) 3797 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2197 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) conc., 2673 (ii).
Mounted Police, 3676 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 2663 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 2300 (i); (N.S.) 3543. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3526 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3146 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3687 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 338.
Tobique Valley Ry., Opening for Traffic (Ques.) 2755 (ii).
——— Dom. Bonus, Voted, &c. (Ques.) 2941 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3230, 3409 (ii).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 436 (i).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. (remarks) 4739 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1019 (i).
Clifton Suspension Bridge Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1585.
Independent Order of Foresters (Supreme Court) incorp. Act Amt. (B. 84) 1°*, 1179 (i).
Maitland and Cobourg Canal Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 75) 1°*, 918 (i).
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 611 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 4484 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 16) 1°, 197 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4122 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4266.
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4702 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 2010 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 17, Dual Language, 1°, 197.

Salvation Army, Gen. Booth's Immigration Scheme (Ques.) 426 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia and Defence (Military College) 3810 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2293 (i).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*

Baie St. Paul Pier, Contract for Construction (Ans.) 3816 (ii).

Butter Shipments to Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4827 (ii).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (Ans.) 4709 (ii).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).

Charlebois' Claim *re* Langevin Block Construction (Ans.) 744, 933 (i).

Coal Contract, Public Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 4709 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4817 (ii).

Cole's Wharf, Bedeque, Dredging (Ans.) 3196 (ii).

Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4779 (ii).

Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1289 (i).

Dredge, New, Preparation of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2703 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3647 (ii).

Gardner's Creek Breakwater, Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

Grand Etang Channel (Ans.) 2141 (i).

——— Contract for Works (Ans.) 3710 (ii).

Guilbault, Ed., Emplymt. by Pub. Works Dept. (Ans.) 306 (i).

Halifax Drill Shed, Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 2358 (i).

Hilton Wharf, St. Joseph's Island, Expend. (Ans.) 2362 (i).

Laurentides P.O., Purchase of Building (Ans.) 3084, 3360 (ii).

——— Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4802 (ii).

"Laval" Dredge, Total Cost, &c., (Ans.) 428 (i).

Little River St. Francois Improvements (Ans.) 1361 (i).

Liverpool Harbour, Surveys, &c., on M. for copies, 326 (i).

McGregor's Creek, Sheet Piling (Ans.) 577 (i).

Magog Wharf, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 2572 (ii).

Mallette, Louis Z., Langevin Block Contract (Ans.) 1180 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, Alleged Utterances of Ministers (Ans.) 578 (i).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii).

Miminegash Breakwater, Extension (Ans.) 931.

Minister of Public Works' Speech in the Prov. of Que. (Ans.) 925 (i).

Ministerial Resignations (statement) 4189 (ii).

Portage la Prairie P.O., Purchase of Site, on M. for O. C., 2383 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4900 (ii).

Port Rowan, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2360 (i).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°, 3082; in Com., 3267 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1829 (i).

Returns, Charlebois' unsettled Accounts (remarks) 774 (i).

Representation in House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 124) 1°, 3082; on consdn. of B., 3458 (ii).

St. John River, Improved Navigation (Ans.) 3360 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 489 (i).

State Funerals (Ans.) 2570 (ii).

——— Late Hon. Thos. White (Ans.) 3193 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Public Works) contingencies, 3102 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Public Works, 4276 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2645, 2676 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3465; (St. Lawrence River Ship Channel) 3464 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2300 (i), 3509 (ii); (Lighting, &c.) 2303; (Lighting Montreal P.O.) 2293; (N.B.) 2273 (i), 3489; (N.W.T.) 3508; (N.S.) 3477 (ii); (Ont.), 2297 (i), 3505 (ii); (Que.) 2293 (i), 3494 (ii); (Repairs, &c., Rideau Hall) 2302; (St. John Custom House) 2273 (i). Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3536. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3533 (ii); (Mar. Provs. generally) 2305, 2326; (N. B.) 2305 (i), 3514; (N. S.) 2304 (i), 3510; (Ont.) 3525; (P.E.I.) 3513 (ii); (Que.) 2331 (i); 3514. Roads and Bridges, 3540. Slides and Booms, 3539. Telegraphs, 3542 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (Ans.) 2726, 2941 (ii).

Three Rivers, Hay Shed (Ans.) 2358 (i).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 1361 (i).

Toronto Drill Hall, Cost (Ans.) 1362 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3846 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1827 (i).

West Point Wharf, Rebuilding (Ans.) 206 (i).

Yamaska and St. Ours Locks, Charges on Vessels (Ans.) 2735 (ii).

——— Obstructions in Channel (Ans.) 925 (i).

——— River, Lock and Dam, Repairs and Maintenance (Ans.) 1697 (i).

——— Construction (Ans.) 2359 (i).

Patterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*

Address to His Ex., on The, 106 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 679 (i).
Six Nation Indians, Deptl. Reps., Distribution (Ques.) 429 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1946 (i), 2690 (ii); (Interior) 1918 (i).
Geological Survey (Artesian Borings) 2489 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Hugh Sutherland's Indemnity) 2092; (Voters' Lists) 1952, 2086 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2492 (ii).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 266 (i).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*

I.C.R., Dismissal of Conductor McCulley (Ques.) 2140 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. L. C., *Laprairie.*

Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal (B. 99) 1°, 1696.
School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. (B. 59) 1°*, 616 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1416 (i).
Cascumpeque Harbour Buoys, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2358 (i).
De Blois Station, Mail Contract (Ques.) 771 (i).
Duvar Road Crossing, Ry. Accommodation (M. for Pets., &c.) 2385 (i).
Kildare Station Post Office (Ques.) 2511 (ii).
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3095, 3668 (ii).
Lobster Packing, License Fees (Ques.) 206 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Extension (Ques.) 931.
North Cape Whistling Buoy (Ques.) 931 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Contract for Cedar Sleepers (Ques.) 3084 (ii).
——— Extension of System, on M. for Ret., 2769 (ii).
St. Louis, Postmaster (Ques.) 771, 2359 (i).
——— Station and Palmer Road, &c., Mail Contract (Ques.) 699 (i).
Steam Service, P.E.I. and Mainland (M. for Ret.) 275 (i).
Straits of Northumberland, Borings (Ques.) 206 (i), 3711 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2319 (i); (P.E.I.) 3512 (ii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Fees Collected (Ques.) 430, 931, 2358 (i) 3715 (ii).
——— Repairs (Ques.) 1361 (i).
——— Names of Vessels (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).
West Point Wharf, Rebuilding (Ques.) 206 (i).
Winter Service, P.E.I. and Mainland (M. for Stmnt.*) 300 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*

Beacon Hill Powder Magazine (Ques.) 919 (i).
Behring Sea Sealers, Payment of Indemnity (Ques.) 620 (i).
——— Seizure of Sealers by Russia, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3872 (ii).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4786 (ii).
Chinamen in B. C., Quarantine, Amounts paid by C.P.R. (Ques.) 698 (i).
Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1286 (i).
Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3979 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2540 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2194 (i).
Provincial Payments into Dom. Treasury (M. for Ret.) 299 (i).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4904 (ii).
Red Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 616 (i).
Return (inquiries) 2943, 3111, 3818 (ii).
"San Pedro," SS., Removal of Wreck (Ques.) 933 (i) 3708 (ii).
Seal Fisheries, Arms and Implements (Ques.) 1083 (i).
——— Compensation to Sealers (Ques.) 83 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3351.
Indians (B.C.) 3902 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2214 (i).
Miscellaneous (Passamaquoddy Bay Boundary) 3908; (Printing, &c.) 3905 (ii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3354 (ii).
Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 57) 1°*, 616 (i).
Volunteer Long Service Medals (remarks) 4906 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 19) 1°, 222 (i).
St. Lawrence River Water Lots (Ques.) 1549 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. D., *Stanstead.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1568, 1589 (i).
Butter, Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 199 (i).
——— Shipments to Great Britain (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Can. Troops for England (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Civil Service, Temporary Employees (Ques.) 3995.
Dom. Loan (1894) Negotiations (Ques.) 1181 (i).
Employees' Voting at Elections (B. 42) 1°, 478 (i).
Foster, H. S., Sale of Govt. Land in Iberville (Ques.) 3195 (ii).
Isle aux Noix, Govt. Land Sales (Ques.) 2510 (ii).
Magog Wharf, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 2572 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Cornwall) 2262 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 1919, 1944; (Justice) J. W. Hughes's services, 1914 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 2505, 4302 (ii). Canals (Welland) 2273 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper, 2103 (i).
Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3182 (ii.)
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Lighting Montreal P.O.) 2293 (i); (N.S.) 3489 (ii); (N.B.) St. John Custom-house, 2288 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Que.), 3515 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (Ques.) 2726 (ii).

Turenne, Auzias, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1181 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbiniere.*

Bourassa, Philip S., Suspension (Ques.) 1970 (i).

Cullers' Office, Quebec, Inspection Dues (Ques.) 1548 (i).

Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4014 (ii).

Electoral Lists, Lotbiniere Co., Printing (Ques.) 771 (i).

Garrison Artillery, Quebec, No. 3 Battery (M. for Cor., &c.) 1973 (i).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa.*

Ottawa and Aylmer Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 616 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1613 (i).

Customs Collections on Theatrical Printing, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2022 (i).

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1593 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4093 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 4481 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2592; in Com., 2598 (ii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4370 (ii).

Private Bills, on M. to Extend Time (remarks) 1177 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2125 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3104 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2652 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3507 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35, on M. to ref. back to Com., 1692 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2655 (ii).

Smith, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1295 (i).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britian (prop. Res.) 581 (i).

Oshawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1179 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2120 (i).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1362 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2129 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Subsidy, Amount Paid B.C. Express Co. (Ques.) 932 (i).

B. C. Mail Service, Contracts (Ques.) 3708 (ii).

Controller of Customs Private Secretaries (Ques.) 1550 (i).

Sugar Island, Sale by Govt. (Ques.) 3359 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Welland) 2270 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 2272; (Williamsburg) 2271 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 2088 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2631.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3162 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3241, 3413 (ii).

Trent Canal, Simcoe and Balsam Lake Div., Tenders (M. for copies*) 2406.

Speaker, Mr. (HON. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*

Address, The, Reply: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 3191 (ii).

Adjmnt. of House, on M. (remarks) 1840 (i).

Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept. (remarks) 2136 (i).

Census Inaccuracies, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1832 (i).

Cockburn, Commissioner, Expenses to Columbian Exhibition, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 2734 (ii).

Committees, references to (ruling) 2539 (ii)

Controller of Customs, relevancy of deb., 4730 (ii).

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (remarks) 2401 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3924, 4068 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (ruling) 3640 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Govt. Pensioners, par. in Peterborough *Examiner re* N.W.T. Rebellion (ruling) 924 (i).
Heir Apparent, Birth of, Acknowledgment from H. M.: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 85 (i).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (ruling) 1823 (i).
Internal Economy Com., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5 (i).
Interruptions by Members, 1473, 1705 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract on Ques. of Order, 2918 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 1974 (i).
Library of Parliament, Joint Rep. (presented) 4.
Manitoba Schools Question (ruling) 4570 (ii).
——— Judgment from Imp. P.C.: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 85 (i).
Members' remarks checked, 1875, 1884 (i), 2943, 3383, 3423, 3622, 3671, 4361, 4748 (ii).
Members, New (notification) 2, 143, 222, 268, 301.
Member's Statement impugned (ruling) 1266 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5, 85, 331, 1453 1539 (i), 3191, 4186, 4352 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations (ruling) 359 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Ives*) on relevancy on Member's remarks, 345 (i).
——— (Mr. *Weldon*) *re* Man. Schools, 799, 803, 814 (i).
——— (Mr. *McCarthy*) reference to previous debate, 814 (i).
——— Member making a correction (ruling) 1029.
——— (Mr. *Foster*) *re* ruling Portage la Prairie P.O. Site, 2513, 2516 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Edgar*) amending Order of the Hse. (ruling) 3912 (ii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Taylor*) reading Newspaper Articles (ruling) 4814 (ii).
Procedure (Ques. of) raising deb. without Notice (ruling) 1293 (i).
Prorogation, Coms. from Gov. Gen's. Sec., 4876, 4903 (ii).
Questions put by Members: Authorities quoted, 1882 (i).
Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec. (read) 3455 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3550; (ruling) 3553 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (reported) 2 (i).
Standing Committees, ref. to, ruled out of Order 2944 (ii).
Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 2159 (i), 2518 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Hugh Sutherland's Indemnity) 2093 (i); (Printing, Paper, &c.) 3342. Library (Salaries, &c.) 3342 (ii). Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2106 (i).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 3540.
Unparliamentary Language, 821, 844, 1106, 1834, 1906, 2061, 2070, 2380 (i), 2944, 3001, 4488, 4491 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Vacancies (notification) 1 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. on Res. (sawed boards) 4851 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co's. B. (ruling) 4886 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (MR. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1539 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Tisdale*) *re* Private Bills Notice (ruling) 3237 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Unforeseen Expenses) 1917 (i).
Unlawful Associations and Oaths R. 7 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) Amt. ruled out of Order, 2520 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., First Rep., conc., 477 (i).
Adulteration of Food Act Amt. (B. 41) 1°, 478 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1454 (i).
Cattle Embargo by Great Britain on prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 584 (i).
——— (Ques.) 4709 (ii).
——— Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 145 (i).
Can. Mutual Life Association, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 221 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2671 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3744 (ii).
Conspiracies, &c., in Restraint of Trade Act Amt. (B. 112) 1°, 2259 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2563 (ii).
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (M. to adjn. deb.) agreed to (Y. 62, N. 57) 4021 (ii).
Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies (B. 12) 1°, 81 (i).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 719 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2028 (i).
——— Wednesdays (remarks) 3623 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2537 (ii).
Hamilton Distillery Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 478 (i).
——— Township Loan Society's Act (1885) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 478 (i).
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3121.
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3588 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2191 (i).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1000 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1936 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1903 (i).

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2065 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. C., &c., 2012 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2180 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4374 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1° *, 617 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3549 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 509 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2110 (i), 4466 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4318 (ii).

Penitentiaries: (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3147 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Kaministiquia River) 3476 (ii).

Thousand Islands, Number Sold (M. for Ret.) 1974 (i).

——— Reservations for Park, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4001 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3236, 3245 (ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz.-Wm., *Halifax.*

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 48) 1° *, 515.

I.C.R., Burning of Shed at Richmond (remarks) 1354 (i).

Ottawa Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 2359.

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2638 (ii).

Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1° *, 515.

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*

Agricultural Products, Imports in June, 1894 (Ques.) 2137 (i).

Anderson, James, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 306, 479 (i).

Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2608 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 1262 (i).

Canal Improvements in St. Lawrence (Ques) 306.

Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. (B. 71) 1° *, 839; in Com., 1732 (i).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1837 (i).

Customs Collectorship, Niagara Falls, Vacancy (Ques.) 574 (i).

Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4760 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Guilbault, Ed., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 305 (i).

Hilton Wharf, St. Joseph's Island, Expend. (Ques.) 2362 (i).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3760, 3942, (ii).

Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4812 (ii).

Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4905.

Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 33) 1° *, 425 (i).

Seigniory of Sorel, Govt. Tenants (Ques.) 304 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3550 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2348 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2096. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2108 (i).

Militia and Defence (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2205 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 3489; (N.W.T.) 3508; (N.S.) 3485; (Ont.) 3507 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3231, 3415 (ii).

Trans-Atlantic Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 305.

Tarte, Mr. J. I., *L'Islet.*

Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4020 (ii).

Employees in Pub. Works Dept. non-permanent (M. for Stmnt.*) 343 (i).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4811 (ii).

Manitoba Schools Question on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4420 (ii).

Military Riding School, Montreal, Amounts Paid (M. for Stmnt.*) 343 (i).

Montreal City P. O., Repairs, Amounts Paid (M. for Stmnts.*) 343 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2644; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2649 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3538. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3517. Slides and Booms, 3539 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 425 (i).

Alien Contract Labour prevention (B. 18) 1°*, 198 (i).

Can. Order of Foresters incorp (B. 47) 1°*, 515.

Chute, Julia Ethel, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 3815 (ii).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (Ques.) 4709 (ii).

Custom Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1271 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 237 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*

Debates, Official, 5th Rep. of Com. (presented) 4255 (ii).
Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of Church of Eng. in Can. incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1818.
Dom. Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1818 (i).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4224 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Article in *Canada Farmer's Sun* (remarks) 4813 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) Amt. to Amt., 2809; neg. (Y. 51, N. 70) 2812 (ii).
Returns, Cost since 1891-95 (Ques.) 2506 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3552 (ii).
——— 8th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 3265.

SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3149 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3531 (ii).

Thousand Islands Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1179 (i).
———Number Sold (M. for Ret.) 1974 (i).
——— Reservations for Park (prop. Res.) 3997.

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 445 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N. S.) on M. for Ret., 1978 (i).

SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) St. John Custom-house, 2277 (i).

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*

Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2611 (ii).
Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1731 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2567 (ii).
——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4088 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2697 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 2°, 3632 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2530 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3761, 3940 (ii).
Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 77) 1°*, 1000 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1930, 2353 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 765 (i).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2083 (i).
Private Bills, on M. to Extend Time (remarks) 1175 (i).
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 601 (i).
St. Lawrence River Water Lots (Ques.) 1549 (i).
Sel. Com. on Rys., &c., Meetings during Sittings of House (M.) 3909, 4113 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3547 (ii).

SUPPLY:
Militia and Defence (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2218 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3236 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Address to His Ex., on The 70 (i).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2442 (ii).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3140 (ii).
Ballot Papers, B. rspecting (remarks) 3916 (ii).
Behring Sea, Arbitration (Ans.) 4862 (ii).
——— Seizure of Sealers by Russian Crusiers (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3863 (ii)
Binder Twine, Govt. Sales (Ans.) 3818 (ii).
——— manufactured in Kingston Penitentiary (Ans.) 2356 (i), 3707 (ii).
Business of the Hse., Bills Reported (M.) 4740 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3762 (ii).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3205, 3377 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4782 (ii).
Connor, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3993.
Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4712 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 103) 1°*, 1881 (i); in Com., 4081 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2685 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) Amt., 6 m.h., 2147 (i).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii)
——— (B. 51) 1°, 515 (i); in Com., 4083, 4741 (ii).
——— Joint Com., (M.) 2406 (ii).
——— Reduction of Quorum, 3266 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Wallace) in Com., 4128, 4166; on Order for consdn. of B., 4470 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4492 (ii)
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2695 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3923; on M. for 3°, 4065; in Com., 4069 (ii).
Female Offenders in N.S. Act Amt. (B. 128) 1°*, 3556; 2° m., 3716; in Com., 3719 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2576; in Com., 2596 (ii).
Fishing Rights in River Matane, Contracts, on M. for copies, 2398 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3637 (ii).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s, incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2701; in Com., 2704 (ii).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1824 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (prop. Res.) 1883, 2180; in Com., 2183, 2196 (i).
——— (B. 127) 1°*, 3086; in Com., 3722; 3° m., 3916 (ii).
——— Superannuation (prop. Res.) 2165 (i); in Com., 3088 (ii).
——— (B. 129) 1°*, 3122; in Com., 4252 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3026, 3075 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1927 (i).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1894 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. to dschge. Order for Com., 2517 (ii).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
——— On M. to adjn. deb., 4570 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4192 (ii).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 1988 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. (B. 131) 1°, 3190; in Com., 4366; Sen. Amts., 4877 (ii).
——— (explanation) 4876 (ii).
——— Insane Convicts (B. 66) 1°, 618; in Com., 2165 (i).
Penitentiary, B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4821 (ii).
Remedial Order *re* Man. Schools (Ans.) 579 (i).
Returns presented, 4906 (ii).
St. Louis, Emmanuel, Civil Proceedings against (Ans.) 1588 (i), 3457 (ii).
St. Thomas P. O., Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2164 (i).
Salmon Fishing in N.B. (Ans.) 3455 (ii).
"San Pedro" SS., Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 3708.
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., Meetings during Sittings of Hse., on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3910 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3549 (ii).
South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4393 (ii).
"Stanley" Str., and Exploration of Hudson Straits (remarks) 4906 (ii).
Superannuation Act Amt. (B. 6) on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2163 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2230 (i).
Civil Government (Justice) Gisborne, &c., services, 1913; J. W. Hughes's services, 1914 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502. Weights and Measures (Litigation) 2502 (ii).
Dominion Police, 3141 (ii).
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335: (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).
Justice, Administration of (B.C.) 1947 (i); (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 3107; (Official Arbitrators) 3107 (ii); (Ont.) 1947; (Que.) 1948 (i); (Supreme Court) 3109; (Travelling Expenses, High Court Judges) 3107; (Travelling Expenses, Judges) 3141 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093; (Voters' Lists) 1953 (i).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490: (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2494, 2623 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 3486 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2331 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 1948 (i); (Dorchester) 3176; (Kingston) 3141, Binder Twine, 3144 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 1948 (i).
U.S. Legislation *re* Navigation of Great Lakes (remarks) 3557 (ii).
Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 144) 1°, 4353 (ii).
Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 4878; in Com., 4890 (ii).

Turcotte, Mr. A. J., *Montmorency.*
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3841 (ii).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. T., *Dorchester.*
Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford Mail Contract (Ques.) 575 (i).
——— (remarks) 3715 (ii).
Lamontagne, Jos., Mail Contract, &c. (M. for copies) 1974 (i).

Wallace, Hon. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Agricultural Imports from Australia (Ans.) 2360.
——— Products, Imports in June, 1894 (Ans.) 2137 (i).
Allen, late Dr., Gratuity to Widow, on M. for O.C., 298 (i).
American-made Milk Cans, Free Entry (Ans.) 3815 (ii).
Board of Experts (Customs) in U.S. (Ans.) 1827.
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1140 (i).
——— (explanation) 1259 (i).
Chenier, Dr., Monument, Customs Duties (Ans.) 3712, 4115 (ii).
"City of Midland," Str., Seizure, &c. (Ans.) 4708.
Courtright Customs Officer, Superannuation (Ans.) 3359 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. N. C.—*Continued.*

Customs Act Amt. (B. 140) 1°, 3913; 2° m., 4125; in Com., 4131, 4168; on consdn. of B., 4471; 3° m., 4473; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4477 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4490.
——— Collectorship, Montreal (Ans.) 205 (i).
——— Collector, Niagara Falls, Vacancy (Ans.) 574 (i).
——— Collectors as Brokers (Ans.) 1359, 1971 (i).
——— Collector, Three Rivers, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 574 (i).
——— Dept., alleged Irregularities (Ans.) 2754.
——— Deptl. Employees, Special (Ans.) 2164 (i).
——— Extra or Regular (Ans.) 3191 (ii).
——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1269 (i).
——— on Spirits (Ans.) 698 (i).
——— Officers at Fort Erie, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3815 (ii).
——— Officials, Toronto, Emplymt. (Ans.) 305.
——— Valuators, Outside Agents (Ans.) 1826 (i).
Exports to Australia (Ans.) 84 (i).
Finlay, W., Appnmt. in Customs Service (Ans.) 2139 (i).
Granite and Freestone, Imports (Ans.) 306 (i).
Granite (Red) Monuments, Imports (Ans.) 306.
Harvesters, Self-binders, Number Exported (Ans.) 2734 (ii).
Hay Exports to U.S. and Great Britain (Ans.) 2357 (i).
Imports and Exports, 1894-95 (Ans.) 426 (i).
Imports of Dutiable Goods, Amount and Duties Collected (Ans.) 576 (i).
——— Free Goods by Govt. (Ans.) 2571 (ii).
Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2058 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
Moir, Geo., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3196 (ii).
Ogilvie, W. W., Drawback on Imported Corn (Ans.) 4357 (ii).
Pig Iron Imported into Can. from U.S. (Ans.) 932 (i).
Piping for Wells, Duty (Ans.) 3708 (ii).
Rice Imports, July, 1894, to May, 1895, Quantity (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Seizure of Illicit Still at L'Islet Station (Ans.) 2139 (i).
Southampton Customs Officers, Names, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 4116 (ii).
Sugar Imports (Ans.) 1357 (i).
——— (Raw) Imports (Ans.) 507 (i).
——— Imports, Raw and Refined (Ans.) 768, 922 (i).
——— Imported into Montreal and Halifax (Ans.) 1001 (i).
Sutton, Mr., Appnmt. to Royal Can. Dragoons (Ans.) 1972 (i).

Wallace, Hon. N. C.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Customs) 2711 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502, 4350; (Litigation) 2503 (ii).
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 86 (i).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 265, 335 (i).
Tobacco Seized from Alphonse Thibault (Ans.) 480 (i).
——— Seizures in Temiscouata (Ans.) 480 (i).
Wallace, George, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3084 (ii).
West Kootenay Customs Rets., on M. for Ret., 322 (i).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*

Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 349 (i).
Copyright, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2687 (ii).
Customs Duties on American Hardware, on Ques. of Order, 1285 (i).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2699 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4270.
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4212 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) Man. Schools 799 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., Reduction of Quorum (M.) 3545 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 491 (i).
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 3108.

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Chignecto Ship Ry., Newspaper par. (remarks) 1354 (i).
Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret., 2763 (ii).
Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 288 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 3512 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*

Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3215, 3374, 4033 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3094 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 514 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1179 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Seal Island Lighthouse Station) 3616 (ii).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*

Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths Act Amt. (B. 7) 1°, 79 (i); 2° m., 2519 (ii).

Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4869; in Com. on B. 150, 4890 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 487 (i).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, &c., 4303 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°, 80 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3536 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F., *Brockville.*

Bourassa, Philippe S., Suspension (Ans.) 1970 (i).

Carleton (N.B.) Bonded Warehouses, Closing (Ans.) 2357 (i).

Cullers at Montreal and Quebec, Number, &c. (Ans.) 577 (i).

——— Offices, Montreal and Quebec, Maintenance and Revenue (Ans.) 929 (i).

——— Que., Abolition (Ans.) 579 (i).

——— Inspection Dues (Ans.) 1549 (i).

——— Supervisor at Quebec (Ans.) 1359 (i).

Excise Duty on Spirits (Ans.) 698 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 122) 1°, 3080; in Com., 3459 (ii).

Illicit Distilleries, Seizure (Ans.) 3357 (ii).

——— Still at L'Islet, (Ans.) 4115 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 4861 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 2718 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, &c., 4338. Culling Timber, 4282, 4463. Excise, 4279; (Methylated Spirits) 4281. Weights and Measures, &c., 4285, 4301 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F.—*Continued.*

Tobacco, Can., Amount Collected (Ans.) 1587 (i).

——— Entry of Foreign Leaf Duty Free (remarks) 2030 (i).

——— Seizure at Isle Verte (Ans.) 697 (i).

Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 434 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1379 (i).

Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com., 2293 (i).

Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3116.

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 1967 (i).

Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) St. John Custom-house, 2279 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Cole's Wharf, Bedeque, Dredging (Ques.) 3196 (ii).

Darnley Basin, &c., Buoys and Range Lights (Ques.) 580 (i).

Lenkletter P. O., Establishment (Ques.) 1179 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3093; in Com., 3096, 3660 (ii).

Magog Wharf, Expenditure of Vote (Ques.) 1968.

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret., 2773 (ii).

Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 283 (i).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Distribution of Bounty) 3991 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3536 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2317 (i); (P.E.I.) 2513(ii).

Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses (Ques.) 2726 (ii).

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

ACTIVE MILTIA FORCE, SAVING BY REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*), 3355 (ii).

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Bennett*) 5; seconded (Mr. *Belley*) 14 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 21; (Mr. *Foster*) 36; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 54; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 70; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 87; (Sir *James Grant*) 97; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 106; (Mr. *Davin*) 115; (Mr. *Casey*) 131; (Mr. *McMullen*) 146; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 154; (Mr. *Costigan*) 171 (i).

——— REPLY: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 3191 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

DOM. DAY, ; M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3545 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3456 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1355 (i).

——— STATE FESTIVITIES, : M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2030 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "Justice."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 2, ; *pro forma*.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°, 478 (i).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 4308 (ii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4827 (ii).

——— IMPORTS FROM AUSTRALIA: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2360 (i).

——— PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO CANADA, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2137 (i).

——— SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii).

AGRICULTURE:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 228 (i).

——— 1ST REP.: conc. (Mr. *Sproule*) 477 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i), 3342, 4465 (ii).

——— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2721 3102 (ii).

——— VACANCY IN CABINET: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*, &c.) 4273 (ii).

——— PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO CANADA, VALUE, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2137 (i).

——— INSPECTING PHYSICIAN, APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 309 (i).

BUTTER PURCHASES BY GOVT. DURING 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 199 (i).

——— SHIPMENTS TO ENGLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4824 (ii).

——— ON GOVT. ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180.

——— TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2511 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Continued.*

CATTLE EMBARGO BY GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor. &c. (Mr. *Innes*) 209 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 296 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 581 (i).

——— Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 173, 1830 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4831 (ii).

——— Removal: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4709 (ii).

——— EXPORTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) on adjnmt., 142 (i).

——— QUARANTINE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4840 (ii).

——— REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) 144 (i).

——— SHIPMENTS TO BELGIUM: Ques. (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 4830 (ii).

——— TRANSPORT THROUGH U.S. FOR SHIPMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 341, 477 (i).

CHEESE FACTORIES IN P.E.I., MANUFACTURE AND SALE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2023 (i).

DAIRY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2031 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i), 3350, 4465 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM BULLETINS: in Com. of Sup., 3350 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 3501 (ii).

——— REPS., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Grieve*) 2406 (i).

HARASS NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii).

MCMURRAY, L. J. A., EMPLYMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 1001 (i).

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 322 (i).

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

PUBLIC HEALTH IN QUARANTINE DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

SAN JOSE "SCALE" PEST IN U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 926 (i).

SEED GRAIN, PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2661 (ii).

SHEEP EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Featherston*) 2385 (i).

SUPERANNUATION, PAYMENTS BY CHARLES THIBAULT: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).

[*See* "ARTS AND STATISTICS."]

AGRICULTURE, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Montague*) 229 (i).

Alberta Railway and Coal Company's B. No. 27 (Sir *Donald Smith*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

Alien Contract Labour, prevention B. No. 18 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°, 198 (i).

Aliens, Contracts to, prevention B. No. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°, 80 (i); 2° m., 2520; deb. adjd., 2542 (ii).

ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4908 (ii).

ALLAN AND DOMINION SS. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

ALLAN SS. CO.'S OCEAN MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3600 (ii).

"Alliance Nationale" B. No. 61 (Mr. *Lachapelle*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i).

"ALPHA AND BETA," MANIFESTS OF CARGO, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

AMERICAN HARDWARE, CUSTOMS DUTIES AND SPECIAL AGENTS: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn., 1268 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1269; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1271; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1271; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1273; (Mr. *Foster*) 1275; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1280; (Mr. *Casey*) 1283; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1285; (Mr. *Prior*) 1286; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1288; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1289; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1291; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 1293 (i).

AMERICAN-MADE MILK CANS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).

ANDERSON, JAS., OF SUTTON, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 306, 479 (i).

Angling Club. *See* "CAMP HARMONY."

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1359 (i).

—— NAMES OF OWNERS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 322 (i).

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2510 (ii).

ANNAPOLIS MILITARY GROUNDS, LEASE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2139 (i).

ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3342 (ii).

ARTESIAN BORINGS IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 3342 (ii).

CENSUS AND AGRICULTURAL CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3994 (ii).

—— PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" REFLECTING ON MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 423 (i).

CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS' EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2736 (ii).

COCKBURN, MR., M.P., EXPENSES AT COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION, CAN. EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3710 (ii).

—— MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 84 (i).

—— EXPENSES IN CONNECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1361 (i).

—— MR. LABRE'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).

INDUSTRIES IN BRAMPTON, DESCRIPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1162 (i).

—— CHATHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406.

ARTS AND STATISTICS—*Continued.*

INDUSTRIES IN QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE, N.S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

—— WINGHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).

PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITION AT IMP. INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (ii).

"STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF CANADA:" in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK, PRINTING, &C.: M. for instructions (Mr. *Casey*) 217 (i).

WORLD'S FAIR, CAN. COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).

[*See* "AGRICULTURE," "Columbian Ex.," &c.]

ARNPRIOR P.O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL SERVICE, SUBSIDY PAID TO B.C. EXPRESS CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 932 (i), 3708 (ii).

Assiniboine River. *See* "WINNIPEG."

ASST. RECEIVER GENL.'S OFFICE, CHARLOTTETOWN: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

—— ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

ATLANTIC AND SUPERIOR RY. CO., GOVT. GUARANTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 2920 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1587 (i) 3193 (ii).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S PET. *re* ESTIMATES FOR DEPT.: Presented (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2132.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2260 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup:

Deb. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2408; (Mr. *Foster*) 2421; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2435; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2442; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2464; (Mr. *Dickey*) 2472; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2477; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2481 (ii).

—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 309 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 86 (i).

AUSTRALIA, EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 84 (i).

BADDECK, GRAND NARROWS, &C., SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL PIER, CONTRACT FOR BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Bankers Life Ass. of Can. incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BANKING AND COMMERCE, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 227 (i).

BASTIEN, AGENT, AND HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1975 (i).

—— LETTER *re* PICAUD *vs.* PICAUD: M. for copy* (Mr. *Laurier*) 2022 (i).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON (N.W.T.) MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2024 (i).

BAY OF FUNDY SS. Co.'s SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2332 (i).

BEACON HILL, VICTORIA (B.C.) POWDER MAGAZINE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 919 (i).

BEALTON, P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1268 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i); conc. 2672 (ii).

BEDARD, CHARLES, APPNMT. AS REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3993 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar Bounty B. No. 148 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 6.)

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4852 (ii).

——— COMPENSATION TO SEALERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 83 (i).

——— CONFERENCE, GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1185 (i).

——— EXPENSES *re* ARBITRATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 426 (i).

——— SEAL FISHERIES, SEALING OF ARMS, &C.: Remarks (M. *Prior*) 1083.

——— SEIZURE OF SEALERS BY RUSSIAN CRUISERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3369, 3856 (ii).

——— SEIZURE OF SHIPS BY U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 215 (i).

BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i)

Benevolent Society. *See* "CANADIAN."

BERNE CONVENTION *re* COPYRIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82 (i).

BERTRAND, CHAS., TOBACCO SEIZED FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480, 697 (i).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 2; *pro forma.*

BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 79; 2°, 465, in Com., 737; M. to restore to Order Paper, 766; again in Com., 1841 (i); Order for Com., read, 2517 (ii).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)
1°*, 79; 2° m., 2145; Amt. (*Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.*) 6 m. h., 2147; agreed to, 2152 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To reduce the salary of the Governor General.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 79 (i); 2°, m., 3246 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) In further amendment of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 79; 2° neg. (Y. 46, N. 100) 2517 (i).

BILL (No. 6) Further to amend the Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 79; 2° m., 2152 (i); deb. rsmd. and ruled out of Order, 2518 (ii).

BILL (No. 7) Further to amend the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°, 79 (i); 2°, 2519; in Com. and 3°*, 2570 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 8) Further to amend the Act respecting Weights and Measures.—(Mr. *Wilson.*)
1°, 89 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To prevent the letting of contracts to Aliens.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°, 80 (i); 2° m., 2520; deb. adjd., 2542 (ii).

BILL (No. 10) Respecting the sale of railway return-fare tickets.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°, 80 (i).

BILL (No. 11) Respecting the liability of the Government and public companies for labour used in the construction of public works.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°, 80 (i).

BILL (No. 12) Respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°, 81 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To promote the safety of railway employees.—(Mr. *Maclean, York.*)
1°, 143 (i).

BILL (No. 14) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to make certain provisions in place thereof.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 182 (i).

BILL (No. 15) In amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 196 (i); 2° m., 2542; deb. adjd., 2569 (ii).

BILL (No. 16) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 197 (i).

BILL (No. 17) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 197 (i).

BILL (No. 18) To prevent the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°, 198 (i).

BILL (No. 19) In further amendment of the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°, 222 (i).

BILL (No. 20) In further amendment of the Dominion Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
1°, 222 (i).

BILL (No. 21) To amend "The Dairy Products Act, 1893."—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
Res. prop., 208; in Com., 234; 1°* of B., 240 (i); transfrd. to Govt. Orders, 4187 (ii).

BILL (No. 22) Further to amend "The Dominion Notes Act."—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 268 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 23) Further to amend "The Railway Act."—(Mr. *Bryson.*)
1°, 269 (i).

BILL (No. 24) Respecting union labels and trade marks, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°, 269 (i).

BILL (No. 25) Further to amend the Act respecting the House of Commons.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 301 (i).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Bankers Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Sir *Donald Smith.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the St. John River Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°., 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the James Maclaren Company (Limited).—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Deschênes Bridge Company.—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Canadian Benevolent Society.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. *Featherston.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 33) To grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited.)—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com., 3230, 3407, 3948; recom., 4030, 4154; 3° m., 4154; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4154; neg. (Y. 39, N. 113) 4163; 3°, 4164 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lachapelle.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i).

BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the salaries of Lieutenant-Governors.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 425 (i).

BILL (No. 38) To incorporate the Hamilton Distillery Company (Limited).—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 478; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 478; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting drainage on and across railway lands.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 477 (i).

BILL (No. 41) Further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°, 478 (i).

BILL (No. 42) To facilitate voting by employees at elections of members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Rider.*)
1°, 478 (i).

BILL (No. 43) To determine the hours of labour for workmen and labourers employed on public works.—(Mr. *Lépine.*)
1°*, 478 (i).

BILL (No. 44) Respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 479 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3085 (ii).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 572; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Trans-Canadian Railway Company.—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 572 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Canadian Order of Foresters.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°, 2293 (i).

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com., 2695; 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Stairs*).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 51) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 515 (i); 2°*, 2406; in Com., 4082, 4741; 3°*, 4746 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 52) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Martin.*)
1°*, 515 (i).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com., 1967; 3°*, 2292 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Ottawa and Aylmer Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Robillard.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1924 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1924: in Com., 1959; 3° on div., 2352 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1731; in Com., 1924; 3°*, 1959 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 91.)

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 616, 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Red Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

BILL (No. 59) To amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Pelletier.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736 (i).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Niagara, Hamilton and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the "Alliance Nationale."—(Mr. *Lachapelle.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Lowell.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 65) To amend "The Railway Act," by providing greater security for passengers and employees, and in other respects.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 617 (i).

BILL No. 66) Further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 618; 2° and in Com., 2165 (i); 3°*, 2406 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 67) Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 618 (i); 2°, 2574; in Com., 2593; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 68) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°, 768 (i); 2° and in Com., 3921; 3° m., 4065; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to recom., 4066; 3°*, 4072 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Voters' Lists of 1895.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3628; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656; 2° and in Com., 3657; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Camp Harmony Angling Club.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com., 1732; 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

BILL (No. 72) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919 (i).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Calgary and Lethbridge Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919 (i); wthdn., 4186 (ii).

BILL (No. 74) Further to amend the Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 839 (i); 2° and in Com., 3086; 3°, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 29.)

BILL (No. 75) To revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1°*, 918; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 76) In further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*)
1°, 918 (i).

BILL (No. 77) To amend the Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Permanent Reserve Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°*, 1,000; 2°*, 1121 (i).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate "Gilmour and Hughson, Limited."—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2353 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 89.)

BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i); Sen. Amts., 4774 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 83.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Co.—(Mr. *Metcalfe.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 51.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 1078; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

BILL (No. 84) To amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii).

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); M. for Com., 2698; in Com., 2704; 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Canada Insurance Promotion Association (Limited).—(Mr. *Choquette.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1357 (i).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725; Sen. Amts., 4777 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. *White, Shelburne.*)
1°*, 1179; 2° objected to, 1310, 1357; 2°*, 1733 (i); M. for Com., 4286; in Com., 4392, 4615, 4771; 3°*, 4771 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 89) Respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); wthdn., 2570 (ii).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Smith, Ont.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend the Law respecting the Lobster Fishery.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 1179 (i); 2° and in Com., 3095, 3659; recom., 3672; 3°*, 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 92) Further to amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1352 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3112; 3°*, 3122; Sen. Amts., 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 20.)

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty, known as the Markland Mortgage.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1352; Res. prop., 1883 (i); in Com., 2408; B. wthdn, 2408 (ii).

BILL (No. 94) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 1353 (i).

BILL (No. 95) To incorporate the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 1452; 2°*, 1733; in Com. and 3°*, 2354 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. *Masson.*)
1°*, 1548; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com., 3583, 3748, 3938; 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 2293 (i); in Com., 4772; 3°*, 4474 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 99) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and amending Acts.—(Mr. *Pelletier.*)
1°, 1696 (i).

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Dominion Trusts Company.—(Mr. *Smith, Ont.*)
1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 102) Further to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1818 (i); dschgd., 4861 (ii).

BILL (No. 103) To amend "The Copyright Act"—(*from the Senate*).—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°*, 1881 (i); 2°* and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 104) Further to amend the Civil Service Act—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 1881 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3932 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

BILL (No. 105) To incorporate the Ottawa Land and Security Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 1959 (i); 2°*, 3150; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

BILL (No. 106) In further amendment of the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 2024 (i).

BILL (No. 107) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 2136 (i).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the assignment and attachment of the salaries of public employees.—(Mr. *Béchard.*)
1°, 2136 (i).

BILL (No. 109) Further to amend "The Indian Act"—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 2351; 2°, 3932; in Com. and 3°*, 3938 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 110) For the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2570; 2° on div., 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 111) Better to secure the Independence of Parliament.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 2257 (i).

BILL (No. 112) To amend the law relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 2259 (i).

BILL (No. 113) To amend Chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 2259; 2°* and in Com., 3270 (i); 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 114) To amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in the Province of Manitoba. —(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°, 2405; 2°* and in Com., 4072; 3°*, 4074 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 115) For the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°*, 2506; 2° on div., 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°, 2507; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°*, 3271; Sen. Amts., 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 117) Respecting *La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montréal.*—(Mr. *Lépine.*)
1°*, 2670; 2°*, 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 118) To amend the Fisheries Act as respects the Salmon Fishery.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 2919; dschgd., 4861 (ii).

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Shore Line Railway Company—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Gillmor.*)
1°*, 3078; M. to place on Order paper for 2°, 3111; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 120) To Amend the North-west Irrigation Act.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°, 3079; 2°* and in Com., 4767; 3°*, 4768 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 121) Further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°; 3080; 2°* and in Com., 4074, 4117; 3° m., 4120; deb. adjd., 4121; rsmd., 4630, 4762; 3°*, 4763 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 122) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 3080; 2°* and in Com., 3459; 3°*, 3463 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 123) Further to amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Ouimet.*)
1°, 3082; 2° and in Com., 3267; 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 124) Further to amend the Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Ouimet.*)
1°, 3082; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 125) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th day of June, 1895, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res., 2815; 1°* of B., 3085; 2°*, 3111; 3°*, 3266 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 126) Respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 3085; 2°, 3558; in Com., 3564; 3° m., 3820; 3° on div., 3848 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 127) Further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1883; in Com., 2180; 1°* of B., 3086; 2°* and in Com., 3722; 3° m., 3916; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3916; neg. (Y. 57, N. 90) 3919; 3°, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 128) to amend the Act respecting certain Female Offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia —(*from the Senate*).—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°*, 3556; 2°, 3716; in Com., 3719; 3°*, 3720 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 129) to amend the Law respecting the Superannuation of Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 2165 (i); in Com., 3088; 1°* of B., 3122; 2°* and in Com., 4252; 3°*, 4254 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°, 3190; 2° m., 3769; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h., 3742; neg., 3746; 2° and in Com., 3746, 3762; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 131) to amend the Acts respecting Penitentiaries.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 3190; 2°* and in Com., 4366; 3°*, 4470; Sen. Amts., 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 132) to revive and amend the Acts to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. *Martin.*)
1°*, 3266; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 133) to again amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 3266 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) to legalize payments heretofore made to the General Revenue Fund of the North-west Territories, of certain fines, penalties, and forfeitures.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
Res. prop., 2573; in Com., 3122; 1°* of B., 3267; 2°* and in Com., 3720; 3°*, 3721 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 135) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 3455; 2°, 3930; in Com., 3931; 3°*, 3932; Sen. Amts., 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 136) Respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty known as the Markland Mortgage.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1883 (i); M. for Com., 2406; in Com., 2408; 1°* of B., 3558; 2°, 3928; in Com., 3930; 3°, 4063 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 137) to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade—(*from the Senate*). —(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 3621; 2°, 3721: in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 138) to amend The Companies' Act—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 3707; 2° m., 4778; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4780; in Com., 4781; 3°*, 4786 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 121.)

BILL (No. 139) for the relief of Julia Ethel Chute—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1°*, 3815; 2° on div., 3948; 3° on div., 4154 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 140) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Wallace*.)
1°, 3913; 2°, 4125; in Com., 4127, 4164; consdn. of B., 4471; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to recom., 4473; Amt. neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486; 3°, 4496 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 22.)

BILL (No. 141) For the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and British Columbia, relating to lands in the Railway Belt, British Columbia—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 3993: 2°, 4078; in Com., 4079; 3°*, 4081 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 142) To encourage Silver-lead smelting.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 3925; 1°* of B., 4065; 2°* and in Com., 4123; recom., 4763; 3°*, 4767 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 143) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 3915; in Com., 4062; conc., 4121; 1°* of B., 4123; 2°* and in Com., 4470; 3°*, 4751 ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend "The Winding Up Act."—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*.)
1°, 4353; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4751 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

BILL (No. 145) To authorize the Treasury Board to exempt certain Societies from the operation of the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 4354; 2°, 4768. in Com. and 3°*, 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

BILL (No. 146) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1894.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. in Com., 4847; 1°* of B., 4861; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 147) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville*.)
1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

BILL (No. 148) Respecting the bounty on Beet-root Sugar.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

BILL (No. 149) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1896, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. in Com., 4862: 1°*, 4863; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 150) Respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
Res. prop., 4819; M. for Com., 4863; in Com., 4869; conc. and 1°* of B., 4876; 2° m., 4877; 2° and in Com., 4890; 3°*, 4893 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT: 3575, 4909 (ii).

BINDER TWINE, GOVT. SALES BELOW COST: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3818 (ii).

—— MANUFACTURED IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2355 (i).

—— PRISON-MADE, SHIPMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3707 (ii).

—— MANUFACTURED AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2022 (i).

BLEAKNEY AND FARROW, MESSRS., CUSTOMS DEPTL. IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2754 (ii).

Boards of Trade incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3621; 2°, 3721; in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 17.)

BONAVENTURE COUNTY PILOT EXAMINERS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).

BOOTH, GEN., PROPOSED CAN. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

—— GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2361 (i).

BOUNTY, FISHING, FRAUDS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i).

—— ON PIG IRON MADE IN CAN.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 2022 (i).

BOSTON P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1267 (i).

BOURASSA, PHILIPPE S., SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1970 (i).

BOWELL, SIR MACKENZIE, LETTER TO MR. MCNEILL, M.P., *re* SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).

BRAMPTON INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1182.

—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2298 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

BRIGADE CAMP, NO. 1 DISTRICT: Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL SERVICE AND B.C. EXPRESS CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3708 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY PAID TO B.C. EXPRESS CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 932 (i).

BEACON HILL, VICTORIA, POWDER MAGAZINE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 919 (i).

BEHRING SEA. *See* general heading.

CABINET REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4786.

C.P.R. QUARANTINED CHINAMEN, GOVT. CHARGES FOR FEEDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 693 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).

FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3533 (ii).

KOOTENAY AND SPOKANE REGISTERED MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 1182 (ii).

NEW WESTMINSTER DRILL SHED; in Com of Sup, 4461 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*
PENITENTIARY; in Com. of Sup., 2669 (i).
—— JUSTICE DRAKE'S INSTRUCTIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Corbould*) 297 (i).
—— JAMES FITZSIMMONS'S SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 204 (i).
—— KEARY, WM. H. RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).
—— MCBRIDE, ARTHUR H., RETIREMENT; Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).
—— NEW BUILDING SITE: Remarks (Mr. *Corbould*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4820 (ii).
ROSSLAND CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 2022 (i).
SALMON FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4839 (ii).
"SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 933 (i), 3708 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 3542 (ii).
VANCOUVER PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2302.
VICTORIA DRILL HALL AND P.O.: in Com. of Sup. 3509 (ii).
WEST KOOTENAY CUSTOMS RETURNS, 1890 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 321 (i).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

BROCKVILLE, CORNWALL AND STRATHROY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

BUDGET, THE, Annual Stmt. (Mr. *Foster*) 517; (explanation) 620;
—— Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 553, 622; Amt., 655; neg. (Y. 71, N. 117) 1816 (i).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 655; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 679; (Mr. *Dickey*) 860; (Mr. *Martin*) 879; (Mr. *Masson*) 933; (Sir *James Grant*) 982; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 954; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1002; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1019; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1057; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1084; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1092; (Mr. *Craig*) 1113; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1114, 1129, 1261; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1140, 1259; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1187; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1222; (Mr. *Legris*) 1246; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1262; (Mr. *Casey*) 1263; (Mr. *Flint*) 1303; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1340; (Mr. *Semple*) 1362; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1379; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1392; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1408; (Mr. *Perry*) 1416; (Mr. *Cameron*) 1429; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1436; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1454; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1469; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 1507; (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1521; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1539; (Mr. *Rider*) 1568, 1589; (Mr. *Kenney*) 1553; (Mr. *Ryckman*) 1593; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1602; (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1613; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1622; (Mr. *Davin*) 1661; (Mr. *Montague*) 1698, 1733; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1754; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 1775; (Mr. *Casey*) 1794.
—— *See* "TARIFF," "WAYS AND MEANS."

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Lowell*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BURNS, SENATOR, SESSIONAL INDEMNITY; in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, BILLS REPORTED, &C.: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4740 (ii).
—— PRECEDENCE OF DEB. ON ADDRESS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 78 (i).
—— *See* "Govt. Business."

BUTTER PURCHASES BY GOVT. DURING 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 199 (i).
—— SHIPMENTS TO GREAT BRITAIN ON GOVT. ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).

BUTTER SHIPMENTS TO ENGLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4824 (ii).
—— TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2511 (ii).

CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4786 (ii).

Calgary and Lethbridge Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 839; 2°*, 919 (i); wthdn., 4186 (ii).

Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com., 1732; 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

CANALS, DEPTH OF WATER AND PROPOSED CHANNEL AT CHICAGO: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

CANALS:
CORNWALL, GOVT. SEWER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 3703 (ii).
DEPTH OF WATER AND PROPOSED CHANNEL AT CHICAGO: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
GALOPS RAPIDS, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2509 (ii).
IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS TO COMPLETE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 306 (i).
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON WATERWAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 3456 (ii).
LACHINE. *See* general heading.
LANGEVIN, H# & CO., CLAIM AGAINST GOVERNMENT FOR DRAINAGE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023.
LUMBER CONTRACTS, WELLAND CANAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).
MCDONALD, PATRICK, EMPLYMT. ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3934 (ii).
"OCEAN" STR., CLAIMS AGAINST FOR DAMAGES RE LOCK 12 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).
ST. PETER'S, ARTICLE IN NORTH SYDNEY *Herald*: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 4580 (ii).
—— OPENING FOR NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).
—— CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS FOR EXTRAS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 272 (i).
—— PERMANENT STAFF, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1972 (i).
—— AND C. P. R. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).
SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).
—— COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3198 (ii).
TAY, REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
TRENT, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies (Mr. *Somerville*) 2406 (i).
—— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
—— COST SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 481 (i).
WELLAND, CONTRACT FOR LUMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).
YAMASKA EMBANKMENT AND LOCK: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2406 (i).

CANALS—*Continued.*
YAMASKA AND ST. OURS LOCK, CHARGES ON VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2735 (ii).
—— RIVER, LOCK AND DAM, COST OF REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1697 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2229, 2270 (i), 3699, 4707 (ii).
[*See* PROVINCES, "SUPPLY," &c.]
CANAL IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS TO COMPLETE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 306 (i).
Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (*title changed*) **B. No. 36** (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i) (58-59 *Vic., c.* 71.)
CAN. MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 221 (i).
CAN. AND NEWFOUNDLAND, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette re* CONFEDERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 270 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 343 (i).
CAN. NEWS CO. AND I.C.R. CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 222 (i).
CAN., FRANCE AND BELGIUM SS. LINE, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3197 (ii).
Can. Ins. Promotion Ass. incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Choquette*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1357 (i).
Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 46.)
Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°, 2136 (i).
CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT, EXPEND.: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Can. Benevolent Society's incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 80.)
C.P.R. AND SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 3674 (ii).
—— QUARANTINED CHINAMEN, GOVT. CHARGES FOR FEEDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 698 (i).
Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°, 2293 (i).
CAN. TROOPS FOR ENGLAND, HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PUBLIC STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).
CAPE BRETON MAILS, CONTRACT FOR CARRYING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., CAPITAL EXPEND., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1551 (i).
—— FREIGHT AND PASSENGER CASH RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1587, 2354 (i).
—— POINT TUPPER TERMINUS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Cameron*) 340 (i).
CARAQUET RY., GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 273 (i).
CARLETON (N.B.) BONDED WAREHOUSE, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 2357 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 573 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2022 (i).
CARRIERE, LAINE & CO., CONTRACT FOR NEW DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).
CASAULT, CHIEF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i).
CATTLE EMBARGO, GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Innes*) 209 (i).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 296 (i).
—— RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773, 1830 (i.)
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4831 (ii).
—— Removal: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4709 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 581 (i).
CATTLE ENTERING CANADA FROM MONTANA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 322 (i).
—— EXPORTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on adjnmt., &c., 142 (i).
—— QUARANTINE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4840 (ii).
—— REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 144 (i)
—— SHIPMENTS TO BELGIUM: Ques. (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 4830 (ii).
—— TRAINS AND GOVT. CONDUCTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 207 (i).
—— TRANSPORT THROUGH U.S. FOR SHIPMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 341, 477 (i).
CEDAR SLEEPERS FOR P.E.I. RAILWAY, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3084 (ii).
CENSUS AND AGRICULTURAL CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3994 (ii).
—— CITY OF LONDON, RETS. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 207 (i).
—— MAN., 1896: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 429 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* REFLECTING ON MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 423.
—— RET. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1830 (i).
[*See* "INDUSTRIES," &c.]
CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS' EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2736 (ii).
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES REVISING OFFICER, APPNMT: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i), 3106 (ii).
CHATHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406 (i).
CHARLEBOIS, J. A., CLAIM *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT; Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 933 (i).
—— CLAIMS FOR EXTRAS ON LANGEVIN BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1970 (i).
—— AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT, RET. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773 (i).
CHEESE FACTORIES IN P.E.I., MANUFACTURES AND SALES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2023 (i).
CHENIER, DR., CUSTOMS DUTIES ON MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3712, 4115 (ii).
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., ARTICLE IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 1354 (i).
CHINAMEN QUARANTINED IN B.C., CHARGES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 698 (i).

Church of England. *See* "DOMESTIC," &c.

Chute, Julia Ethel. *See* "DIVORCE."

CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, JUDGES, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3107 (ii).

"CITY OF MIDLAND" STR., SEIZURE AT COLLINGWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4708 (ii).

CIVIL EMPLOYEES (MILITIA) SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°. 222 (i).

—— **B. No. 104** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 1881 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3932 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Montague*). 1°, 3190; 2° m., 3769; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h., 3742; neg., 3746; 2° and in Com., 3746, 3762; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

—— **Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 102** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1818 (i); dschgd., 4861 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE BOARD OF EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 3100 (ii).

—— EXAMINATION FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

—— EXAMINERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Montague*) 2570 (ii).

—— PAYMENTS TO TEMPORARY CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1585 (i).

—— PROMOTION EXAMINATIONS, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

—— SUPERANNUATION OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4116 (ii).

—— TEMPORARY CLERKS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3995 (ii).

Civil Service. *See* "SUPERANNUATION."

CLARKE AND PAISLEY, MESSRS., CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 305 (i).

Clifton Suspension Bridge Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Northrup*). 1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES (MILITIA): in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).

COAL CONTRACT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4709 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4817 (ii).

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S (N.S.): M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3202, 3375, 4031 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3210, 3378, 4039; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 3215, 3374, 4033; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3377; (Mr. *Gillies*) 3382; (Mr *Fraser*) 3392; (Mr. *Cameron*) 3402, 3418; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 3445; (Mr. *Borden*) 3451; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4031; (Mr. *McDougall*) 4033 (ii).

COCKBURN, MR., M.P., EXPENSES AT COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).

COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE (P.E.I.) DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 3196 (ii).

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AS BROKERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1358, 1971 (i).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i), 2502, 4276, 4462 (ii).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BALANCE OF EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2489 (ii).

COLONIES AND THE EMPIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4894 (ii).

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION, CAN. EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3710 (ii).

—— EXPENSES IN CONNECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1361 (i).

—— MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 84 (i).

—— MR. LARKE'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).

—— *See* "World's Fair."

COMMITTEES.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members 228 (i).

BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 227 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP., 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *LaRivière*) 268 (i).

—— 2ND REP. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 696 (i).

—— 3RD REP. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 3110 (ii).

—— 4TH REP. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3544 (ii).

—— 5TH REP. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4255 (ii).

—— DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 231 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Sel. Com., 180 (i).

—— TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Legris*) 359 (i).

EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 224 (i).

LIBRARY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 223 (i).

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS: List of Members, 225 (i).

PRINTING: List of Members, 226 (i).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 223.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, EMPLYMT. OF SHORTHAND WRITER: M. (Mr. *Baker*) 1267 (i).

—— IRREGULARITY OF MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1829 (i), 2943 (ii).

—— List of Members, 226 (i).

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 224 (i).

—— REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3545 (ii).

—— MEETINGS DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3909 (ii), 4113 (ii).

—— 8TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3265 (ii).

—— 12TH REP. *re* LAKE MAN RY., &C., CO.: M. (Mr. *Martin*) to ref. back, 4113 (ii).

SELECT STANDING: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4 (i).

—— COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 180 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to add Names, 767 (i).

—— Lists presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 223 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 226 (i).

COMMUTATION IN LIEU OF REMISSION OF DUTIES: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

Commercial Treaties affecting Can. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 479 (i); Order for 2 dschgd., 3085 (ii).

—— *See* "TREATY WITH FRANCE."

Companies' Act Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3707; 2° m., 4778; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4780; in Com., 4781; 3°*, 4786 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 121.)

COMPANIES. *See.*

"ALLIANCE NATIONALE."

BUFFALO AND FORT ERIE BRIDGE CO.

COMPANIES—*Continued.*
CAMP HARMONY CAMPING CLUB.
CAN. AND MICHIGAN TUNNEL CO.
CAN. INSURANCE PROMOTION ASSOCIATION.
CANADIAN ORDER OF FORESTERS.
CLIFTON SUSPENSION BRIDGE CO.
DESCHENES BRIDGE CO.
DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY (CHURCH OF ENGLAND).
DOMINION TRUSTS CO.
EASTERN ASSURANCE CO.
GILMOUR AND HUGHSON CO.
GRAND FALLS WATER POWER AND BOOM CO.
HAMILTON AND LAKE ERIE POWER CO.
HAMILTON DISTILLERY CO.
HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.
IMPERIAL TRUSTS CO.
INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS (SUPREME COURT).
INSURANCE SOCIETIES.
JAMES MACLAREN CO.
LA CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE DU DISTRICT DE MONTREAL.
MAN. AND NORTH-WEST LOAN CO.
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL CO.
ONTARIO ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO.
OTTAWA LAND ARD SECURITY'S CO.
PERMANENT RESERVE LIFE ASSOCIATION.
SABLE AND SPANISH BOOM AND SLIDE CO.
ST. JOHN RIVER BRIDGE CO.
SCHOOL SAVINGS BANK.
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
[*See* "RAILWAYS."]

CONNOLLY, MESSRS., PROCESS OF EXECUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 233 (i).

CONNOR, JOHN, OF ST. JOHN (N.B.) EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 3993 (ii).

CONSOLID. FUND, REVENUE AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427, 1082 (i).

Conspiracies and Combinations in Restraint of Trade Act Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 2259 (i).

Contracts. *See* "ALIENS."

CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204, 230 (i).

——— TRENT VALLEY CANAL: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS: Ques. of Priv. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).

Deb. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4712; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4714; (Mr. *Davin*) 4716; (Mr. *Casey*) 4718; (Mr. *Devlin*) 4723; (Mr. *Martin*) 4727; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4730; (Mr. *Dickey*) 4735 (ii).

——— PRIVATE SECRETARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1550 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°*, 1881 (i); 2°* and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 37.*)

COPYRIGHT, BERNE CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2683 (ii).

CORN IMPORTS BY W. W. OGILVIE, CLAIM FOR DRAWBACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4357 (ii).

CORNWALL CANAL: GOVT. SEWER, TELEPHONE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 3703 (ii).

COURTWRIGHT CUSTOMS OFFICER, RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3359 (ii).

COWAN, MILES, ALLOWANCE FOR EXTRA SERVICES; in Com. of Sup, 2505 (ii).

COW BAY BREAKWATER; in Com. of Sup., 3510 (ii).

CREAMERY AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN N.W.T., ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2401 (i).

CREASE AND DAVIE, CHIEF JUSTICES; in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. Bill No. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 196 (i); 2° m., 2542; deb. adjd., 2569 (ii).

——— **B. No. 133** (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1°, 3266 (ii).

——— **(Disorderly Houses, &c.) B. No. 106** (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1°, 2024 (i).

——— **(Schedule) B. No. 51** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*) 1°*, 515; (i); 2°*, 2406; in Com., 4082, 4741; 3°*, 4746 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 40.)

——— **(Seduction and Abduction) B. No. 3** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 79; 2° m., 2145; Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6 m. h., 2147; agreed to, 2152 (i).

——— **(Union Labels, &c.) B. No. 24** (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°, 269 (i).

CRIMINAL CODE, JOINT COM., REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3266 (ii).

CRONK, MR., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3359 (ii).

CUSTOMS:
ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2754.
AMERICAN-MADE MILK-CANS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).
AUSTRALIA, EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 84 (i).
BLEAKNEY AND FARROW, MESSRS., CUSTOMS DEPTL. IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2754 (ii).
COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AS BROKERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1358, 1971 (i).
COLLECTIONS ON THEATRICAL PRINTING, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).
COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, PRIVATE SECRETARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1550 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).
CORN IMPORTS BY W. W. OGILVIE, CLAIM FOR DRAWBACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4357 (ii).
CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 2710 (ii).
DUTIES ON SPIRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).
EMPLOYEES, RECENT APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 3191 (ii).
FREE LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).
FREE GOODS IMPORTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2571 (ii).
GRANITE AND FREESTONE, DRESSED, IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306 (i).
GRANITE (RED) IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306 (i).
HARVESTERS, SELF-BINDING, EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2734 (ii).
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, GROSS AMOUNT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 425 (i).
——— M. for Stmnts* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 222 (i)

CUSTOMS--*Continued.*

IMPORTS, DUTIABLE GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 576 (i).

IMPORTATIONS UNDER CUSTOMS ACT AMT., 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1357 (i).

LUMBER, SAWN, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4850 (ii).

MILK-CANS, AMERICAN-MADE, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).

MILK, &c., CONDENSED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4856 (ii).

PIG-IRON, IMPORTS FROM ALABAMA: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 932 (i).

——— BOUNTY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr *Edgar*) 2022 (i).

PIPING, DUTY ON IMPORTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3708 (ii).

RICE IMPORTATIONS, UNCLEANED, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1585 (i).

ROSSLAND (B.C.) Customs Officer, Appnmt.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 2022 (i).

SPECIAL EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2164 (i).

SUGAR IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1357 (i).

——— (RAW) IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

——— RAW AND REFINED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 922 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 768 (i).

——— IMPORTS INTO MONTREAL AND HALIFAX: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1000 (i).

TARIFF, THE, INCREASED DUTIES ON ITEMS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).

——— STATEMENTS RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 265 (i).

U. S. CUSTOMS BOARD OF APPRAISERS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1826 (i).

VALUATIONS AND DEPTL. EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1826 (i).

WEST KOOTENAY CUSTOMS RETURNS, 1890 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 321 (i).

[*See* "INLAND REVENUE," PROVINCES, &c.]

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 3913; 2°, 4125; in Com., 4127, 4164; consdn of B., 4471; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy* to recom., 4473; neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486; 3°, 4496 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 22.)

CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 2710 (ii).

Customs Tariff (1894) B. No. 146 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., 4847; 1°* of B., 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 23.)

CULLERS, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, NUMBER EMPLOYED: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 577 (i).

——— REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 927 (i).

——— QUEBEC, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 579 (i).

——— INSPECTION DUES, AMOUNT OWING: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1548 (i).

——— SUPERVISOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1359 (i).

CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 4282, 4462 (ii).

DAIRY COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2031 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*). Res. prop., 208; in Com., 234; 1°* of B., 240 (i); trnsfd. to Govt. Orders, 4187 (ii).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i), 3350, 4465 (ii).

DAIRYING IN N.W.T., ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4011 (ii).

DAWSON, F., RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2272 (i).

DARNLEY BASIN (P.E.I.) BUOYS AND RANGE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 580 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "COMMITTEES."

DE BLOIS (P.E.I.) MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771 (i).

DEPTL. REPORTS, DISTRIBUTION FROM 1888 TO 1895: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 362 (i).

DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

Deschenes Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 30 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 73.)

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. No. 12 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 81.

DETROIT AND ST. CLAIR RIVERS, &c., FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*) 2356 (i).

DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR RUPERT, MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND, N.S.: Introduced, 571 (i).

DINGMAN, ABSOLAM, APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF INDIAN AGENCIES: Ques. (Mr. *Boston*) 4186 (ii).

DISFRANCHISEMENT OF PROVINCIAL OFFICIALS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 587 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 596; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 601; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 605; (Mr. *Curran*) 608; (Mr. *Casey*) 609; (Mr. *Northrup*) 611; (Mr. *Fraser*) 614 (i).

DIVISIONS:

COMPANIES ACT AMT. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*): 2° agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4728 (ii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 140: on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Board of Customs, 4474; neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486 (ii).

DAIRYING IN THE N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) Bonus on Butter Exports, 4011: Amt. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 4014; M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 62, N. 57) 4021 (ii).

ENFRACHISEMENT OF WOMEN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1867; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 719; neg. (Y. 47, N. 101) 2143; Res. neg. (Y. 47, N. 105) 2144 (ii).

EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 655; neg. (Y. 71, N. 117) 1816 (i).

GOVT. ORDERS, PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026; agreed to (Y. 87, N. 55) 2029 (ii).

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS ACT (SALARIES) AMT. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 57, N. 90) 3919 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE CONTRACT: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E.I.*) 2838; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3077 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOVERNORS' TENURE OF OFFICE: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills Bothwell*) 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271 (ii).

MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4392; neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4457 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS *re* RUMOURED RESIGNATIONS: on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4190; neg. (Y. 82, N. 116) 4251 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2789; Amt. (Mr. *Guillet*) 2809; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2809; neg. (Y. 51, N. 70) 2811; Amt. agreed to (Y. 68, N. 57) 2812.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3271; neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339 (ii).

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS, RUMOURED: on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4050; neg. (Y. 72, N. 111) 4061 (ii).

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMT. B. 5: on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) for 2°, 483; neg. (Y. 46, N. 100) 2518 (ii).

SENATE VACANCIES, SIR MACKENZIE BOWELL'S LETTER TO MR. MCNEILL, M.P.: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3854; neg. (Y. 55, N. 95) 3855 (ii).

THOMPSON, LADY, CONTRIBUTION TO FUND: on conc., Amt. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) to strike out. Vote, neg. (Y. 39, N. 76) 2682 (ii).

THOMPSON, LATE SIR J. S. D., FUNERAL EXPENSES: on conc., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) M. to strike out Vote, 2673; neg. (Y 48, N. 68) 2681.

VOTERS' LISTS B. 69: on M. (Mr. *Montague*) for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to repeal Franchise Act, 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656 (ii).

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.'S B. 34: on M. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 2 cents per mile rate, 5144; neg. (Y. 39, N. 112) 4163 (ii).

Divorce (Helen Woodburn Jarvis) B. No. 115 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°*, 2506; 2° on div,, 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 97.)

Divorce (Julia Ethel Chute) B. No. 139 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 3815; 2° on div., 3948; 3° on div., 4154 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 95.)

Divorce (Mary Bradshaw Falding) B. No. 110 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2570; 2° on div., 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 96.)

DOM. AND ALLAN SS. LINES, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

DOM. AND P. O. SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co's. incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com., 2695; 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 47.)

DOM. BANK, PETER VANLUVEN'S DECLARATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).

——— CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).

——— DAY, ADJOURNMENT: M. (Mr. *Foster.*) 3545.

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3456 (ii).

Dom. Eections Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 197 (i).

——— **B. No. 68** (Mr. *Montague*). 1°, 768 (i); 2° and in Com., 3921; 3° m., 4065; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to recom., 4066; 3°*, 4072 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 13.)

——— **B. No, 76** (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1°, 918 (i).

——— **Elections (Employees Voting) B. No. 42** (Mr. *Rider*). 1°, 478 (i).

Dom. Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°, 222 (i).

DOM. GOVT. CREDIT IN CAN. BANKS: Ques. (Sir Richard *Cartwright*) 204 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°, 2507; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°*, 3271; Sen. Amts., 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 34.)

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).

——— LOAN (OCTOBER, 1894) BY WHOM NEGOTIATED: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).

Dom. Notes Act Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 268 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 16.)

DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 229 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

——— REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

——— RYS., AID TO BUILDING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

Dom. Trusts Co.'s, incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 84.)

Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society's (Church of England) incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 94.)

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3176.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RY. LINES: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Casey*) 208 (i).

Drainage. *See* "RY. LANDS."

DRAKE, JUSTICE, SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i), 2669 (ii).

DREDGE "LAVAL." CONTRACT AND TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 428 (i).

——— NEW, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).

——— "PRINCE EDWARD," WORK IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

DRILL, CITY CORPS AND FIELD BATTERIES: in Com. OF SUP., 4460 (i).

DRILL HALL, TORONTO, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1362 (i).

DROUTH IN ONTARIO: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4582.

Drugs. *See* "ADULTERATION OF FOOD."

DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA, ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

"DUART CASTLE" MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

DUROCHER'S BALLOT PAPER: in Com. of Sup., 2093.

DUVAR ROAD (P.E.I.) FLAG STATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

DYNAMITE FACTORY, LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1080 (i).

Eastern Ass. Co. of Can. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Fraser*). 1°*, 1078; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 81.)

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, PREPARATION OF MAPS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

——— LISTS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 576 (i).

Electoral. *See* "FRANCHISE," "DOMINION," "VOTERS' LISTS," &c.

EMBARGO. *See* "Cattle."

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 701; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 717; neg. (Y. 47, N. 101) 2143 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Montague*) 716; (Mr. *Charlton*) 716, 1875; (Mr. *Sproule*) 719; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 720; (Mr. *McMullen*) 722, 1874; (Mr. *Craig*) 723; (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 726; (Mr. *Maclean, York*), 729; (Mr. *Amyot*) 730; (Mr. *McInerney*) 734; (Mr. *Foster*) 735, 1867; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1873; (Mr. *Denison*) 1875; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 1876; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1878; (Mr. *Gillies*) 1879: (Mr. *Dupont*) 2141 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).

ESTIMATES, THE, 1896: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 331 (i).

——— SUPPL. (1895-96): Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4352.

——— (1894-95): Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1539 (i).

——— Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 572, 1182 (i).

EXCHANGE BANK AND MR. OGILVIE'S GUARANTEE: Que.. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3368, 3455 (ii).

EXCISE DUTY ON SPIRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).

EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1810 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM: in Com. of Sup., 3350, 3501 (ii).

——— PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTING REPS.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2406 (i).

EXPIRING LAWS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 224 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Stmnts.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 222; Ques., 425 (i).

EXPORTS TO AUSTRALIA: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 84 (i).

EXPORT OF SHEEP TO GREAT BRITAIN: on M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Featherston*) 2385 (i).

FABRE, MR., SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

Falding, Mary Bradshaw. *See* "DIVORCE."

FARRAN'S POINT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

FARM LANDS IN ONT., VALUE: Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 772 (i).

Female Offenders in Nova Scotia Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°*, 3556; 2°, 3716; in Com., 3719; 3°*, 3720 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 43.)

FENELON FALLS, AUTHORITY FOR FILLING ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4581 (ii).

Fertilizers. *See* "ADULTERATION OF FOOD."

FINANCE:

ASST. RECEIVER GEN'S OFFICE, CHARLOTTETOWN: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL, PET., *re* ESTIMATES OF DEPT.: Presented (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2132; remarks, 2260 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Stmnt., (Mr. *Foster*) 517 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 620 (i).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i), 3106 (ii).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BALANCE OF EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2489 (ii).

FINANCE—*Continued.*

CONSOLID. FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427, 1082 (i).

DOM. AND P.O. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

DOM. LOAN (OCTOBER, 1894) BY WHOM NEGOTIATED: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).

ESTIMATES. *See* general heading.

EXCHANGE BANK, AND MR. OGILVIE'S GUARANTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3368, 3455 (ii).

GOVT. CREDIT IN CAN. BANKS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

MARKLAND MORTGAGE, KINGSTON: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1267 (i), 3557 (ii).

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR APRIL: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS, GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2508 (ii).

——— STAMPS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2024 (i).

SUBSIDIZED STEAMERS TO WEST INDIES, &C., RET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3819 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION LIST, DATES OF APPNMTS. AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 273 (i).

——— RETS. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen* 774 (i), 3819 (ii).

——— SINCE 1ST JAN., 1895, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3994 (ii).

VANLUVEN, PETER, DECLARATIONS *re* DOM. BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).

[*See* "SUPPLY," &C.]

FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

——— MINISTER'S PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

Fines and Forfeitures. *See* "GENERAL REVENUE FUND."

FINLAY, W., OF COURTWRIGHT, APPNMT. IN CUSTOMS SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2139 (i).

FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3621 (ii).

FISHERIES:

BEHRING SEA CONFERENCE, GREAT BRITAIN AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1185 (i).

——— EXPENSES *re* ARBITRATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 426 (i).

——— SEAL FISHERIES, SEALING OF ARMS, &C.; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1083.

——— SEIZURE OF SEALERS BY RUSSIAN CRUISERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3369 (ii).

——— COMPENSATION FOR SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 83 (i).

——— SEIZURES BY U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 215 (i).

FISHING BOUNTY FRAUDS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i).

FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2704, 2721 (ii).

——— OF THE GREAT LAKES: Remarks (Mr. *Allan*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 3948 (ii).

FISHERY OVERSEER, JOS. P. KINNEY, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 573 (i).

——— KENT DISTRICT, ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 698.

FISH IMPORTATIONS FROM FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1550 i).

FISHERIES—*Continued.*
FISHING GUARDIANS ON THE MIRIMACHI: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1081 (i).
FISHING LICENSES PAID TO NEWFOUNDLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).
FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).
GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).
INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3083 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3360 (ii).
—— INDUSTRY, ESTABLISHMENT OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).
LOBSTERS, REGULATIONS AS TO SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 574 (i).
MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).
NOBLE BROS. FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WITHDRL. OF LICENSE: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1979 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER (N.B.) FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 430 (i).
[*See* PROVINCES, &c.]
Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 67.—(Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 618 (i); 2°, 2574; in Com., 2593; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 27.*)
—— **(Salmon) B. No. 118.**—(Mr. *Costigan*). 1°*, 2919; dschgd., 4861 (ii).
FISHERIES ACT, STREAMS EXEMPT UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i), 3618 (ii).
FISHERIES OF THE GREAT LAKES: Remarks (Mr. Allan) 3948 (ii).
Fishing Vessels. *See* "SEA FISHERIES."
FITZSIMMONS, JAS., SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 204 (i).
FLEMING, WM., AND HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MAN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).
FOREIGN POWERS AND THE FRENCH TREATY, PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1697 (i).
Foresters. *See* "CAN. ORDER," "INDEPENDENT."
FORT ERIE CUSTOMS OFFICERS, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3815 (ii).
FOSTER, H. S., AND RICHELIEU RIVER LANDS, PURCHASE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3195 (ii).
Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal B. No. 14 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 182 (i).
—— **B. No. 99** (Mr. *Pelletier*). 1°, 1696 (ii).
FRANCO-CAN. TREATY, RATIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).
FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3533.
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438, 483 (i).
FREE LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2047; (Mr. *Martin*) 2054; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2058; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2063; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2065; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2067; (Mr. *Bennett*) 2076; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2080; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2083 (i).
FREIGHT RATES IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4022 (ii).
FRENCH TREATY, ADDITIONAL COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).
—— *See* "TREATY WITH FRANCE."
FURNESS LINE SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2332.
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3704 (ii).
—— RAPIDS, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2509 (ii).
GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER (N.B.) TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).
GASPÉ BASIN, &c., AND DALHOUSIE N.B. SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 3080; 2°*, and in Com., 3459; 3°*, 3463 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 24.*)
General Revenue Fund of N.W.T. B. No. 134 (Mr. *Daly*). Res. prop., 2573; in Com., 3122; 1°* of B., 3267; 2°* and in Com., 3720; 3°*, 3721 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 32.*)
GEOFFRION, C. A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR VERCHÈRES: Introduced, 301 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 2488, 2723 (ii).
—— MADOC AND MARMORA: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).
—— REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 181 (i).
—— SUMMARY REP.: Presented (Mr. *Daly*) 181 (i).
GENDREAU, TÉLESPHORE, CHARGES AGAINST, INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 3712 (ii).
GIBSON, W. W., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).
GILBERT DREDGING AND BLASTING CO., CLAIM *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2509 (ii).
Gilmour and Hughson Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *Edwards*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2353 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 89.*)
"GOLDEN CITY," REFUND OF FINES: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).
GOVT. BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).
—— WEDNESDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3621 (i).
—— MONDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4254 (ii).
—— TWO SITTINGS DAILY: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4579, 4708, 4770 (ii).
GOVT. CREDIT IN CAN. BANKS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
—— IMPORTS OF FREE GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2571 (ii).
—— INSPECTORS OF WHEAT AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
—— LAND ON RICHELIEU RIVER, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 1969 (i).
Govt. Liability; Labour, &c., on Public Works, B. No. 11 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°, 80.
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
—— PENSIONS, PAR. IN PETERBOROUGH *Examiner*: prop. Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 923 (i).
—— SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2508 (ii).
Governor General, Reduction of Salary, B. No. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 79 (i); 2°*, 3246.
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 384, 1912 (i).
—— WARRANTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Co.'s B. No. 95 (Mr. *McAlister*). 1°*, 1452; 2°*, 1733; in Com. and 3°*, 2354 (i). 58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

GRAND FALLS WATER POWER, &c., CO.'S PET.: M (Mr. *McAlister*) Suspension of Rules, 1117 (i).

GRAND ETANG (B.C.) OPENING OF NEW CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2141 (i).

—— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3709 (ii).

GRANITE AND FREESTONE, DRESSED, IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306.

—— (RED) IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306 (i).

GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3359 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 572; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)

GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).

—— COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 4357 (ii).

GREY, LIEUT. COL. JOHN, APPMNT. AS INSPECTOR OF STORES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).

GROCERIES CONTRACT, QUEBEC CITADEL: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).

GUILBAULT, EDWD., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 305 (i).

GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

GUY, CHARLES, OF PETERBOROUGH, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1452 (i).

GUYSBORO' INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 774 (i).

HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3817 (ii).

—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3877 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2357 (i).

—— FREIGHT SHED, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2727 (ii).

HALLIWELL, J. L., OF STERLING, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1969 (i).

Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); M. for Com., 2698; in Com., 2704: 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

—— **Distillery Co.'s incorp. B. No. 38** (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 478; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

—— **Provident and Loan Society's incorp. B. No. 39** (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 478; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

HARASS, NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i), 3510 (ii).

Harbour Commissioners. *See* "THREE RIVERS."

HATCH, MR., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1078 (i).

HEIR APPARENT, BIRTH: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

HERBERT, MAJOR-GEN., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2137 (i).

HICKEY, G. N., APPNMT. ON RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).

HICKEY, C. E., APPNMT. ON WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3097 (ii).

HILTON WHARF (ONT.) AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2362 (i).

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS IN MAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Bennett*) 5; seconded (Mr. *Belley*) 14 (i).

—— REPLY: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 3191 (ii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 3575, 4909 (ii).

BOWELL, SIR MACKENZIE, LETTER TO MR. MCNEIL, M.P. *re* SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 481 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 462 (i).

BURNS, SENATOR, SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, BILLS REPORTED, &C.: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4740 (ii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).

—— WEDNESDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3621 (ii).

—— MONDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4254 (ii).

—— TWO SITTINGS DAILY: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4579, 4708, 4770 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "Committees."

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

LIBRARY, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (i).

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, &C., MONEYS PAID OUTSIDE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 331 (i).

MEMBERS, NEW: 1, 2, 143, 222, 268, 301 (i).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION, ARTICLE IN *Canada Farmer's Sun*: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4813 (ii).

—— VOTES ON DIVISION: Remarks (Mr. *Boyle*) 4358 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS, PRESENTATION: M. (Mr. *Masson*) Extension of Time, 1175 (i).

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).

—— MR. SPEAKER'S RULING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2512 (ii).

PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4876, 4903 (ii).

—— Mess. from His Ex. by Black Rod, 4909 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4738 (ii).

RETURNS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2507 (ii).

READING ROOM, U.S. FRENCH CAN. PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3194 (ii).

SENATE, VACANT SENATORSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, DELAY IN OPENING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2607 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: 2 (i), 4911 (ii).
SUTHERLAND, MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1827 (i).
[*See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE," page lxxxvii."]

House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 301 (i).

—— READING ROOM, U. S. FRENCH CAN. PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3194 (ii).

—— **Representation Act Amt. B. No. 124** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 3082; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

House of Commons. *See* "INDEMNITY," "SENATE," &c.

Hours of Labour. *See* "LABOURERS," &c.

HUDSON BAY RY., ADVANCES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on Adjnmt. 181 (i).

—— O. C., *re* SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 207, 516 (i).

—— SUBSIDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1082 (i).

HULL POST OFFICE APPNMT. OF LETTER CARRIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1586 (i).

HURON INDIANS. *See* "Bastien."

HURTEAU, YULE AND RIDDELL'S ACCOUNT: in Com. of Sup., 2261 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

ILLICIT DISTILLERIES, SEIZURES BY MR. BOURINOT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357 (ii).

ILLICIT STILL, L'ISLET STATION; Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).

Immigration, Foreign. *See* "ALIEN CONTRACTS," &c.

—— MICHIGAN TO ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).

—— TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS FROM U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 241 (i).

IMPERIAL HONOURS TO CANADIANS, GOV. GEN'S. RECOMMENDATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1823, 1973.

—— TITLES TO CANADIAN SUBJECTS: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1589 (i).

Trusts Co. of Can. Acts Amt. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 839, 2°*, 919 (i).

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, GROSS AMOUNT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 425 (i).

—— EXPORTS: M. for Stmnts.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 222 (i).

—— DUTIABLE GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 576 (i).

Indemnity. *See* "SENATE," &c.

—— **To Members, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 143** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 3915; in Com., 4062; conc., 4121; 1°* of B., 4123; 2°* and in Com., 4470; 3°*, 4751 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 9).

Independence of Parliament B. No. 111 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 2257 (i).

Independent Order of Foresters (Supreme Court) incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 84 (Mr. *Northrup*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii).

Indian Act Amt. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 2351; 2°, 3932; in Com. and 3°*, 3938 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Daly*) 181 (i).

—— DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 1918, 1938 (i), 2690, 3101 (ii).

INDIANS:
BASTIEN, AGENT, AND HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1975, 2022 (i).
DINGMAN, ABSOLAM, APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF INDIAN AGENCIES: Ques. (Mr. *Boston*) 4186 (ii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 1918, 1938 (i), 2690, 3101 (ii).
INDIANS, EXPENDITURE: Remarks (Mr. *Daly*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2483, 3813, 3874 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 2484, 3874 (ii).
REED, HAYTER AMTS. PAID, &c. (1879-94) MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 266 (i).
—— Ret. *re* inquiry (Mr. *McMullen*) 1829 (i), 2814 (ii).
ROBINSON TREATY, ANNUITIES UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 2483 (ii).
ST. PETER'S RESERVE (MAN.) INDIANS, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 4007 (ii).
[*See* PROVINCES, "INTERIOR," &c.]

INDUSTRIES IN CHATHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406 (i).

—— IN QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

—— IN WINGHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).

—— IN BRAMPTON, DESCRIPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1182 (i).

INLAND REVENUE.
ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 4308 (ii).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).
SEIZURE OF ILLICIT STILL AT L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).
—— DISTILLERY BY MR. BOURINOT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357 (ii).
PATTON, JAS., APPNMT. AS CHIEF INSPECTOR OF CULLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1359 (i),
SPIRITS, CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES ON STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).
TOBACCO, CAN. DUTY COLLECTED IN 1894, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1587 (i).
—— PROTECTION AGAINST FOREIGN LEAF: Remarks (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 2030 (i).
—— ISLE VERTE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 697 (i).
WARNER, LEVI, COMPENSATION. in Com. of Sup., 2503 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2503, 4285, 4301 (ii).
WHEAT INSPECTION AT FORT WILLIAM, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
[*See* "CUSTOMS," &c.]

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 25.)

INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2718 (ii).

INLAND REVENUES OF THE DOM., REPS.: Presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i).

Inspection. *See* "General."

Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1352 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3112; 3°*, 3122; Sen. Amts., 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 20.)

——Act (Societies Exemption) B. No. 145 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 4354; 2°, 4768; in Com. and 3°*, 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 19.)

INS. COMPANIES, ABSTRACT STATEMENTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1829 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4894 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RY.:

BURNING OF SHEDS AT RICHMOND: Remarks (Mr. *Stairs*) 1354 (i).

CAP ST. IGNACE, NEW SIDING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2571) (ii).

—— STOPPAGE OF EXPRESS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1973 (i).

COST OF MAINTENANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 430.

DISCHARGED EMPLOYEES AT CHAUDIERE CURVE: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

DISMISSAL OF CONDUCTOR MCCULLY: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Colchester*) 2140 (i).

EMPLOYEES' SUMMER VACATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2511 (ii).

HALIFAX, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).

NEWSPAPER SALES, CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 222.

RIVER INHABITANTS, SIDING OR FLAG STATION: M. for Ret., &c.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 343 (i).

SUMMER TIME TABLES, CHANGE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 1970 (i).

THEFTS AT RIVIERE DU LOUP, INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 272 (i).

TIME TABLES *re* P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1828 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2571 (ii).

[*See* "MANITOBA," "N.W.T.," &c.]

INTEREST COMPUTING: in Com. of Sup. 3099 (ii).

INTERIOR:

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, NAMES OF OWNERS, &C.; M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 322 (i).

BOOTH, GEN., PROPOSED CAN. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2361 (i).

DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup. 4317 (ii).

FLEMING, WM., AND HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MAN., M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

FOSTER AND RICHELIEU RIVER LANDS PURCHASE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY. *See* general heading.

—— MADOC AND MARMORA: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS IN MAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

INTERIOR—*Continued.*

IMMIGRATION, MICHIGAN TO ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).

—— TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS FROM U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 241 (i).

INTERIOR DEP.: in Com. of Sup., 420 (i); 2688 (ii).

LAND GRANTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T. DENOMINATIONAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

LANDS UNPATENTED IN MORRIS, MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

LOW, HENRY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1179 (i).

MAPS OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

PARADIS, REV. FATHER, GOVT. AID TO COLONIZATION SCHEME: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3197 (ii).

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T. PAYMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 3198 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER, SALE OF LANDS ON BANKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).

SALVATION ARMY PROPOSED CAN. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

THOUSAND ISLANDS, SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 (i).

UNPATENTED LANDS IN MORRIS, MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *La Rivière*) 2024 (i).

[*See* "MANITOBA," "N.W.T.," &c.]

INTERIOR DEPT. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Daly*) 1083 (i).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5 (i).

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, RESOLUTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 773 (i).

—— COMMISSION ON WATERWAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 3456 (ii).

—— CONVENTION *re* INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 2403 (i).

—— FISHERIES COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3083 (ii).

—— FRATERNAL ALLIANCE ASS. CO., REGISTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3995 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. *Masson*). 1°*, 1548; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com., 3583, 3748, 3938; 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 49.)

Irrigation. *See* "NORTH-WEST."

ISLE AUX NOIX, GOVT. LAND SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2510, 3195 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp B. No. 87 (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725; Sen. Amts. 4777 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 50.)

Jas. Maclaren Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 90.)

Jarvis, Helen Woodburn. *See* "DIVORCE."

JENKINS, S. J., PRIVATE SECRETARY TO FIN. MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

JEW PEDLARS, TRANSPORT FROM CHICAGO TO N.W.T.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 241 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Salaries) B. No. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). Res. prop., 1883; in Com., 2180; 1°* of B., 3086; 2°* and in Com., 3722; 3° m., 3916; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3916; neg. (Y. 57, N. 90) 3919; 3°, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

—— **(Superannuation) B. No. 129** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). Res. prop., 2165 (i); in Com., 3088; 1°* of B., 3122; 2°* and in Com., 4252; 3°*, 4254 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

JUSTICE.

B. C. Penitentiary, Justice Drake's Instructions: M. for copy (Mr. *Corbould*) 297 (i).

Binding Twine manufactured at Kingston Penitentiary: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2022 (i).

Casault, Chief Justice: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

Circuit Allowances, Judges, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3107 (ii).

Connolly, Messrs., Process of Execution: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 233 (i).

Copyright, Berne Convention: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82 (i).

Crease and Davie, Chief Justices: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).

Criminal Code, Joint Com., Reduction of Quorum: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3266 (ii).

Dom. Police: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Drake's, Justice Services: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i), 2669 (ii).

Foreign Powers and the French Treaty, Privileges: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1697 (i).

Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i), 3106 (ii).

—— Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 407, 1913 (i).

Larkin, Connolly & Co., Suit against: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 203 (i).

Official Arbitrators: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 408, 1913 (i).

School Legislation, Man (1890) Judicial Decisions, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 221

Supreme Court of Can.: in Com. of Sup., 3108 (ii).

Toronto Ry. Co., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 2502 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, High Court Judges: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i), 3107 (ii).

Watters, T. J., Offence and Punishment: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 920 (i).

[*See* "Manitoba Schools," Provinces, &c.]

Kaministiquia River: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).

Keary, Wm. H., Retirement from Service: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).

Kemptville Postmaster, Complaints against: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 697 (i).

Kent (Ont.) Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 698 (i).

Kildare (P.E.I.) Station, Appnmt. of Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2511 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Metcalfe*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

Kingston Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Kinney, J. P., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 573 (i).

Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 1182 (i).

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE CONTRACT: Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2815; deb. adjd., 2917; rsmd., 2947; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3077 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2839; (Mr. *Gibson*) 2848; (Mr. *Masson*) 2855; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2867; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2874; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2888; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2900; (Mr. *Foster*) 2917; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2917; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2918; (Mr. *Costigan*) 2919; (Mr. *Martin*) 2947; (Mr. *Curran*) 2968; (Mr. *Tarte*) 2981; (Mr. *Davin*) 2991; (Mr. *Casey*) 3002; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3007; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3026, 3075; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3047; (Mr. *Foster*) 3060; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3070; (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 3067; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3075 (ii).

—— Remarks, &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).

—— Commission *re* Bridge, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2229 (i).

—— Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2229 (i).

Labourers, &c., on Public Works (Hours of Labour, &c.) B. No. 43 (Mr. *Lépine*). 1°*, 478 (i).

"La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montreal" B. No. 117 (Mr. *Lépine*). 1°*, 2670; 2°*, 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

La Jeune Lorette, Indian Agent Bastien: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1975, 2022 (i).

Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 575 (i), 3715 (ii).

—— M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1974 (i).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s revival Act Amt. B. No. 75 (Mr. *Northrup*). 1°*, 918; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

Lake St. John Ry., Earnings and Expenditure, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1974 (i).

Land Damages, Rideau Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2256 (i).

Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T., Denominational: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

Lands in Railway Belt, B.C., Settlement B. No. 141 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3993; 2°, 4078; in Com., 4079; 3°*, 4081 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

Lands unpatented in Morris, Man.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

Landry, Philippe Robt., Papers respecting: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier*) 2406 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1924; in Com., 1959; 3° on div., 2352 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

Langevin Block. *See* "Charlebois," "Mallette," &c.

Langevin, H., Claim against Govt. for Damages: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (ii).

——— CAMP, TENDERS FOR GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3193 (ii).

LARKE, MR., SERVICES *re* WORLD'S FAIR: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).

LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., SUIT AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 203 (i).

LAURENTIDES P.O., LEASE OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3360 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4800 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 3083 (ii).

"LAVAL" DREDGE, CONTRACT AND TOTAL COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 428 (i).

LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 4356 (ii).

LEGER, PIERRE, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 1949. 2086 (i), 2669, 3341, 4460 (ii).

——— *re* ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

——— *re* MAN. SCHOOLS, JUDICIAL DECISIONS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 221 (i).

——— LENKLETTER (P.E.I.) POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1179 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

——— SEL. COM., JOINT: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 223 (i).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOV. SCHULTZ AND DR. BOURINOT'S LETTER *re* MAN. SCHOOLS: Remarks 774 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. Hse., 774 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 783; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 788; (Mr. *Dickey*) 793; (Mr. *Martin*) 797; (Mr. *Daly*) 811; (Mr. *Fraser*) 822; (Mr. *Ives*) 827; (Mr. *Casey*) 830; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 836 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 735 (i).

LIEUT.-GOVS.' TENURE OF OFFICE: Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOV. OF MAN., VACANCY AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3710 (ii).

Lieut.-Governor's Salaries B. No. 37 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°*, 425 (i).

Life Association. *See* "BANKERS."

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i), 3617 (ii).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Muttawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*). 1°*, 1,000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i); Sen. Amts., 4774 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, ROYAL COMMISSION APNMT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Casey*) 210 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 2024.

——— NUMBER OF MEETINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 3084 (ii).

——— EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 83, 204 (i).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, ROYAL, COMMISSION, FURTHER EXPEND.: in Com. of Sup., 2491, 2611; conc., 2673 (ii).

——— REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 208 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 85 (i).

——— COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 1083, 1959 (i).

LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BELL BUOY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).

LITTLE RIVER ST. FRANCOIS, CLEARING CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1361 (i).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR (N.S.) ENGINEER'S SURVEYS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Forbes*) 325 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 1179 (i); 2° and in Com., 3093, 3659; recom., 3672; 3°*, 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2573, 3360 (ii).

——— INDUSTRY, ESTABLISHMENT OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).

——— PACKING, LICENSE FEES, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

——— REGULATIONS AS TO SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 574 (i).

LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS, GOVT. INSPECTION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3199 (ii).

LOISELLE, PAPERS *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 481 (i), 3713 (ii).

LOISELLE *vs.* GUILLET, DELAYED RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

LONDON MILITARY SCHOOL, SEWAGE DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1359 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 79; 2°, 465; in Com., 737; M. to restore to Order paper, 766; again in Com., 1841 (i); Order for Com. read, 2517 (ii). Deb. in Com. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 737; (Mr. *Curran*) 739; (Mr. *Charlton*) 741, 758, 1841; (Mr. *Amyot*) 745; (Mr. *Masson*) 748; (Mr. *Lister*) 752; (Mr. *Hazen*) 754; (Mr. *Foster*) 756; (Mr. *Dickey*) 759; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 760; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 765; (Mr. *Langelier*) 1844; (Mr. *Mara*) 1847; (Mr. *Bergin*) 1852; (Mr. *Masson*) 1844, 1853; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1854; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1856; (Mr. *Beckard*) 1858; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1860; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*), 1861; (Mr. *Montague*) 1863; (Mr. *Corbould*) 1864; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1865 (i).

LOTBINIERE ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).

LOUISBOURG, PROP. MONUMENT BY U.S. CITIZENS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 925 (i).

LOW, HENRY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1179 (i).

LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS, FREE: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).

LUMBER CONTRACTS, WELLAND CANAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).

LUMBER, SAWN, &C.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4850 (ii).

Maclaren Co. *See* "JAMES."

McBRIDE, ARTHUR H., RETIREMENT FROM OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).

McCLORY AND EDGRAFT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 2272 (i).

McCULLY, GEO., CONDUCTOR, DISMISSAL FROM I.C.R. SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 2140.

McDONALD, PATRICK, EMPLYMT. ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

McDONALD, RODERICK, BALANCE OF ACCOUNT SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i).

McGREEVY, THOS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST: Introduced, 344 (i).

McGREGOR'S CREEK, CHATHAM, SHEET PILING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 577 (i).

McINTYRE'S STATION AND SYDNEY (C.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1971 (i).

McISAAC, COLIN F., ESQ., MEMBER FOR ANTIGONISH: Introduced, 223 (i).

McMURRAY, L. J. A., EMPLYMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 1001 (i).

MADOC AND MARMORA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).

MADUXNEKEAG (N.B.) FISH-WAY, DAM AT MOUTH OF STREAM: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 699 (i).

MAGOG WHARF, DISPOSITION OF VOTE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1968 (i).

——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2572 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i), 3597 (ii).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1180 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monet*) 2406 (i).

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2140 (i).

MANITOBA:

BRANDON INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2298 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

CENSUS OF 1896: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 429 (i).

DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

LIEUT.-GOVERNOR OF MANITOBA AND DR. BOURINOT'S LETTER: Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 735, 774 (i).

——— VACANCY AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3710 (ii).

MAN. PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

MORRIS, UNPATENTED LANDS IN MUNICIPALITY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE, PURCHASE: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Martin*) 2376 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 4894 (ii).

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PAYMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3198 (ii).

RESD, HAYTER, AMTS. PAID, &c. 1879-94: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 366 (i).

ST. PETER'S RESERVE INDIANS, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 4007 (ii).

SCHOOL LEGISLATION (1890) JUDICIAL DECISIONS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 221 (i).

MANITOBA—*Continued.*

"STANLEY" STR., EXPLORATION OF HUDSON'S STRAITS: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 4905 (ii).

TOWNSHIP 16, RANGE 16, W., NEW SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2138 (i).

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY. CO., O.C. *re* GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 928 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "INTERIOR," "N.W.T.," &c.]

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com., 1967; 3°*, 2292 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 86.)

Manitoba and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 55.)

MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4379; Neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4458 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 4403; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4420; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 4435; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4437; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4442; (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 4451; (Mr. *Belley*) 4455 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4496, 4545; deb. adjd., 4579; rsmd., 4583; neg., 4707 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4496, 4568; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4545, 4570; (Mr. *Foster*) 4568; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4573; (Mr. *Martin*) 4573; (Mr. *Daly*) 4576; (Mr. *Casey*) 4578; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4631; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4640; (Mr. *Masson*) 4658; (Mr. *Davin*) 4667; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4677; (Mr. *Craig*) 4679; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4682; (Mr. *Hughes*) 4684; (Mr. *Costigan*) 4684); (Mr. *Baker*) 4696; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4697; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4699; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 4702 (ii).

——— ARTICLE IN *La Presse* NEWSPAPER: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 577 (i).

——— BISHOP GRAVEL'S COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3360 (ii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH HIS EX.: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2572 (ii).

——— JUDGMENT *re* BARRETT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 571 (i).

——— JUDGMENT OF IMP. PRIVY COUNCIL: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

——— MEMORIAL OF LEGISLATURE: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4186 (ii).

——— PAPERS *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE'S PROCEEDINGS: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1453 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 4187 (ii).

——— REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 578 (i), 3373, 3458, 3716 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 3997 (ii).

MAPS OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

MARINE:

"ALPHA AND BETA" MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Davies P.E.I.*), 2023 (i).

BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).

"GOLDEN CITY," REFUND OF FINES: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

MARINE—*Continued.*
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i), 3617 (ii).
LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BELL BUOY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).
MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).
MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).
ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (ii).
SAW-DUST DEPOSITS, RIVERS EXEMPT IN N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1975 (i).
SHIPPING REGULATIONS ON THE GREAT LAKES, U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2361 (i).
TIDAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
TIGNISH HARBOUR WHARF, NAMES, &c., OF VESSELS WHICH PAID DUES: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Perry*) 2406 (i).
[*See* PROVINCES, "PUBLIC WORKS, &c.]

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 768 (i), 2569 (ii).
MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).
MARITIME PROVINCES, PUB. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2305 (i), 3536 (ii).
MARKLAND MORTGAGE, KINGSTON: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1267 (i), 3557 (ii).

Markland Mortgage Discharge B. No. 93 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1352; Res. prop., 1883 (i); in Com., 2408; B. wthdn., 2408 (ii).

——— **B. No. 136** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1883 (i); M. for Com., 2406; in Com., 2408; 1°*, of B., 3558; 2°, 3928; in Com., 3930; 3°, 4063 (ii). (58 59 *Vic., c.* 5.)

MARYSVILLE (N.B.) P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3489, 3922.
MASSACHUSETTS BENEFIT ASSOCIATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 221 (i).
MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
MATANE AND STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 2023 (i).
MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).
MATTICE, LIEUT.-COL. G., RETIREMENT AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2484, 3874 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 2499 (ii).
MEGANTIC, &c., ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).
MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, &c., MONEYS PAID OUTSIDE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 331 (i).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.
DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR R.: Cumberland, N.S., 571.
GEOFFRION, C. A., ESQ.: Verchères, 301 (i).
MCGREEVY, THOS., ESQ.: Quebec West, 344 (i).
MCISAAC, COLIN F., ESQ.: Antigonish, 223 (i).
MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ.: Haldimand, 143.

MEMBERS, NEW: 1, 2, 143, 222, 268, 308 (i)
Mercantile Agencies. *See* "DETECTIVE."

METAPEDIA AND CAPLAN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 305 (i).
METEGHAN, MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques (Mr. *Bowers*) 3192 (ii).
METHYLATED SPIRITS: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).
"MEXICO" SS., WRECK, OFFICIAL INFORMATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4359 (ii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE:
ACTIVE MILITIA FORCE, SAVING BY REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3355 (ii).
CAN. TROOPS FOR ENGLAND, HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PUBLIC STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LONDON PURCHASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2022 (i).
CIVIL EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).
CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3185.
DOM. CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).
DRILL, CITY CORPS AND FIELD BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).
GREY, LIEUT.-COL. JOHN, APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF STORES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii),
HERBERT, MAJOR-GEN., RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2137 (i).
LANDRY, PHILIPPE ROBT., PAPERS RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2406 (i).
MATTICE, LIEUT.-COL. G., RETIREMENT AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358.
MILITARY PROPERTY, STORES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).
——— RIDING SCHOOL, MONTREAL: M for Stmt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).
MILITIA, ANNUAL DRILL, 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 573.
——— AND DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 2197 (i), 3100 3177, 3731, 4460 (ii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dickey*) 571 (i).
MILITIA, ANNUAL DRILL, 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 573.
MILITARY COLLEGE CADETS, NUMBER AND ATTENDANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).
———BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 1588 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Denison*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3781; neg., 3813 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3731 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, PAY AND ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 2197 (i), 3177 (ii).
QUEBEC CITADEL, GROCERIES CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).
QUEEN'S PRIZE WINNER AT BISLEY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) 4904 (ii).
ROYAL STANDARD, HOISTING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2137 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Dickey*) 2354 (ii).
SECRETAN, J. A., AMOUNT PAID BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).
SUTTON, MR., APPNMT. IN ROYAL CAN. DRAGOONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1972 (i), 2919 (ii).
TOTAL STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2362 (i).
VOLUNTEERS' LONG SERVICE MEDALS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) 4906 (ii)
WARLIKE AND OTHER STORES: in Com. of Sup., 3184.
[*See* PROVINCES, &c.]

MILK CANS, AMERICAN-MADE, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).
MILK, &c., CONDENSED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4856 (ii).

MILTON (N.S.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER (P. E. I.) EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 354 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 354, 376; (Mr. *Laurier*) 356, 375; (Mr. *Edgar*) 361; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 367; (Mr. *Casey*) 370; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 377; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 378; (Mr. *McDonald, P.E.I.*) 383 (i).

——— RESIGNATIONS, RUMOURED: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4055; neg. (Y. 72, N. 111) 4061 (ii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster, &c.*) 4187 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4190; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4192; (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 4194; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4195; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4197; (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 4208; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4213; (Mr. *Joncas*) 4213; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 4214; (Mr. *Amyot*) 4216; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4216; (Mr. *Denison*) 4216; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4224; (Mr. *Belley*) 4236; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4243 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4116 (ii).

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS' SPEECH IN MONTREAL *Herald's* REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 925.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 2489; conc., 2673, 3905 (ii).

——— PRIVATE BILLS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 225 (i).

MOIR, GEO., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3196 (ii).

MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALDIMAND: Introduced, 143 (i).

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 322 (i).

MONTMAGNY HARBOUR MASTER, INQUIRY INTO CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i).

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

——— CUSTOMS, COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 205 (i).

——— P.O., LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

MORDEN (N.S.) PIER, PETS., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 477 (i).

MORRIS (MAN.) UNPATENTED LANDS IN MUNICIPALITY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

Mortgage. *See* "MARKLAND."

MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2482 (ii).

MULLEN, JOHN, LOCKMAN, GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3514.

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ASST. RECEIVER GENERAL, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

CARAQUET RY. GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 273 (i).

CARLETON BONDED WAREHOUSE, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 2357 (i).

CONNOR, JOHN, OF ST. JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 3993 (ii).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3170.

FISHING GUARDIANS ON THE MIRIMACHI: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1081 (i).

FISHERY REGULATIONS, ST. JOHN RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 273, 430 (i).

GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

MARYSVILLE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3489, 3922 (ii).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).

ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i).

——— RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3359 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2360 (i).

SALMON FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3455 (ii).

TOBIQUE VALLEY RY., DOM. BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2941 (ii).

——— OPENING FOR TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2755 (ii).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

YARMOUTH BAR BREAKWATER, CONDITION, COST, &c.: M. for Cor.,* &c., (Mr. *Flint*) 2023 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

NEWFOUNDLAND, PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 270, 343, 840, 919, 1183 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 842, 852; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 844; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 845; (Mr. *Montague*) 847; (Mr. *Laurier*) 849; (Mr. *Foster*) 852; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 855; (Mr. *Ives*) 857; (Mr. *McMullen*) 859 (i).

——— REFUND OF FISHING LICENSE FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).

NEW WESTMINSTER DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).

NIAGARA FALLS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Lovell*) 574 (i).

Niagara, Hamilton, &c. *See* "ST. CATHARINES."

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

ARTESIAN BORINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2024 (i).

CREAMERY AND CHEESE FACTORIES ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2401 (i).

DAIRYING, ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4011 (ii).

GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).

MEDICINE HAT, GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 2499 (ii).

QU'APPELLE VALLEY, INDIAN RESERVES, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1550 (i).

REBELLION, SCRIP FOR SCOUTS, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2400 (i).

REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, DISCARDED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Bergin*) 1078 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "INTERIOR," "MANITOBA," &c.]

North-west Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°, 3079; 2°* and in Com., 4767; 3°*, 4768 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 33.)

N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 197 (i.)

N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Martin*). 1°*, 515 (i).

N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 3455; 2°, 3930; in Com., 3931; 3°*, 3932; Sen. Amts., 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°, 3080; 2°* and in Com., 4074, 4117; 3° m., 4120; deb. adjd., 4121; rsmd., 4630, 4762; 3°*, 4763 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

NOBLE BROS. FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WITHDRL. OF LICENSE: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1979 (i).

NORTH CAYUGA TOWNSHIP CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 2266.

NORTH CAPE (P.E.I.) WHISTLING BUOY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, BORINGS FOR TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

——— *See* "Prince Edward Island."

NOVA SCOTIA:

ANNAPOLIS MILITARY GROUND, LEASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2139 (i).

ANTIGONISH ANG SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2510 (ii).

CAPE BRETON MAILS, CONTRACT FOR CARRYING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

CAPE BRETON RY., CAPITAL EXPEND., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1551 (i).

——— POINT TUPPER TERMINUS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Cameron*) 340 (i).

——— FREIGHT AND PASSENGER CASH RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1587, 2354 (i).

CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., ARTICLE IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 1354 (i).

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3202, 4031 (ii).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3510 (ii).

DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR RUPERT, MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND, N.S.: Introduced, 571 (i).

DISTILLERIES, SEIZURES BY MR. BOURINOT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357 (ii).

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).

GRAND ETANG, OPENING OF NEW CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2141 (i).

——— WORKS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3709.

GUYSBORO' INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 774 (i).

HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3817 (ii).

——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).

——— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2357 (i).

——— FREIGHT SHED, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2727 (ii).

I.C.R. *See* general heading.

KINNEY, J. P., DISMISSAL AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 573 (i).

LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BUOY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR, ENGINEER'S SURVEY'S, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Forbes*) 325 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

LOUISBOURG, PROP. MONUMENT BY U.S. CITIZENS; Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 925 (i).

MCINTYRE'S STATION AND SYDNEY (C.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1971 (i).

MCISAAC, COLIN F., ESQ., MEMBER FOR ANTIGONISH: Introduced, 223 (i).

MADUXNEKEAG FISHWAY, DAM AT MOUTH OF STREAM: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 699 (i).

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2140 (i).

METEGHAN, MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 3192 (ii).

MORDEN PIER, PETS., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 477 (i).

PORT DE BERT, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 305 (i).

QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE INDUSTRIES, RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

ST. PETER'S CANAL, ARTICLE IN NORTH SYDNEY *Herald*: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 4580 (i).

——— OPENING FOR NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

SAW-DUST DEPOSITS, RIVERS EXEMPT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1975 (i).

SEAL ISLAND LIFE-BOAT STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).

SHELBURNE, &c., INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS PET.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2670 (ii).

SHELBURNE HARBOUR, IRON CAN BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 700 (i).

SHIELDS, F., EX-POSTMASTER OF MILTON, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

SOUTH INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 2304 (i).

SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1078 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s incorp. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Fraser*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1731; in Com., 1924; 3°*, 1959 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

Oaths. *See* "ADMINISTRATION," "SEDITIOUS," &c.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i), 3615 (ii).

"OCEAN" STR., CLAIMS AGAINST FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

OGILVIE, MR., GUARANTEE TO EXCHANGE BANK: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3368, 3455 (ii).

OGILVIE, W. W., CLAIM FOR DRAWBACK ON CORN IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4357 (ii).

OKA INDIANS, TRANSFER TO MUSKOKA, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1358 (i).

ONTARIO:

ANDERSON, JAS., OF SUTTON, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 306, 479 (i).

ARNPRIOR P.O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1587 (i), 3193 (ii).

BEALTON, P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1268 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

BINDER TWINE, GOVT. SALES BELOW COST: Ques. (Mr. *Featherstone*) 3818 (ii).
——— MANUFACTURED IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2355 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3707 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2022 (i).
BOSTON P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1267 (i).
BRAMPTON INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1182 (i).
BROCKVILLE, CORNWALL AND STRATHROY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 573 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2022 (i).
CENSUS OF CITY OF LONDON, RETS. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 207 (i).
CHATHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406 (i).
"CITY OF MIDLAND" STR., SEIZURE AT COLLINGWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4708 (ii).
CLARKE AND PAISLEY, MESSRS., CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 305 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, GOVT. SEWER, TELEPHONE, &C.: in Com., of Sup., 2262 (i), 3703 (ii).
COORTWRIGHT, CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2139 (i), 3359 (ii).
CRONK, MR., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3359 (ii).
DETROIT AND ST. CLAIR RIVERS, &C., FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*) 2356 (i).
DOM. BANK, PETER VANLUVEN, DECLARATION BY: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
DROUTH IN PROVINCE: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4582 (ii).
FARRAN'S POINT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).
FARM LANDS IN ONT., VALUE: Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 772 (i).
FENELON FALLS, AUTHORITY FOR FILLING ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4581 (ii).
FORT ERIE, CUSTOMS OFFICERS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3815 (ii).
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3704 (ii).
——— RAPIDS, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2509 (ii).
GOVT. PENSIONS, PAR. IN PETERBOROUGH *Examiner*: prop. Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 922 (i).
GUY, CHARLES, OF PETERBOROUGH, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1452 (i).
HALLIWELL, J. L., OF STIRLING, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1969 (i).
HICKEY, G. N., APPNMT. ON RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).
HICKEY, C. E., APPNMT. ON WILLIAMSBURG CANAL; Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).
HILTON WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2362 (i).
KAMINISTIQUA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
KEMPTVILLE POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 697 (i).
KENT FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 698 (i).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
——— *See* "Binder Twine."
LAND DAMAGES, RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2256.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

LONDON MILITARY SCHOOL, SEWAGE DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1359 (i).
MCGREGOR'S CREEK, CHATHAM, SHEET PILING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 577 (i).
MADOC AND MARMORA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).
MOIR, GEO., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3196 (ii).
MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALDIMAND: Introduced, 143 (i).
NIAGARA FALLS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 574 (i).
NOBLE BROS. FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WTHDRL. OF LICENSE: M. for O. C., &c., (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1979 (i).
NORTH CAYUGA, TOWNSHIP'S CLAIM; in Com. of Sup., 2266.
OTTAWA AND KINGSTON MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 839 (i).
PLUMMER'S WHARF, SAULT STE. MARIE, GOVT. TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2363 (ii).
PORT ROWAN WHARF, AMOUNT VOTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2360 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
ROSA'S BRIDGE OVER OTONABEE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2261 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. SUBSIDIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 333 (i).
ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE, EMPLOYEES' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2163, 2357 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL. *See* general heading.
SAW-LOGS IN GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE HURON, TOWING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Macdonnell, Algoma*) 2405 (i).
SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3198 (ii).
——— M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).
SIX NATION INDIANS AND DEPTL. REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 429 (i).
SMITH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 596, 926 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4116 (ii).
SUGAR ISLAND, SALE BY INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 3359 (ii).
SUTTON, MR., APPNMT. TO ROYAL CAN. DRAGOONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1972 (i), 2919 (ii).
TAY CANAL, REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
THOUSAND ISLANDS, RESERVATION FOR NATIONAL PARK: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3997 (ii).
——— SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 (i).
TORONTO DRILL HALL, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1362 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
——— COST SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 481 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3705 (ii).
——— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Somerville*) 2406 (i).
VALLEYFIELD SEWER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2509 (ii).
WEIR, MR., OF KEENE, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1453 (i).
WELLAND CANAL. CONTRACT FOR LUMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*
WEST RIDEAU LAKE DAM, LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
WHEAT INSPECTION AT FORT WILLIAM, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
WINGHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c."]

Ontario Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

OPEN ACCOUNT: in Com. of Sup., 2661 (ii).

ORANGE PROCESSION THROUGH PARLT. GROUNDS: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 4255 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c. *See* page lxxxvii.

Oshawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310; in Com. and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

Ottawa and Aylmer Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Robillard*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1924 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

OTTAWA AND KINGSTON MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 839 (i).

OTTAWA AND MARITIME PROVINCES MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 2359 (i).

Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. *Featherston*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

Ottawa Land and Security's Co.'s incorp. B. No. 105 (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 1959 (i); 2°*, 3150; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PROTECTION AGAINST STORMS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 2573 (ii).
——— *See* "Coal Contracts."

OVERSEERS AND GUARDIANS (FISHERY) SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).

PAPINEAUVILLE AND CHENEVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 580 (i).

PARADIS, REV. FATHER, GOVT. AID TO COLONIZATION SCHEME: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3197 (ii).

PARLIAMENT, 7TH. 5TH SESSION: Opening, 1; Prorogation, 4909 (ii).

PASSAMAQUODDY BAY, &c., BOUNDARY SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

"PATENT RECORD:" in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

PATTON, JAS., APPNMT. AS CHIEF INSPECTOR OF CULLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1359 (i).

PEDLARS. *See* "Jew."

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°, 618; 2° and in Com., 2165 (i); 3°*, 2406 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°, 3190; 2°* and in Com., 4366; 3°*, 4470; Sen. Amts., 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

PENITENTIARIES, B.C., JAMES FITZSIMMONS'S SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 204 (i).
——— MCBRIDE AND KEARY'S RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).
——— NEW BUILDING SITE: Remarks (Mr. *Corbould*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4820 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 408, 1913 1948 (i), 2669 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES REP.: Presented (Mr. *Curran*) 1353 (i).
——— *See* SUPPLY.

PERMANENT CORPS, PAY AND ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 2197 (i), 3177 (ii).
——— TOTAL STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2362 (i).

Permanent Reserve Life incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Article in *Canada Farmer's Sun*: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4813 (ii).
——— PAR. IN *Mail-Empire re* CARRIAGE OF MAILS: Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 517 (i).
——— (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031.
——— VOTES ON DIVISIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Boyle*) 4358 (ii).

PHILADELPHIA EXHIBITION (1876): Expenses of Can. Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2736 (ii).

PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITION AT IMP. INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (ii).

PICAUD *vs.* PICAUD, LETTER FROM AGENT BASTIEN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Laurier*) 2022.

PICKFORD AND BLACK'S SS. CONTRACT, HALIFAX, &c., AND W. INDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 922 (i).

PICTOU, N.S., &c., AND GEORGETOWN, &c., P.E.I., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 3599.

PILON, THEORET, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).

PIG IRON, IMPORTS FROM ALABAMA: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 932 (i).
——— BOUNTY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 2022 (i),

PIPING, DUTY ON IMPORTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3708 (ii).

PLUMMER'S WHARF, SAULT STE. MARIE, GOVT. TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2363 (i).

POINT TUPPER TERMINUS, CAPE BRETON RY.: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Cameron*) 340 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO., REPS. TO GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Devlin*) 2405 (i).
——— SUBSIDY, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1586.
——— CONDITION OF ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 574.
——— EARNINGS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Devlin*) 211 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P. O. SITE, PURCHASE: M. for O. C.; (Mr. *Martin*) 2376 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 3547, 3628, 3715, 4894 (ii).

PORT DE BERT (N.S.) APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 305 (i).

PORT ROWAN WHARF, AMOUNT VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2360 (i)

PORT MULGRAVE, ARICHAT, &c., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 3600 (ii).

POST OFFICE:

ALLAN AND DOMINION SS. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2510 (ii).

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1587 (i), 3193 (ii).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON (N. W. T.) MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2024 (i).

BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BEALTON P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1268 (i).

BOSTON P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1267 (i).

CAPE BRETON MAILS, CONTRACT FOR CARRYING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

DE BLOIS (P.E.I.) MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1697.

EXPENDITURE, TOTAL FOR NINE MONTHS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 926 (i).

HULL POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF LETTER CARRIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1586 (i).

INTEREST, COMPUTING: in Com. of Sup., 3099 (ii).

KEMPTVILLE POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 697 (i).

KILDARE STATION, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2511 (i).

LAKE ETCHEMIN AND STE. ROSE DE WATFORD MAIL CONTRACT: M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1974 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 575 (i), 3715 (i).

LAURENTIDES P.O., LEASE OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3360 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4800 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 3083 (ii)

LENKLETTER (P.E.I.) P.O., ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1179 (i).

LOISELLE *vs.* GUILLET, DELAYED RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

—— *See* "Ste. Angele de Monnoir."

MCINTYRE'S STATION AND SYDNEY (C.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1971 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i).

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2140 (i).

MATANE AND STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE; M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 2023 (i).

METAPEDIA AND CAPLAN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 305 (i).

METEGHAN MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 3192 (ii).

MILTON (N.S.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

MONTREAL DISTRICT INSPECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

OTTAWA AND KINGSTON MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 839 (i).

OTTAWA AND MARITIME PROVINCES MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Staire*) 2359 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

PAPINEAUVILLE AND CHENEVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 580 (i).

PORT DE BERT, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 305 (i).

POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2505, 2719, 3922, 4312.

RICHMOND STATION AND DENISON MILLS MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).

STE. ANGELE DE MONNOIR, EX-POSTMASTER, PAPERS *re* DISMISSAL: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3627.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3713 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 481 (i).

ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE, EMPLOYEES SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2163, 2357 (i).

ST. LOUIS (P.E.I.) P.O., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771, 2359 (i).

ST. LOUIS STATION AND PALMER ROAD, &c. (P.E.I.) MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 699 (i).

TRANS-ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, FAST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 305 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4708 (ii).

WAKEFIELD AND RUPERT MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1585) (i).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE (P.E.I.): in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i).

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," PROVINCES, &c.]

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 1353 (i).

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PAYMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3198 (ii).

PRIDHAM, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, GRENVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 4357 (ii).

PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE, WORK IN CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i).

CEDAR SLEEPERS FOR P.E.I. RY., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3084 (i).

CHEESE FACTORIES, MANUFACTURES AND SALES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 2023 (i).

COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 3196 (ii).

DARNLEY BASIN, BUOYS AND RANGE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 580 (i).

DE BLOIS MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771 (i).

DUVAR ROAD, FLAG STATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

KILDARE STATION, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2511 (ii).

LENKLETTER P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1179 (i).

LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2573 (ii).

—— PACKING, LICENSE FEES, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i), 3597 (ii).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*

NORTH CAPE WHISTLING BUOY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE, WORK IN CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

PRINCE COUNTY RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

RUSTICO BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 699 (i).

RY. SYSTEM IN P.E.I., EXTENSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2756 (ii).

ST. LOUIS POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771, 2359 (i).

ST. LOUIS STATION AND PALMER ROAD, &c., MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 699 (i).

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, PREPARATION FOR BORINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3711 (ii).

—— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (i).

—— BOARINGS FOR TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1361 (i).

—— WHARFINGER'S RET. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 430, 931, 2358 (i), 3714 (ii).

—— HARBOUR WHARF, NAMES, &c., OF VESSELS THAT PAID DUES; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 2406.

WEST POINT WHARF, BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

WOOD ISLAND, &c., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

PRINCESS PIER AT LÉVIS, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 410, 418 (i); 3101 (ii).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Montague*) 3190.

PRINTING BUREAU, PLANT.: in Com. of Sup., 3907.

—— REPORTS, BILLS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 309 (i).

PRINTING, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 226 (i).

—— LITHOGRAPHS, &c., COMPANIES VISITING CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).

—— MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).

—— PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 3342.

PRIVATE BILLS, PRESENTATION: M. (Mr. *Masson*) Extension of Time, 1175 (i).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 223 (i).

PRIVILEGE, Ques. of, Controller of Customs (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).

—— MR. SPEAKER'S RULING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2512 (ii).

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com of Sup., 386 (i).

PROHIBITION. *See* "Liquor Traffic."

PROROGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4738 (ii).

—— COMNS. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4876 and 4903 (ii).

—— Mess. from His Ex. by Black Rod, 4909 (ii).

Provincial Courts. *See* "JUDGES."

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., EMPLYMT. OF SHORTHAND WRITER: M. (Mr. *Baker*) 1267 (i).

—— IRREGULARITY OF MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1829 (i), 2943 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CAN.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 181 (i).

—— REF. TO SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Baker*) 425 (i).

—— SEL. COM.: List of Members, 226 (i).

Public Employees. *See* "SALARIES."

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3271; neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339 (ii).

PUBLIC HEALTH IN QUARANTINE DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 3082; 2° and in Com., 3267; 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 36.)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1829 (i).

—— (INCOME) AMOUNT TO COMPLETE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3712 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i), 2722, 3102, 3464, 3922, 4276 (ii).

Public Works. *See* "LABOUR."

PUBLIC WORKS:

ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4908 (ii).

ARNPRIOR P. O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL, PIER, CONTRACTOR FOR BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, CORNWALL AND STRATHROY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2236 (i).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i).

CHARLEBOIS, J. A., CLAIM *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 933 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1970 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773 (i).

COAL CONTRACTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4709 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 4817 (ii).

COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 3196 (ii).

CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Sir. *Richard Cartwright*) 204, 230 (i).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3510 (i).

DREDGE "LAVAL," CONTRACT AND TOTAL COST; Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 428 (i).

DREDGE, NEW, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).

DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," WORK IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

DRILL HALL, TORONTO, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1362 (i).

GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (i).

GILBERT DREDGING AND BLASTING CO., CLAIM *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2509 (ii).

GRAND ETANG WORKS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3709 (ii).

HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3817 (ii).

—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

HALIFAX DRILL HALL, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357.

—— FREIGHT SHED, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2727 (ii).

HILTON WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2362 (i).

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR (N.S.) ENGINEER'S SURVEYS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Forbes*) 325 (i).

MAGOG WHARF, PURCHASE OF PROPERTY; Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2572 (ii).

MALLETTE, LOUIS O., AND CONTRACT *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monet*) 2406 (i).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1180 (i).

MEDICINE HAT GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

—— LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

MORDEN (N.S.) PIER, PETS., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 477 (i).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3514.

NEW WESTMINSTER DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).

OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PROTECTION AGAINST STORMS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 2573 (ii).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE, PURCHASE: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Martin*) 2376 (i); Remarks 4896 (ii).

PORT ROWAN WHARF, AMOUNT VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2360 (i).

PRINCESS PIER AT LÉVIS, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., NON-PERMANENT EMPLOYEES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS (INCOME) AMOUNT TO COMPLETE; Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3712 (ii).

REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3142 (ii).

RICHMOND P.O. AND CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

RIMOUSKI P.O. AND CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

ROSSA'S BRIDGE OVER OTONABEE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2261 (i).

RUSTICO BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 699 (i).

ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i)

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4355)ii).

SOUTH INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR, TOTAL COST TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier* (3995 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER. *See* general heading.

TOLLS ON PUBLIC WHARFS, COLLECTION: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

WEST POINT WHARF, BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

WOOD ISLAND, &c., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

YAMASKA DAM AND LOCK, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1697, 2359 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

YAMASKA EMBANKMENT AND LOCK: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Mignault*) 2359 (ii).

YARMOUTH BAR BREAKWATER, CONDITION, COST, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2023 (i).

[*See* PROVINCES, "SUPPLY," &c.]

QU'APPELLE VALLEY INDIAN RESERVES, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1550 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

QUEBEC CITADEL, CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).

—— FOR CORDWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726.

QUEBEC:

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1359 (i).

—— NAMES OF OWNERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 322 (i).

BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

—— PIER, CONTRACTOR FOR BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

BEDARD, CHARLES, APPNMT. AS REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3993 (ii).

BERTRAND, CHARLES, TOBACCO SEIZED FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480, 697 (i).

BOURASSA, PHILIPPE, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1970 (i).

CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES REVISING OFFICER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

CHARLEBOIS, J. A., CLAIM *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 933 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773 (i).

CHENIER, DR., CUSTOMS DUTIES ON MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3712, 4115 (ii).

CULLERS, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC. *See* general heading.

DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

DYNAMITE FACTORY, LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. (*Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1080 (i).

FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).

GENDREAU, TELESPHORE, CHARGES AGAINST, INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 3712 (ii).

GEOFFRION, C. A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR VERCHÈRES: Introduced, 301 (i).

GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3359 (ii).

GRENVILLE CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 4357 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).

GILBAULT, EDWD., EMPLYMT. BY PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 305 (i).

GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

I. C. R. *See* general heading.

ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURES AT L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).

ISLE AUX NOIX, GOVT. LAND SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2510, 3195 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL. *See* general heading.

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Lavergne* 1974 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

LANDRY, PHILLIPE ROBT., PAPERS RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2406 (i).

LANGEVIN, H., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DRAINAGE: M. for Car.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

—— APPNMT. of REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

—— CAMP, TENDERS FOR GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3193 (ii).

LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 4356 (ii).

L'ISLET, ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURES; Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138, 4115 (ii).

LITTLE RIVER ST. FRANCOIS, CLEARING CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1361 (i).

LOTBINIERE ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).

MCDONALD, PATRICK, EMPLYMNT. ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

MCGREEVY, THOS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST: Introduced 344 (i).

MAGOG WHARF, DISPOSITION OF VOTE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1968 (i).

—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2572 (ii).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1180 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monet*) 2406 (i).

MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).

MEGANTIC, &c., ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

"MEXICO" SS. WRECK, OFFICIAL INFORMATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4359 (i).

MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, MONTREAL: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

MONTMAGNY HARBOUR MASTER, INQUIRY INTO CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2136.

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 205 (i).

—— P.O., LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

OKA INDIANS, TRANSFER TO MUSKOKA, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1358.

PASSAMAQUODDY BAY, &c., BOUNDARY SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

PILON, THEORET, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).

MONTREAL DISTRICT, INSPECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. *See* general heading.

PRINCESS PIER AT LÉVIS, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

QUEBEC CITADEL, CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).

—— CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER, GOVT. LAND SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 1969 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3195 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

RICHMOND P.O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

RIMOUSKI P. O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3494 (ii).

RIVIÈRE DU SUD.: in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i).

ST. JEAN AND IBERVILLE REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4355 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3542 (ii).

—— RIVER WATER LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 1549(i).

—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

ST. LOUIS, EMMANUEL. *See* general heading.

ST. ROCH DES AULNETS LIGHTSHIP, CORDWOOD CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726 (ii).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY; in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

SEIGNIORY OF SOREL, TENANTS ON GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 304 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

THIBAULT, CHAS., PAYMENTS TO SUPERANNUATION FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).

THREE RIVERS, CONSTRUCTION OF HAY SHED BY C.P.R. CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2358 (i).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 574 (i).

—— HARBOUR COMMISSION, REVENUE AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4356 (ii).

—— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3995 (ii).

TOBACCO SEIZURE IN ST. LOUIS DE HA HA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).

—— TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).

TROOPS IN QUEBEC, REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2361 (i).

TURENNE, AUZIAS, EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).

VALLEYFIELD DRAIN, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS, LOTBINIERE, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).

—— MEGANTIC, &c., PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

YAMASKA AND ST. OURS LOCKS. *See* general heading.

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 1584; 2°*, 2293 (i); in Com., 4772; 3°*, 4472 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE (N.S.) INDUSTRIES, RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2031 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1355 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1452 (i).

—— STATE FESTIVITIES: M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn. Hse., 2030 (i).

QUEEN'S PRIZE WINNER AT BISLEY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4904 (ii).

RAILWAYS.

ATLANTIC AND SUPERIOR RY. CO., GOVT. GUARANTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 2920 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY. *See* general heading.
COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3202, 4031 (ii).
CATTLE TRAINS AND GOVT. CONDUCTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 207 (i).
DOM. RYS., AID TO BUILDING, &c., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
C.P.R. *See* general heading.
DUVAR ROAD (P.E.I.) FLAG STATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438, 483 (i).
FREIGHT RATES, IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4922 (ii).
HUDSON BAY RY. *See* general heading.
I. C. R. *See* general heading.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1974 (i).
LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS, GOVT. INSPECTION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3199 (ii).
P.E.I. RY. *See* general heading.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. *See* general heading.
PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).
RAILWAYS AND DRAINAGE: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Casey*) 208 (i).
—— VOTED DURING 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
RY. SYSTEM IN P.E.I., EXTENSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2756 (ii).
RIVER INHABITANTS, INVERNESS, PETS., &c., FOR FLAG STATION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cameron*) 343.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. SUBSIDIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 333 (i).
SUBSIDIES, TO RYS., PROVINCES, MILES BUILT, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4007 (ii).
—— PAID, 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1079 (i).

RAILWAYS. *See also:*

ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
CALGARY AND LETHBRIDGE RY. AND IRRIGATION CO.
CANADA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
INTERNATIONAL RADIAL RY. CO.
JAMES BAY RY. CO.
KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RY. CO.
LINDSAY, HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
OSHAWA RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND AYLMER RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.
RED MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. CLAIR AND ERIE SHIP CANAL CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.
SOUTH SHORE SUBURBAN RY. CO.
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. CO.
TRAIL CREEK AND COLUMBIA RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*

TRANS-CANADIAN RY. CO.
WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY. CO.
WINNIPEG AND GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.
[*See* "COMPANIES."]

Railway Act Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1°, 269 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. (Security for Passengers, &c.) B. No. 65 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 617 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS DEPT: in Com. of Sup., 2723.
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 515 (i).
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 224 (i).
—— *See* "SELECT COM. ON RYS."
RAILWAY EMPLOYEES, PAYMENT OF WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Bryson*) 4359 (ii).

Railway Employees Safety Promotion B. No. 13 (Mr. *Maclean, York*). 1°, 143 (i).

Railway Lands. Drainage on and across, B. No. 40 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 477 (i).

RAILWAYS OF THE DOM., AID TO, &c., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
RAILWAY RATES COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 839 (i).

Railway Return Fare Tickets, Sale, B. No. 10 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°, 80 (i).

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, PAID 1894-5: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1079 (i).
—— VOTED DURING 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
REBELLION IN N.W.T., SCRIP FOR SCOUTS, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2400 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1082 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2024 (i).
RECEIVER GENERAL, ASST., ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

Red Mountain Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c*, 60.)

REED, HAYTER, AMTS. PAID, &c. (1879-94) MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 266 (i).
—— RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1829 (i), 2814.
REID, GEO., TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).
REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 578 (i), 3373, 3458, 3716 (ii).

Representation. *See* "N.W.T.", "HOUSE OF COMMONS," "INDEPENDENCE."

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Montague*) 229 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Foster*) 309 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. *Montague*) 2570 (ii).
DOMINION POLICE (Mr. *Costigan*) 229 (i).
EXCISE, &c. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SUMMARY REP. (Mr. *Daly*) 181.
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Daly*) 181.
INLAND REVENUES OF THE DOM. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 151 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED—*Continued.*

INS. CO.'S, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENTS (Mr. *Foster*) 1829 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Daly*) 1003 (i).
LIQUOR TRAFFIC, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: (Mr. *Foster*) 208 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. *Costigan*) 768 (i) 2569 (ii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Dickey*) 571 (i).
PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Curran*) 1353 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Montague*) 3190 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CAN. (Mr. *Foster*) 181 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1829 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Haggart*) 515 (i).
RAILWAY RATES COMMISSION (Mr. *Haggart*) 839 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE (Mr. *Foster*) 4854 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i).

RETURNS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2507 (ii).

——— DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

Return-Fare Tickets. *See* "RY."

RETURNS: Inquiries for, 1083, 1185 (i), 3818, 3913, 4256, 4358 (ii).

——— RETURN *re* SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1083 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.:

ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN. LEGISLATION RESPECTING*: Mr. *Lovell*, 2405 (i).
"ALPHA" AND "BETA" MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, NAMES OF OWNERS, &c.: Mr. *Forbes*, 322 (i).
BASTIEN, AGENT, AND HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE: Mr. *Laurier*, 1975 (i).
——— LETTER *re* PICARD *vs.* PICARD*: Mr. *Laurier*, 2022 (i).
BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON (N.W.T.) MAIL CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Martin*, 2024 (i).
B.C. PENITENTIARY, JUSTICE DRAKE'S INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *Corbould*, 297 (i).
BEHRING SEA, SEIZURE OF SHIPS BY U.S.: Mr. *Laurier*, 215 (i).
BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND: Mr. *Forbes*, 2401 (i).
BINDING TWINE MANUFACTURED AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY*: Mr. *Grieve*, 2022 (i).
BONAVENTURE COUNTY PILOT EXAMINERS: Mr. *Fauvel*, 339 (i).
BOUNTY ON PIG IRON MADE IN CAN.*: Mr. *Edgar*, 2022 (i).
CAN. NEWS CO. AND I.C.R. CONTRACT*: Mr. *Choquette*, 222 (i).
CAN. MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION*: Mr. *Sproule*, 221.
CAPE BRETON RY., POINT TUPPER TERMINUS: Mr. *Cameron*, 340 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LONDON, PURCHASE, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 2022 (i).
CATTLE EMBARGO, GREAT BRITAIN: Mr. *Innes*, 209 (i).
——— Mr. *Mulock*, 296 (i).
CATTLE ENTERING CANADA FROM MONTANA: Mr. *Mulock*, 322 (i).
CATTLE TRANSPORT THROUGH U.S. FOR SHIPMENT: Mr. *McMillan*, 341, 477 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

CHATHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS*: Mr. *Campbell*, 2406 (i).
CHEESE FACTORIES IN P.E.I., MANUFACTURES AND SALES*: Mr. *McMillan*, 2023 (i).
COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: Mr. *Flint*, 3202, 4031 (ii).
CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS ON THEATRICAL PRINTING, &c.*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).
CUSTOMS RETURNS, WEST KOOTENEY, 1890 to 1894: Mr. *Mara*, 321 (i).
DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Charlton*, 209 (i).
DEPTL. REPORTS, DISTRIBUTION FROM 1888 TO 1895: Mr. *Charlton*, 312 (i).
DOM. AND P.O. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: Mr. *McMullen*, 332 (ii).
DOM. RYS., AID TO BUILDING, &c., &c.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
DRAINAGE ACROSS RY. LINES: Mr. *Casey*, 208 (i).
"DUART CASTLE," MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.*: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
DUVAR ROAD (P.E.I.) FLAG STATION: Mr. *Perry*, 2385 (i).
EMBARGO. *See* "Cattle."
EXPERIMENTAL FARM REPS., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION*: Mr. *Grieve*, 2406 (i).
EXPORT OF SHEEP TO GREAT BRITAIN: Mr. *Featherston*, 2385 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 222 (i).
FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER, CONTRACTS: Mr. *Laurier*, 2397 (i).
FLEMING, WM., HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MAN.: Mr. *Martin*, 2364 (i).
FOSTER, H. S., AND RICHELIEU RIVER LANDS PURCHASE*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2406 (i).
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 438, 483 (i).
——— RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2024 (i).
FRENCH TREATY, ADDITIONAL COR.*: Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).
GOVT. INSPECTORS OF WHEAT AT FORT WILLIAM: Mr. *Martin*, 431 (i).
HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS IN MAN.: Mr. *Martin*, 2364 (i).
HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE AND AGENT BASTIEN: Mr. *Laurier*, 1975 (i).
I. C. R. *See* general heading.
IMMIGRATION. TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS FROM U.S.: Mr. *Martin*, 241 (i).
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 222.
INDIANS, HAYTER REED'S SERVICES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 266 (i).
INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE: Mr. *Forbes*, 326 (i).
——— IN WINGHAM*: Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*, 2406 (i).
——— IN CHATHAM*: Mr. *Campbell*, 2406 (i).
JEW PEDLARS, TRANSPORT FROM CHICAGO TO N.W.T.; Mr. *Martin*, 241 (i).
LA JEUNE LORETTE, INDIAN AGENT BASTIEN*: Mr. *Laurier*, 2022 (i).
LAKE ETCHEMIN AND ST. ROSE DE WATFORD MAIL CONTRACT: Mr. *Vaillancourt*, 1974 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE, &c.: Mr. *Lavergne*, 1974 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

LAND GRANTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., DENOMINATIONAL: Mr. *Charlton*, 209 (i).

LANDS UNPATENTED IN MORRIS, MAN.*: Mr. *LaRivière*, 2024 (i).

LANDRY, PHILIPPE ROBT., PAPERS RESPECTING*: Mr. *Langelier*, 2406 (i).

LANGEVIN, H., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).

LEGISLATION *re* ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN.*: Mr. *Lovell*, 2405 (i).

LEGISLATION *re* MAN. SCHOOLS, JUDICIAL DECISIONS*: Mr. *Charlton*, 221 (i).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, ROYAL COMMISSION APPNMT.: Mr. *Casey*, 210 (i)

—— EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Flint*, 2024 (i).

LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BELL BUOY: Mr. *Forbes*, 2401.

LIVERPOOL (N.S.) HARBOUR ENGINEER'S SURVEYS, &c.: Mr. *Forbes*, 325 (i).

LUMBER CONTRACTS, WELLAND CANAL: Mr. *Lovell*, 2363 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 275 (i).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND CONTRACT *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK*: Mr. *Monet*, 2406 (i).

MASSACHUSETTS BENEFIT ASSOCIATION*: Mr. *Sproule*, 221 (i).

MATANE AND STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE*: Mr. *Joncas*, 2023 (i).

MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: Mr. *Laurier*, 2397 (i).

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, &c., MONEYS PAID OUTSIDE: Mr. *McMullen*, 331 (i).

MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, MONTREAL*: Mr. *Tarte*, 343 (i).

MILTON (N.S.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Mr. *Forbes*, 324 (i).

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING CANADA: Mr. *Mulock*, 322 (i).

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID*: Mr. *Tarte*, 343 (i).

MORDEN (N.S.) PIER, PETS., &c.*: Mr. *Borden*, 477 (i).

MORRIS (MAN.) UNPATENTED LANDS IN MUNICIPALITY*: Mr. *LaRivière*, 2024 (i).

NOBLE BROS., FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WITHDRAWAL OF LICENSE: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1979 (i).

"OCEAN STR." CLAIMS AGAINST FOR DAMAGES TO BEAUHARNOIS CANAL*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).

"OLD CARLING BREWERY," PURCHASE OR LEASE BY GOVT.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2022 (i).

PICARD *vs.* PICARD, LETTER TO INDIAN COMMISSNR. FROM AGENT BASTIEN*: Mr. *Laurier*) 2022 (i).

PIG IRON MADE IN CAN., BOUNTY, &c.*: Mr. *Edgar*, 2022 (i)

PILON, FELIX, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).

PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: Mr. *Fauvel*, 339 (i).

POINT TUPPER TERMINUS, CAPE BRETON RY.: Mr. *Cameron*, 340 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO., REPS. TO GOVT.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 2405 (i).

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY., EARNINGS: Mr. *Devlin*, 211 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE, PURCHASE: Mr. *Martin*, 2376 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PAYMENTS: Mr. *LaRivière*, 3198 (ii).

PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) RY. ACCOMMODATION; Mr. *Perry*, 2385 (ii).

PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHS, &c., COMPANIES VISITING CAN.*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).

PROHIBITION. *See* "Liquor Traffic."

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., NON-PERMANENT EMPLOYEES*: Mr. *Tarte*, 343 (i).

QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE (N.S.) INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: Mr. *Forbes*, 326 (i).

RAILWAYS AND DRAINAGE: Mr. *Casey*, 208 (i)

RAILWAYS OF THE DOM., AID TO, &c., &c.*: Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*, 2023 (i).

REED, HAYTER, AMTS. PAID, &c.* (1879-94) MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 266 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, SALE OF LAND ON BANKS*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2406 (i).

RIVER INHABITANTS, INVERNESS, PETS., &c., FOR FLAG STATION*: Mr. *Cameron*, 343 (i).

ROSSLAND (B.C.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT.*: Mr. *Mara*, 2022 (i).

RY. SYSTEM IN P.E.I., EXTENSION: Mr. *Macdonald*, (*King's*) 2756 (ii).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS*: Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. SUBSIDY: Mr. *Bergeron*, 333 (i).

ST. PETER'S RESERVE (MAN.) INDIANS, MEMORIALS, &c.: Mr. *Laurier*, 4007 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL*: Mr. *Lister*, 2023 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS, GOVT.: Mr. *McMullen*, 332 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS STAMPS*: Mr. *Lépine*, 2024 (i).

SAW-DUST DEPOSITS, RIVERS EXEMPT IN N.S.: Mr. *Forbes*, 1975 (i).

SCHOOL LEGISLATION, MAN. (1890) JUDICIAL DECISIONS, &c.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 221 (i).

SEALERS IN BEHRING SEA, ILLEGAL SEIZURES: Mr. *Laurier*, 215 (i).

SENATE SPEAKER, LAW OFFICERS' OPINION *re* ACT*: Mr. *Mills*, (*Bothwell*) 221 (i).

SHEEP EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN: Mr. *Featherston*, 2385 (i).

SHEIK'S ISLAND DAM*: Mr. *Lister*, 2023 (i).

SHIELDS, FRANCIS, EX-POSTMASTER AT MILTON: Mr. *Forbes*, 324 (i).

SHOW PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHS, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).

SOUTH SHORE AND COAST RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: Mr. *Flint*, 3202, 4031 (ii).

STANLEY, STR., MAIL SERVICE P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 275 (i).

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK, PRINTING, &c.: Mr. *Casey*, 217 (i).

SUBSIDES TO RYS., PROVINCES, MILES SUBSIDIZED, BUILT, &c., &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 4007 (ii).

SUBSIDIZED SS., CONTRACTS, MAR. PROVS. AND WEST INDIES*: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

SUPERANNUATION, DATES, APPNMTS. AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES: Mr. *McMullen*, 273 (i).

TARIFF, THE, INCREASED DUTIES ON ITEMS, &c.: Mr. *Edgar*, 335 (i).

—— STATEMENT RESPECTING: Mr. *Amyot*, 265, 266.

"TAYMOUTH CASTLE," MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.*: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
THEATRICAL PRINTING, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).
THÉORET, ALEX., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).
THOUSAND ISLANDS, SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: Mr. *Taylor*, 1974 (i).
TIGNISH HARBOUR WHARF, NAMES, &C., OF VESSELS WHICH PAID DUES*: Mr. *Perry*, 2406 (i).
TOLLS ON PUBLIC WHARFS, COLLECTION*: Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).
TREATY WITH FRANCE*, Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).
TRENT CANAL, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Somerville*, 2406 (i).
UNPATENTED LANDS IN MORRIS, MAN.*: Mr. *La-Rivière*, 2024 (i).
WAR EAGLE GOLD MINING CO., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT ROSSLAND, B.C.: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).
WELLAND CANAL, CONTRACT FOR LUMBER: Mr. *Lowell*, 2363 (i).
WEST KOOTENAY CUSTOMS RETURNS, 1890 TO 1894: Mr. *Mara*, 321 (i).
WHEAT INSPECTORS AT FORT WILLIAM, NAMES, &c.: Mr. *Martin*, 431 (i).
WINGHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS*: Mr. *Macdonald* (*Huron*) 2406 (i).
YAMASKA EMBANKMENT AND LOCK*: Mr. *Mignault*, 2406 (i).
YARMOUTH BAR BREAKWATER, CONDITION, COST, &c.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2023 (i).
YEAR-BOOK (STATISTICAL) INSTRUCTIONS *re* PRINTING, &c.: Mr. *Casey*, 217 (i).

Reserve Life. *See* "PERMANENT."

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR APRIL: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427 (i).

REVISING OFFICERS, AUTHORITY FOR APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1080 (i).

—— LAPRAIRIE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930.

RICE IMPORTATIONS, UNCLEANED, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 1585 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, GOVT. LAND SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 1969 (i).

—— SALE OF LANDS ON BANKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).

RICHMOND P.O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

RICHMOND STATION AND DENISON MILLS MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).

RIMOUSKI P.O, CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3494 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS (N.W.T.) DISCARDED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Beryin*) 1078 (i).

RIVER INHABITANTS, INVERNESS, PETS., &c., FOR FLAG STATION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cameron*) 343 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU SUD: in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i).

Roads and Road Allowances (Man.) Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Daly.*) 1°, 2405; 2°* and in Com., 4072; 3°*, 4074 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

ROBINSON TREATY, ANNUITIES UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COMS. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 3455, 4969 (ii).

ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS. *See* "Sutton, Mr."

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 3781 (ii).

—— BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1588.

—— *See* "Military College."

ROYAL STANDARD, HOISTING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2137 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Dickey*) 2354 (i).

ROSA'S BRIDGE OVER OTONABEE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

ROSSLAND (B.C.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 2022 (i).

RUSTICO BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 699 (i).

STE. ANGELE DE MONNIOR, EX-POSTMASTER, PAPERS *re* DISMISSAL: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3627.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3713 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 481 (i).

STE. ROSE DE WATFORD AND LAKE ETCHEMIN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt.*)
See "Lake Etchemin."

St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co. (*title changed*) **B. No. 60** (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

ST. JEAN AND IBERVILLE REVISING OFFICERS, APPNMT. Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX *via* YARMOUTH SS. SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).

—— &c., AND WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3597 (ii).

—— DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3599 (ii).

—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i).

St. John River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. *McAlister*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

ST. JOHN (N. B.) RIVER, FISHERY REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 273, 430 (i).

—— IMPROVED NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3359 (i).

—— PILOTAGE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2360 (i).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4355 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

—— SUBSIDIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 333 (i).

St. Lawrence River North Shore Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 3542 (ii).

—— Water Lots: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 1549.

—— Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Civil Proceedings against: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1588 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3457 (ii).

—— Judge Desnoyers' Decision: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1552 (i).

—— Prosecution *re* Curran Bridge Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 926 (i).

St. Louis (P.E.I.) P.O., Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771, 2359 (i).

—— Station and Palmer Road, &c. (P.E.I.) Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 699 (i).

St. Rochs des Aulnets Lightship, Cordwood Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726 (ii).

St. Thomas P.O., Employees Salaries: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2163, 2357 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Article in North Sydney *Herald*: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 4580 (ii).

—— Opening for Navigation: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

St. Peter's Reserve (Man.) Indians, Memorials, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 4007 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co of Algoma B. No. 33 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

Salaries of Public Emplcyees Assignment, &c., B. No. 108 (Mr. *Bechard*) 1°, 2136 (i).

Salary Reduction. *See* "Governor General."

Salmon Fishing, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4839 (ii).

—— N.B., Licenses: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3455 (ii).

Salmon. *See* "Fisheries Act."

Salvation Army, proposed Can. Settlement: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

—— *See* "Booth, Genl."

San Jose "Scale" Pest in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 926 (i).

"San Pedro," Removal of Wreck: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 933 (i), 3708 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal and C.P.R. Steamers: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).

—— Contractors' Claims for Extras: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 272 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4707 (ii).

—— M. for O.C. (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).

—— Permanent Staff, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1972 (i).

Savings Banks Deposits, Govt.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2508 (i).

—— Stamps: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lépine*) 2024 (i).

Saw-dust Deposits, Rivers Exempt in N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1975 (i).

Saw-Logs in Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, Towing: prop. Res. (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 2405.

Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i), 3617 (ii).

School Legislation, Man. (1890) Judicial Decisions, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Charlton*) 221 (i).

School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Pelletier*). 1°*, 616: 2°*, 736 (i).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 839 (i); 2° and in Com., 3086; 3°, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

Sealers in Behring Sea, Illegal Seizures: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 215 (i).

Seal Fisheries, Compensation for Seizures: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 83 (i).

—— Sealing of Arms and Implements: Ques (Mr. *Prior*) 1083 (i).

—— *See* "Behring Sea."

Seal Island Life-boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).

Secretan, J. A., Amount Paid by Militia Dept.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Alien Labour in Can., Legislation respecting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

Civil Service Board of Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 3109 (ii).

—— Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

—— Payments to Temporary Clerks: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1585 (i).

—— Promotion Examinations, Abolition: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

—— Superannuation of Employees: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4116 (ii).

—— Temporary Clerks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3995 (ii).

Deptl. Report, Distribution from 1888 to 1895: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 362 (i).

Durocher's Ballot Paper: in Com. of Sup., 2093 (i).

Electoral Districts, Preparation of Maps: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

—— Lists, Revision: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 576 (i).

Experimental Farm Reps. Printing and Distribution: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2406 (i).

Printing and Stationery Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 410, 418 (i), 3101, 3907 (ii).

—— Reports, Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 309 (i).

Printing, Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 3905.

Printing, Paper and Binding: in Com. of Sup., 3342 (ii).

Revising Officers, Authority for Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1080 (i).

Secretary of State's Dept.: in Com. or Sup., 410 (i), 3101 (ii).

Voters' Lists. *See* general heading.

Security for Passengers, &c. *See* "Ry. Act."

Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths (*Chap. 10, Consolid. Statutes, L. C.*) **B. No. 7** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 79 (i); 2°, 2519; in Com. and 3°*, 2520 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

Seduction. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."

SEED GRAIN, PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2661 (ii).

SEIGNIORY OF SOREL, TENANTS ON GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 304 (i).

SEL. STANDING COMS.: Lists Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 223 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to add Names, 767 (i).

——— RYS., &c., 8TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3265 (ii).

——— 12TH REP. *re* LAKE MAN. RY., &c., CO.: M. (Mr. *Martin*) to ref. back, 4113 (ii).

——— MEETINGS DURING SITTINGS OF HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3909, 4113 (ii).

——— REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3545 (ii).

——— *See* "COMMITTEES."

SELF-BINDING HARVESTERS, EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2734 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 79; 2° neg. (Y. 46, N. 100) 2517 (ii).

Deb. on 2° (Mr. *Mulock*) 483, 495; (Mr. *Foster*) 486; (Mr. *Casey*) 485; (Mr. *Fraser*) 487; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 488; (Mr. *Edgar*) 488; Mr. (*Ouimet*) 489; (Mr. *Charlton*) 490; (Mr. *Weldon*) 491; (Mr. *Flint*) 492; (Mr. *Denison*) 493; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 494; (Mr. *Laurier*) 495; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 496; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498; (Mr. *Hazen*) 499; (Mr. *Lister*) 502; (Mr. *McMillan*) 504; (Mr. *McMullen*) 505; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 506; (Mr. *Ingram*) 507; (Mr. *Cameron*) 508; (Mr. *Baird*) 509; (Mr. *Sproule*) 509; (Mr. *Curran*) 512; (Mr. *Bruneau*) 513; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 514 (i).

SENATE SPEAKER, LAW OFFICERS' OPINION *re* ACT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 221 (i).

——— VACANCIES, &c.: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3848; neg. (Y. 55, N. 95) 3855 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).

——— VACANT SENATORSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480.

SHEEP EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Featherston*) 2385 (i).

SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3198 (ii),

——— M. for O.C. (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).

SHIELDS, F., EX-POSTMASTER OF MILTON (N.S.) REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

SHELBURNE, &c., INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2670 (ii).

——— HARBOUR, IRON CAN BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 700 (i).

SHIPPING REGULATIONS ON THE GREAT LAKES, U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2361 (i).

Shore Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Gilmor*) 1°*, 3078; M. to place on Order paper for 2°, 3111; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

SHOW PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHS, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).

Silver-Lead Smelting Encouragement B. No. 142 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. and in Com., 3925; 1°* of B., 4065; 2°* and in Com., 4123; recom., 4763; 3°*, 4767 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.* *c.* 7.)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, DELAY IN OPENING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2607 (ii).

——— *See* "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

SIX NATION INDIANS AND DEPTL. REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 429 (i).

SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3519 (ii).

SMITH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 596, 926 (i).

SMITH, WM., GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).

Societies, Exemption. *See* "INS. ACT."

SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4116 (ii).

SOUTH INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*). 1°*, 1179; 2° objected to, 1310, 1357; 2°*, 1733 (i); M. for Com., 4286; in Com., 4392, 4615, 4771; 3°*, 4771 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

——— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1078 (i).

——— M. for PETS., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3203, 4031 (ii).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; M. to ref. back to Com., 1689 (i).

SPEAKER. *See* "Senate."

SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE, 2 (i), 4911 (ii).

SPENCER, J. R., GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).

SPIRITS, CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES ON STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).

STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 226.

"STANLEY," STR., EXPLORATION OF HUDSON'S STRAITS: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 4905 (ii).

——— MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

STATE FUNERALS, LATE HON. THOS. WHITE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3193 (ii).

——— NAMES OF CANADIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2570 (ii).

"STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF CANADA": in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

——— YEAR-BOOK, PRINTING, &c.: M. for Instructions (Mr. *Casey*) 217 (i).

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, PREPARATION FOR BORING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3711 (ii).

——— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

STREAMS EXEMPT UNDER FISHERIES ACT (SAW-DUST): Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).

SUBSIDIES, RYS., PROVINCES, MILES BUILT, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4007 (ii).

——— PAID, 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1079 (i).

——— VOTED TO RYS. DURING 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).

SUBSIDISED SS. CONTRACTS, MAR. PROVS. AND WEST INDIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023.

——— STEAMERS TO WEST INDIES, &c., RET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3819 (ii).

SUGAR ISLAND, SALE BY INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Oriere*) 3359 (ii).

SUGAR, RAW AND REFINED, IMPORTS INTO MONTREAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1000 (i).

——— IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1357 (i).

——— IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

——— RAW AND REFINED: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 768 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 922.

Sunday Observance. *See* "LORD'S DAY."

Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 79; 2°* m., 2152 (i); deb. rsmd. and ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2518 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION LIST, DATES OF APPNMTS. AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 273 (i).

——— PAYMENTS BY CHARLES THIBAULT: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).

——— RETURNS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 774 (i), 3819 (ii).

SUPERANNUATIONS SINCE 1ST JAN., 1895, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3994 (ii).

Superannuation. *See* "CIVIL SERVICE," "JUDGES."

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*, &c.) Ministerial Explanations, 361; (Mr. *Brodeur*, &c.) Delayed Returns, 1885. Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) Free Lumber and Saw-logs, 2031 (i). Remarks (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*, &c.) Auditor Gen.'s Petition, 2408; (Mr. *Laurier*) Lachine Canal, Bridge Contract, 2608; (Mr. *Sutherland*, &c.) Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, 2608; (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright, 2683. Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, 2815; deb. adj., 2917; rsmd., 2947; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3078. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) Atlantic and Superior Ry., 3123. Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Public Expenditure, 3271: neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339. Amt. in Com. (Mr. *Denison*) Military College, 3781; neg., 3813. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Senate Vacancies, &c., 3848; neg. (Y. 55, N. 95) 3855. Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers by Cruisers, 3856; (Mr. *Allan*) Fisheries of the Great Lakes, 3948. Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271. Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*, &c.) Minister of Agriculture) 4273. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Manitoba Schools Question, 4379; neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4458. Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Manitoba Schools Question, 4496-4545; deb. adjd., 4579; rsmd., 4583; neg. 4707 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1895-96, 331 (i); Suppl., 4352 (ii); Suppl., 1894-95, 1539 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) FOR COM., 180; MS., 361, 1884, 2031, 2197, 2260, (i) 2409, 2608, 2683, 2815, 3097, 3123, 3271, 3464, 3597, 3674, 3781, 3848, 3948, 4256, 4379, 4496 (ii).

IN COM.: 384, 1910, 1938, 2086, 2197, 2261 (i), 2482, 2611, 2688, 2704, 2815, 3097, 3141, 3150, 3341, 3464, 3597, 3674, 3781, 3874, 3992, 4276, 4301, 4459, 4757 (ii).

RES. IN COM. OF WAYS AND MEANS, 2815, 4862 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. *See* "Justice."

Agriculture:

Agricultural Societies, N.W.T., 3349.
Dairying Interests, 2108, 3350, 4465.
Experimental Farm Bulletin, 3350.
Haras National, 3349.

Arts and Statistics:

Archives, 3342.
"Patent Record," 3345.
Photographic Exhibition at Imp. Institute, 3351.
"Statistical Abstract of Canada," 3345.

Charges of Management:

Asst. Receiver Genl's Office, Charlottetown, 1910.
General Vote, 3106.

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 2721.
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Agriculture, 3102.
Governor Gen's. Sec.'s Office, 1912.
High Commissioner's Office, 3097.
Indian Affairs, 3101.
Militia and Defence, 3100.
Post Office, 3922.
Printing and Stationery, 3101.
Public Works, 3102.
Secretary of State, 3101.
Trade and Commerce, 3106.
Unforeseen Expenses, 1917.
Civil Service Board of Examiners, 3100.
Customs Dept., 1912, 2710.
Finance Dept., 2704.
Fisheries Dept., 2704, 2721.
Geological Survey, 2723.
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, 384.
High Commissioner's Office, 3097.
Indian Affairs, 1918, 1938, 2650.
Inland Revenue Dept., 2718.
Interior Dept., 420, 2688.
Justice Dept., 407, 1913.
Penitentiaries Branch, 408, 1913.
Marine Dept., 2721.
Postmaster General's Dept., 2719.
Computing Interest, 3099.
Printing and Stationery Dept., 410, 418.
Privy Council Office, 386.
Public Works Dept., 2722.
Railways and Canals Dept., 2723.
Secretary of State's Dept., 410.
Trade and Commerce, 1912, 4459.

Collection of Revenues: 2270, 2502, 4276.

Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 4308.
Canals:
Beauharnois:
Leger, Pierre, gratuity to widow, 2270.
Cornwall:
Dawson, F., retiring allowance, 2272.
Galops:
Mullen, John, lockman, 2270.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Canals—*Continued.*
Lachine:
Maintenance and lighting Mill St., 2273.
Welland:
McClory and Edgraft, retiring allowances, 2272.
Williamsburg:
Reid, Geo., travelling expenses, 2270.
Cowan, Miles, allowance for extra services, 2502.
Culling Timber, 4282, 4462.
Excise. 4279.
Methylated Spirits, 4281.
Post Office, 2505, 4312.
Public Works, 4276.
Toronto Ry. Co., legal expenses, 2502.
Weights and Measures, &c.:
Inspection, 4285, 4301.
Werner, Levi, compensation, 2503.
Dominion Police: General Vote, 3141.
Dominion Lands: General Vote, 4317.
Fisheries:
Fishing Bounty Frauds, legal expenses, 2335.
Overseers and Guardians, N.S., salaries, &c., 3618.
——— B.C., salaries, &c., 3620.
——— Man., salaries, &c., 3619.
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 3621.
Geological Survey:
Artesian borings in N.W.T., 2488.
Government of N. W. T.: General Vote, 3905.
Indians:
British Columbia:
Medical attendance, &c., 2487.
Salaries, &c., 3874.
Manitoba and North-west Territories, 3814.
New Brunswick: salaries, &c., 3813.
Nova Scotia: Medical attendance, &c., 2484.
Ontario and Quebec:
Robinson Treaty, Annuities under, 2483.
Justice, Administration of:
British Columbia:
Chief Justices Crease and Davie, 1947.
Circuit Allowances, 3107.
Official Arbitrators, 3106.
Ontario:
Travelling Expenses, High Court Judges, 1947, 3107.
Quebec:
Chief Justice Casault, 1948.
Supreme Court of Can., 3108.
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Durocher's Ballot Slip, 2093.
Printing, Paper and Binding, 3342.
Sessional Indemnity, Senator Burns, 4460.
——— Mr. Sutherland, M.P., 2091.
———Senator Sutherland, 2105, 2669.
Voters' Lists, Revision, 1949, 2086, 3341.
Library:
Officers' salaries, 2341.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Maintenance and Repairs to Lights, &c., 3617.
Smith, Wm., Gratuity to widow, 2334.
Militia:
Permanent Corps, Pay and Allowances, 2197, 3177.
Civil Employees, salaries, &c., 3178.
Military Property, Stores, &c., 3178.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Militia—Continued.
Clothing and Necessaries, 3185.
Dom. Cartridge Factory, 3189
Drill, City Corps and Field Batteries, 4460.
Esquimalt Defences, 3189.
Miscellaneous, 3188.
Military College, 3781.
Warlike and other Stores, 3184.
Mounted Police, 2482.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Allan ss. Co., Ocean Mail Service, 3600.
Baddeck, Grand Narrows, &c., 3598.
Bay of Fundy ss. Co.'s services, 2332.
Furness Line, ss. services, 2332.
Gaspé Basin, &c., and Dalhousie, N.B., 3598.
McDonald, Roderick, balance of Account, 2333.
Pictou, N.S., Murray Harbour, Georgetown, &c., P.E.I., 3599.
Port Mulgrave, Arichat, &c., 3600.
Prince Edward Island and Mainland, 2331.
P.E.I. and Mainland, season of 1895, 3597.
St. John, &c., and West Indies, 3597.
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, &c., 3598.
St. John, Digby and Annapolis, 3599.
Yarmouth ss. Co.'s services, 2332.
Miscellaneous:
Academy of Arts, 3907.
Banff Hot Springs Reservation, 3907.
Canada Temperance Act, Expenditure, 3906.
Colonial Conference, balance of Expenses, 2489.
Commutation in Lieu of remission of Duties, 3906.
Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 3906.
Liquor Traffic Commission, further Expenditure, 2491, 2611; conc., 2673.
Medicine Hat General Hospital, 2499.
Miscellaneous Printing, 3905.
Passamaquoddy Bay, &c., Boundary Survey, 3908.
Printing Bureau Plant, 3907.
Straits of Northumberland, Survey, 3908.
Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses, 2500, 2632; conc., 2673.
Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund, 2501; conc., 2682.
Ocean and River Service:
Masters and Mates, Examination, 3615.
Seal Island Life-boat Station, 3616.
Tidal Service, 3616.
Winter Mail Service, 2333.
Open Account:
Seed Grain, purchase and distribution, 2661.
Post Office. *See* "Collection of Revenues."
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 2669.
Justice Drake's services, 1948, 2669.
Dorchester, 3176.
Kingston, 3141.
Manitoba, 3141.
Regina Jail, 3141.
St. Vincent de Paul, 1948.
Gibson, W. W., Salary, 1948.
Public Works—Capital:*
Harbours and Rivers:
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3464.
Kaministiquia River, 3465.

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
New Westminster Drill Shed, 4461.
Vancouver Public Buildings, 2302.
Victoria Drill Hall and P. O., 3509.
Manitoba:
Brandon Industrial School, 2298; conc., 2672.
New Brunswick:
Marysville P.O., 3489, 3922.
St. John Custom House, 2273.
North-west Territories, 3508.
Nova Scotia:
Halifax Drill Hall, 3477.
Ontario:
Arnprior P. O. and Custom House, &c., 3505.
Brockville, Cornwall and Strathroy Public Buildings, 2296.
Dom. Reformatory, 3505.
Quebec:
Montreal P. O., Lighting, 2293.
Richmond P. O. and Custom House, 3402.
Rimouski P. O. and Custom House, &c., 3494.
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:
Rideau Hall, Renewals, &c., Lighting Public Buildings, &c., 2302.
Dredging:
Maritime Provinces, 3536.
Experimental Farms, 3510.
Harbours and Rivers generally:
Maritime Provinces, Repairs, &c., 2305.
Harbours and Rivers.
British Columbia:
Fraser River Channel, 3533.
Nova Scotia:
South Ingonish Wharf, 2304.
Nova Scotia:
Cow Bay Breakwater, 3510.
New Brunswick;
Hopewell Cape Wharf, 2304.
Negro Point Breakwater, 3514.
Ontario:
General Vote, 3525.
Prince Edward Island:
Wood Island, &c., Breakwaters, 3512.
Quebec:
Rivière du Sud, 2331.
Generally, 3514.
Slides and Booms, 3519.
Telegraphs:
British Columbia, 3542.
St. Lawrence North Shore Line, 3542.
Quarantine:
Organized Districts, salaries, 3354.
Public Health in Quarantine Districts, 3354.
Tracadie Lazaretto, 3354.
Railways and Canals—Capital.*
Canals:
Cornwall, 3703.
Grenville, 3707.
Sault Ste. Marie, 4707.
Rapide Plat, 3703.
Galops, 3704.
Soulanges, 3699.

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Capital—Continued.
Trent, 3705.
Railways:
Canadian Pacific, 3674.
Construction, Award, 3674.
Intercolonial, 3682.
Halifax, increased accommodation, &c., 3682.
Railways and Canal—Income.
Canals:
Beauharnois, 2257; conc., 2672.
Chambly, Hurteau, Yule and Riddell's accounts, 2261.
Cornwall, Govt. Sewer, Telephone, &c., 2262.
Farran's Point, 2264; conc., 2672.
Lachine, 2229; Commission *re* Bridge, salaries, &c., 2229.
Rideau, Land Damages, 2256.
Trent, Roser's Bridge over Otonabee River, 2265.
Welland Canal, North Cayuga Township's claim, 2266.
Scientific Institutions, 2334, 3617.
Hydrographic Surveys, 3617.
Trade and Commerce: 1912 (i), 3105, 4347, 4459.

CONCURRENCE:
Brandon Industrial School, 2672.
Farran's Point Canal, 2672.
Golden City, Refund of Fines, 2334.
Hydrographic Surveys, 3617.
Liquor Traffic Commission, further Expenditure, 2673.
Spencer, J. R., gratuity to widow, 2334.
Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses, 2673.
Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund, 2682.
Valleyfield Drain, Beauharnois Canal, 2672.

Supply B. No. 125 (Mr. *Foster*). Res., 2815; 1°* of B., 3085; 2°*, 3111; 3°*, 3266 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

Supply B. No. 149 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., 4862; 1°* of B., 4863; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

SUPREME COURT OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3108 (ii).
SUTHERLAND, M.P., MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
—— SENATOR: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (i).
SUTTON, MR., APPNMT. IN ROYAL CAN. DRAGOONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1972 (i), 2919 (ii).
TARIFF, THE, CHANGES: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4847 (ii).
—— *See* "BUDGET," "WAYS AND MEANS."
—— INCREASED DUTIES ON ITEMS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).
—— STATEMENTS RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 265 (i).
TAY CANAL, REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
"TAYMOUTH CASTLE," MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *McAlister*). 1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

Temperance Act. *See* "CAN."

THEATRICAL PRINTING, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).
THIBAULT, ALPHONSE, TOBACCO SEIZED FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).
——— PAYMENTS TO SUPERANNUATION FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).
THOMPSON, LADY, CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL FUND: in Com. of Sup., 2501, 2682 (ii).
THOMPSON, LATE SIR J. S. D., FUNERAL EXPENSES, DETAILS: Ques. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 2922 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2500, 2632; conc., 2673 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2726 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2516 (ii).
——— *See* "DIVISIONS."
Thousand Islands Ry. Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); wthdn., 2570.
THOUSAND ISLANDS, RESERVATIONS FOR NATIONAL PARK: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3997 (ii).
——— SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CONSTRUCTION OF HAY SHED BY C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2358 (i).
——— CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 574 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (*Chap.* 10, *Statutes* 1892) **Amt. B. No. 113** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 2259; 2°* and in Com., 3270 (i); 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)
THREE RIVERS, HARBOUR COMMISSION, REVENUE AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4356 (ii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3995 (ii).
TIDAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1361 (i).
——— WHARFINGER'S RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i), 3714 (ii).
——— TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).
——— NAMES, &C., OF VESSELS WHICH PAID DUES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 2406 (i).
——— WHARFINGER'S COLLECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 430 (i).
TOBACCO, CAN., DUTY COLLECTED IN 1894, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1587 (i).
——— PROTECTION AGAINST FOREIGN LEAF: Remarks (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 2030 (i).
——— ISLE VERTE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 697 (i).
——— SEIZURE IN ST. LOUIS DE HA HA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).
——— SEIZURE IN TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY., DOM. BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2941 (ii).
——— OPENING FOR TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2755 (ii).
TOLLS ON PUBLIC WHARFS, COLLECTION: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).
TORONTO DRILL HALL, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1383 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com., 3230, 3407, 3948; recom., 4030, 4154; 3° m., 4154; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4154; neg. (Y. 39, N. 113) 4163; 3°, 4164 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
TORONTO RY. CO., LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2502 (ii).
TOWNSHIP 16, RANGE 16-W., NEW SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2138 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4054 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 3105, 4347, 4459 (ii).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS," &c.
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Wallace*) 86 (i).
Trade Marks. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."
Trade Restraint. *See* "CONSPIRACIES, &c."
Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)
TRANS-ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, FAST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 305 (i).
Trans-Canadian Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 572 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, HIGH COURT JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i), 3107 (ii).
Treaty with France B. No. 126 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 3085; 2°, 3558; in Com., 3564; 3° m. 3820; 3° on div., 3848 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)
TREATY WITH FRANCE, IMPORTATION OF GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1968 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).
——— PRIVILEGES TO FOREIGN POWERS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1697 (i).
——— RATIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).
TRENT CANAL, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies * (Mr. *Somerville*) 2406 (i).
——— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
——— COST SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 481 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3705 (ii).
TROIS PISTOLES POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4708 (ii).
TROOPS FOR ENGLAND, HIGH COMMISSIONERS PUBLIC STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).
TROOPS IN QUEBEC, REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2361 (i).
TURENNE, AUZIAS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Union Labels, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."
Unlawful Associations. *See* "SEDITIOUS."
UNPATENTED LANDS IN MORRIS, MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

U.S. Customs Board of Appraisers: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1826 (i).
——— Shipping Regulations on the Great Lakes: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2361 (i).
Vacancies in the Senate: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480 (i).
——— House of Commons: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
Vacancy in the Cabinet: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 4581.
Valleyfield Drain, Beauharnois Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2509 (ii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2302.
Vanluven, Peter, Declarations *re* Dominion Bank: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
Ventilation of the Chamber: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1827 (i).
Victoria Drill Hall and P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
Voters' Lists (1895) B. No. 69 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3628; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656; 2° and in Com., 3657; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)
Volunteers' Long Service Medals: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) 4906 (ii).
Voters' Lists for Wright, Ottawa Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 2351 (i).
——— Outside Printing, Amount Paid: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 308 (i).
——— Cost of Revision: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 83, 229.
——— Revision: in Com. of Sup., 1949, 2086 (i), 3341 (ii).
——— Megantic, &c., Printing: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).
——— Lotbinière, Printing: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).
——— Revision: Correction (Mr. *Montague*) 1002 (i).
——— Laprairie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).
——— Revision: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 576 (i).
Voting by Employees. *See* "Dom."
Wakefield and Rupert Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1585 (i).
War Eagle Gold Mining Co. Cor. *re* Customs Collector at Rossland, B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).
Warlike and Other Stores: in Com. of Sup., 3184.
Warner, Levi, Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 2503 (ii).
Watters, T. J., Offence and Punishment: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 920 (i).
WAYS AND MEANS: Res. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 180 (i).
——— Res. in Com., 2815, 4862 (ii).
——— M. for Com., 4786, 4819 (ii).
——— Tariff Changes, in Com., 4847 (ii).
——— *See* "Budget," "Supply."
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Wilson*). 1°, 80 (i).
Weights and Measures and Gas, Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i.)
——— in Com. of Sup., 2503, 4285, 4301 (ii).
Weir, Mr., of Keene, Pension: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1453 (i).
Welland Canal, Contract for Lumber: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).
West Kootenay Customs Returns, 1899 to 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 321 (i).
West Rideau Lake Dam, Land Damages: Ques. (Mr *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
West Point (P.E.I.) Wharf, Rebuilding: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
Wheat Profits: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2051 (i).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. No. 144 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°, 4353; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4751 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)
Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
Wingham Industrial Establishments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co., O.C. *re* Grant: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 928 (i).
Winnipeg City Water Power revival Acts Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Martin*). 1°*, 3266; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)
Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150 (Mr. *Haggart*). Res. prop., 4819; M. for Com., 4863; in Com., 4869; conc. and 1°* of B., 4876; 2° m., 4877; 2° and in Com., 4890; 3°*, 4893 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)
Wood Island, &c., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
World's Fair, Can. Commissioners' Expenses: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).
——— Can. Employees, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3710 (ii).
——— Expenses: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1361 (i).
——— Medals and Diplomas: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 84 (i).
——— Mr. Larke's Services: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).
Yamaska Embankment and Lock: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Mignault*) 2406. (i).
——— and St. Our's Locks, Charges on Vessels: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2735 (ii).
——— River Obstructions, Removal: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 924 (i).
——— Lock and Dam, Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1697 (i).
——— Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2359 (i).
Yarmouth Bar Breakwater, Condition, Cost, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2023 (i).
Yarmouth SS. Co.'s Service: in Com. of Sup., 2332.
Year-Book (Statistical) Instructions *re* Printing, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Casey*) 217 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE

ORDER :

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS IN COM.: Amt. prop. by Mr. *McLean* (*York*) objected to by Mr. *Tisdale* and Rule read, 3236; ruled by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* out of Order, no notice having been given, 3237 (ii).

ATTACKS ON PUBLIC OFFICIALS objected to by Mr. *Weldon* and an appeal to the Chair; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 799.

BREACH OF PARLIAMENTARY RULES: Member called to Order by Mr. *Speaker* for using unparliamentary language; a withdrawal requested, 2944 (ii).

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.: Amt. prop. by Mr. *Gillies* declared out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, the subject not being relevant to original motion, 3383 (ii).

INTERRUPTIONS BY MEMBERS AND PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 1029 (i).

MEMBER'S REMARKS AS TO VERACITY CHALLENGED BY MR. CASEY: Mr. *Speaker* appealed to, who asked withdrawal of same, 1266 (i).

MEMBER'S REMARKS CHALLENGED BY Mr. *Ives*, 826 (i).

MEMBER'S REMARKS CHECKED BY MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. *Perry*) 517; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1875; (Mr. *Brodeur*) &c., 1884 (i); (Mr. *Lister*) 2943; (Mr. *Gillies*) 3383; (Mr. *Cameron*) 3423; (Mr. *Casey*) 3622; (Mr. *Bowers*) 3671; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4360; (Mr. *McLennan* 4748 (ii).

MEMBER'S REMARKS STATED TO BE UNTRUE BY AN HON. MEMBER: the latter was called to Order by Mr. *Speaker* and asked to withdraw the same; wthdn., 2380 (ii).

MOTIONS TO ADJN. HOUSE AN ABUSE OF PRIVILEGE: Mr. *Speaker's* attention called by Mr. *Daly* to a previous ruling, 1831; Remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 1832 (i).

OBJECTION TAKEN BY MR. FOSTER TO MEMBER asking Mr. Speaker to reconsider his Ruling *re* Unparliamentary Language: Rules of the House quoted and further remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 2513, 2516 (ii).

ORDERS OF THE DAY: Making speeches before being called objected to by Mr. *Ives*; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 345 (i).

REFERENCE TO PREVIOUS DEBATE objected to by Mr. *McCarthy*, 813; sustained (Mr. *Speaker*) 814 (i).

REFERENCE TO PROCEEDINGS IN A COM.: objection (Mr. *Martin*) declared out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 2839 (ii).

QUESTIONS (LENGTHY) ON ORDER PAPER: Mr. *Speaker's* attention drawn to the matter by Mr. *Foster*, 2733; Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* and Ques. ruled in Order, 2734 (ii).

ORDER—*Continued.*

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS: Par. in Peterborough *Examiner re* Govt. Pensioners; prop. Ques. by Mr. *Landerkin* checked by Mr. *Speaker* as not being in accordance with the Rules of Parlt.; Rule and May quoted, 924; further authorities quoted, 1882 (i).

QUOTING NEWSPAPER ARTICLES: Member's attention called by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule of the House pertaining to such matters, 4814 (ii).

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: (Mr. *Daly*) 821; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 844; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1108; (Mr. *Martin*) 1834; (Mr. *Foster*) 1275; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1906; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2061; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2070; (Mr. *Martin*) 2380 (i); (Mr. *Lister*) 2944, 4488; (Mr. *Davin*) 3001; (Mr. *Casey*) 4491 (ii).

PRIVILEGE :

CARRIAGE OF MAILS IN P. E. I.: Personal Explanation *re* Paragraph in *Mail-Empire* (Mr. *Perry*) 517 (i).

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS, AND GOVT. POLICY; M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. House, 4709; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 4730 (ii).

FREE LUMBER AND SAW LOGS: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE: Mr. *Speaker* asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg to reconsider his decision *re* Unparliamentary language, 2512 (ii).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Statement in *Canada Farmer's Sun* respecting Mr. *Taylor's* actions in the House, 4813 (ii).

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS: Omissions in division lists, attention of House called to the fact by Mr. *Boyd* whose name did not appear in two divisions, 4358 (ii).

PROCEDURE :

ADJOURNED DEBATE: prop. M. of Mr. *Foster* to to make adjd. deb. on Com. of Sup. the first Order of the Day at the next sitting of the House; objection taken by Mr. *McCarthy* and Mr. *Speaker* appealed to as to its being in Order or not; Ruling, 2918 (ii).

ADJNMT. OF THE HOUSE: Member's attention drawn by Mr. Speaker to the fact that a Motion for Adjnmt. having been negatived and nothing intervening there can be no other motion for adjnmt. made; Rule read, 359 (i).

ADJNMT. OF THE HOUSE: Ms.: Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* and authorities quoted, 1293 (i).

PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

ADJNMT. OF THE HOUSE: Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* to the effect that any Member has a right to bring before the House a matter of urgency on M. to adjourn, but the debate should be confined to the subject matter of urgency, &c., 803 (i).

AMT. TO REPEAL FRANCHISE ACT made by Mr. *Mulock* to 2° of B. 69 (Voters Lists) objected to by Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*, 3637; May quoted, 3640; Mr. *Speaker* stated that if Amt. carried it would be an instruction to Govt. to bring in a B. to repeal the Franchise Act; Mr. Speaker Brand quoted; Amt. ruled in Order by Mr. *Speaker* 3640 (ii).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SITTINGS OF HOUSE: On M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) objection taken by Mr. *Edgar* no notice having been given, 3909; objected to also by Mr. *Casey*, 3911; objections sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, 3912 (ii).

PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

MOVING AN AMT: Members having spoken cannot move an Amt., but some other Member can do so (Mr. *Speaker*) 4361 (ii)

ON M. FOR THE HOUSE TO GO INTO COM. ON A GOVT. RES. ON A CERTAIN DAY: Members reminded by Mr. *Speaker* that no discussion can take place under the motion but can take place upon motion for Com. of the Whole, 1884 (i).

REDUCTION OF QUORUM OF SEL. COM.: M. by Mr. *Weldon*, objected to by Mr. *Edgar*, no notice having been given, 3545; Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* and Bourinot quoted, 3550, 3553; M. declared in Order, 3553 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMT. B. 6: On 2° Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the B. involving a charge upon the public revenue should not be introduced by a private Member, 2159; would be introduced by authority of the Crown and by resolution, 2518 (ii).

581